

Johnson, Bill H (DNR)

From: Jim Scott <jr.scott@ [REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, January 20, 2012 1:40 PM
To: Carlson, Erik (DNR)
Cc: Moore Brad
Subject: Re: (PolyMet's land tenure boundaries) map information request

Erik

I have discussed with PolyMet management. PolyMet has initiated the process to acquire the parcel mentioned below and sees no reason that the process will not be successfully completed.

Jim

From: Carlson, Erik (DNR)
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2012 11:15 AM
To: Jim Scott
Subject: FW: (PolyMet's land tenure boundaries) map information request

Jim,
See below

From: Al Trippel [mailto:Al.Trippel@ [REDACTED]]
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2012 10:30 AM
To: Hale, Thomas A -FS; Liz Roat (eschleif [REDACTED] Carlson, Erik (DNR)
Cc: Hingsberger, Thomas J MVP; Deb McGovern; Ross Vellacott; Heather Heater; Steven Koster; David Blaha
Subject: FW: (PolyMet's land tenure boundaries) map information request

Tom and Liz - - before we incorporate these corrections by PolyMet into the draft PSDEIS analysis & chapters, can you address the outstanding items about transmission line ROW and railroad property boundary that PolyMet is asking for USFS confirmation on (see second of their figs attached) ?

Erik - - (JIM CAN YOU PLEASE GET AN ANSWER TO THIS?)similarly, can you verify that the State forty acre parcel south of railroad **T59 R13 Sec. 10** is going to be acquired by PolyMet ? We need to know how to show it on maps, and whether to include or exclude from certain impact analyses (eg air modeling "fenceline" boundary).

Once these are resolved, ERM will request GIS shapefiles from PolyMet/Barr and start the process of revising chaps 3, 4 , and 5 - - and alerting impact assessors so they can adjust their models/calculations of impacts to water, air, veg, wetlands, etc.....

Is it possible to confirm these by Tuesday Jan 24 ? That would help minimize schedule pressures on making all the changes throughout the analyses & draft chapters.

Thanks, Al

From: John Borovsky [mailto:JBorovsky [REDACTED]]
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2012 1:05 PM
To: 'Carlson, Erik (DNR)'; Al Trippel; Deb McGovern
Cc: 'Kevin Pylka'; 'Jim Scott'; Amy R. Meulebroeck; Pat Sheehy; Jennifer J. Koenen; Tina Pint; Christie Kearney; Tom Radue
Subject: FW: map information request

Erik,

This email, Amy's email below and the attachment provide a response to your request to Jim Scott (12/06/11, see email thread below) regarding project boundaries. These boundaries are largely driven by eventual surface ownership. As you know PolyMet continues to pursue surface ownership and some of that ownership acquisition is a subject of the EIS (USFS Land Exchange). Finally, some land areas are subject to transfer of State leases to PolyMet upon permitting of the proposed project (representation of such lands was previously provided in DEIS). Therefore the attachment also provides the most up to date information on current and planned surface ownership. As requested, we will provide ERM with shape files for this information, although this will be delivered under separate cover with cc to you.

We hope this information is self explanatory, however we would be glad meet/conference call as necessary to answer potential questions. In any case, we would like to avoid a flood of follow up transactions with individual information users within ERM's very busy team.

Regards,

John Borovsky

Senior Environmental Scientist
Vice President
Minneapolis office: [REDACTED]
cell: [REDACTED]
jborovsky [REDACTED]
www.barr.com

resourceful. naturally.



From: Amy R. Meulebroeck
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2012 5:04 PM
To: John Borovsky
Cc: Christie Kearney; Pat Sheehy; Tina Pint; Cheryl D. Feigum; Lisa A. Ungar
Subject: RE: map information request

Hi John-

I think the best way to respond to Erik's request is to provide 3 figures, see attached. Erik's request specifically asked for the ambient air boundaries so those are on the first figure in the PDF. The request references Large Figure 7 of the Mine Plan Management Plan so an updated version of that figure has been used as a base for this figure. Erik also originally requested the Permit to Mine boundary and groundwater compliance boundary but these are not included in this response based on his 12/12/2011 email to you saying "I got an answer earlier than anticipated. Please leave the permit to mine boundary off" and your subsequent phone conversations with Erik about groundwater compliance boundary.

The last two figures in the PDF provide detail updates to surface ownership data that occurred since the Mine Plan Management Plan was submitted. The second figure in the PDF is an updated version of Large Figure 7 from the Mine Plan Management Plan and the areas where changes have occurred have been called out with red circles. The last figure in the PDF shows a more detailed view of surface ownership changes in the mine site/land exchange area. As in the second figure, changes have been called out with red circles.

The last item Erik requests is for GIS shapefiles to be submitted "in the same package of information as the modified project footprint shapefiles." I will be submitting that data to Matt Teichert (ERM's GIS Technician) later this week.

