Deb,

Would a Friday time work for your team? I see a few things in this email that could use some additional clarification. Bill and I are generally available though avoiding the 10-11 time slot is preferable. 30 min may be sufficient.

-Erik

---

Hi Erik and Bill,

Per your request, provided below are responses to the four (4) questions you raised on Wednesday. If you need further information, then I would refer you to Dave Blaha. If I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Thanks,

--Deb

1. What is the status of the current QAQC phase and when will DNR receive a report?

We have completed Phase 1 and believe the models can be used for evaluation of design concepts and project planning. We will provide a concise memo report by Sept 21st to DNR describing what we checked and providing examples of the independent calculations performed.

2. How long will the next QAQC phase be?

This is something we should discuss. There will be many changes in the next version of the model, which I presume comes after the final AWMP. Most notably will be elimination of PRBs and engineered wetlands.

3. Would Fred find it beneficial to have Foth review the next phase of the modeling effort or is it unnecessary? (PolyMet is willing to authorize Foth for this activity.)

We don’t have a problem with Foth’s review, but also don’t feel that it is critical.

4. Will Fred continue with the current model flow path QAQC before the next AWMP comes in?
We propose to stop for now, consolidate what we’ve done, and wait to see how much the new model changes. We do think a conference call with Erik/Bill/Steve is probably warranted to discuss our objectives for the next round of review.

---

From: Deb McGovern  
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2012 3:51 PM  
To: David Blaha  
Cc: Deb McGovern; Melinda Todorov  
Subject: NorthMet: QAQC Update Requested by DNR

Hi Dave,  Erik called before lunch and wanted an update on the QAQC effort. I told him that Fred has reported out to us internally, and I thought that he was awaiting directions from you. Is that the case? Specifically, Erik and now Bill want an update on the following four (4) items:

1. What is the status of the current QAQC phase and when will DNR receive a report?  
2. How long will the next QAQC phase be?  
3. Would Fred find it beneficial to have Forth review the next phase of the modeling effort or is it unnecessary? (PolyMet is willing to authorize Forth for this activity.)  
4. Will Fred continue with the current model flow path QAQC before the next AWMP comes in?

I’m hoping that you will be able to provide an update yet today or tomorrow. I would send the update directly to Erik and Bill, and copy Al and me. FYI, Erik is out for the rest of this week & his last day at DNR is Sept 21st.

Thanks,

--Deb

Debra L. McGovern  
Environmental Resource Management (ERM)  
190 East Fifth Street, Suite 255  
St. Paul, MN  55101

(T): 651/

One Planet. One Company. ERM.

Please consider the environment before printing.

---

From: Johnson, Bill H (DNR)  
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2012 2:30 PM  
To: Deb McGovern  
Cc: Carlson, Erik (DNR)  
Subject: Check-in

Deb, please copy me on your report back from Fred on the QA/QC status, looking ahead request from Erik. Thanks. Bill.
This message contains information which may be confidential, proprietary, privileged, or otherwise protected by law from disclosure or use by a third party. If you have received this message in error, please contact us immediately and take the steps necessary to delete the message completely from your computer system. Thank you.

Please visit ERM's web site: http://www.erm.com