Please let me know if you have any questions about this.

Amy R. Meulebroeck

GIS Specialist
Water Resources
Minneapolis office: [REDACTED]
[ameulebroeck@\[REDACTED\]](mailto:ameulebroeck@[REDACTED])
www.barr.com

resourceful. naturally.



From: Jim Scott [mailto:jr.scott@[REDACTED]]
Sent: Tuesday, December 06, 2011 7:57 PM
To: John Borovsky; Pylka Kevin
Cc: Carlson Erik (DNR); Trippel Al
Subject: Fw: map information request

John – please work with Barr staff and coordinate Kevin to satisfy this request

Kevin – please coordinate with John to satisfy this request

As I understand the Mgt Plan maps are current with information learned in the land exchange process. Going forward the plan is to show ownership or control by lease or access rights in only the Project Description and show permit boundaries (PTM, ambient air and GW) in Mgt Plans.

Contact me if there are questions.

Jim

From: Al Trippel
Sent: Tuesday, December 06, 2011 2:04 PM
To: Carlson, Erik (DNR)
Cc: Jim Scott
Subject: RE: map information request

This captures the items well

Thanks

From: Carlson, Erik (DNR) [mailto:Erik.Carlson@[REDACTED]]
Sent: Tuesday, December 06, 2011 12:49 PM
To: Jim Scott
Cc: Al Trippel
Subject: map information request

Hi Jim,

My understanding is that the project area depicted in Large Figure 7 in version 1 of the Mine Plan is the most up-to-date version of the project area.

Has Barr been using this figure as a baseline assumption in their air and water analyses for the EIS or another version? If another, which one?

We are checking with our technical people to see if internally there is consistency in using this map or another.

We would also like to check a few other things with you to verify consistency.

So here is the info request:

Using Large Figure 7 as a base, please provide to me and AI a GIS file that show these boundaries:

- Ambient air boundary for the mine site and plant site
- Groundwater compliance boundaries for the mine site and plant site
- Permit to Mine boundary

It may be convenient to provide these GIS layers in the same package of information as the modified project footprint shapefiles.

I appreciate your help.

(AI if I have missed something please chime in.)

Erik Carlson, AICP
Principal Planner
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources


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>

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>

Johnson, Bill H (DNR)

From: Jim Scott <jr.scott@ [REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2012 3:06 PM
To: Carlson, Erik (DNR); Jim Scott; John Borovsky
Subject: Re: NMet EIS - - request for meetings on land tenure and facility boundary changes

Erik

I was not planning to be down here on Thurs or Friday and would prefer to join by phone – if that is the case, any time either day would work. If F2F is required, I would prefer Wed 1/25 as soon after 12:30PM (I have a meeting at MPCA that gets over then) as practical.

Also project changes that we envision would be presented and accepted/modifies as part of water modeling results review.

Jim

From: Carlson, Erik (DNR)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2012 2:45 PM
To: Jim Scott ; John Borovsky
Subject: FW: NMet EIS - - request for meetings on land tenure and facility boundary changes

Al Trippel would like a meeting to discuss maps, Thursday Jan 26 or Friday Jan 27. Thursday morning or anytime Friday works for us. In person would be best, but I understand the restraints on people's time so I can set up a conference call if necessary. Please let me know your availability. Thank you.

-Erik

From: Al Trippel [[mailto:Al.Trippel@\[REDACTED\]](mailto:Al.Trippel@[REDACTED])]
Sent: Friday, January 20, 2012 5:11 PM
To: Carlson, Erik (DNR); [thale@\[REDACTED\]](mailto:thale@[REDACTED]); Hingsberger, Thomas J MVP
Cc: Deb McGovern; Ross Vellacott; Heather Heater
Subject: NMet EIS - - request for meetings on land tenure and facility boundary changes

Greetings

ERM has reviewed PolyMet/Barr's emails of Jan 11 and 12 about corrected land tenure and facility boundaries - - and would like to meet with you and PolyMet/Barr to clarify and resolve various outstanding items. A few land tenure items are already being worked on by Tom and Erik. We also need to learn the timing of other project changes PolyMet/Barr have recently said are going to be submitted soon.....

We'd like to use about 15 minutes of our PM meeting next Monday Jan 23 to highlight our questions (and synchronize our collective ones) ?

And can you trigger a F2F meeting for us (Co-lead PMs and ERM) with PolyMet/Barr for either Thurs Jan 25 or Fri Jan 26 to resolve outstanding questions ?

It is critical for gantt schedule reasons that these all be resolved by Jan 31 so ERM can launch necessary revisions (ripple effect) to PSDEIS draft chaps 1-4 already prepared, and to adjust impact analyses and chap 5 writing that are in progress.

Thanks, Al