NorthMet Project

Adaptive Water Management Plan

Version 5

Issue Date: March 7, 2013

Table of Contents

Acronyms, Abbreviations and Units 1
1.0 Introduction 3
1.1 Purpose and Outline 5
1.2 Definitions 7
1.3 Adaptive Management Process 8
2.0 Mine Site Adaptive Water Management 10
2.1 Overview 10
2.1.1 Water Management Systems 10
2.1.2 Water Resource Objectives 14
2.1.3 Monitoring 15
2.2 Waste Water Treatment Facility (WWTF) 15
2.2.1 Purpose and Overview 15
2.2.1.1 Operations 15
2.2.1.2 Reclamation 16
2.2.1.3 Long-Term Closure 16
2.2.2 Preliminary Design Basis 16
2.2.2.1 Preliminary Process Water Quantities 17
2.2.2.2 Preliminary Process Water Quality 19
2.2.2.3 Preliminary WWTF Unit Process Design 21
2.2.2.3.1 WWTF Preliminary Water Quality Targets 21
2.2.2.3.2 Preliminary WWTF Design Overview 23
2.2.2.3.3 Chemical Precipitation 24
2.2.2.3.4 Membrane Filtration 27
2.2.2.3.5 WWTP Reject Concentrate Management 30
2.2.2.3.6 Site Layout 30
2.2.2.3.7 Building 30
2.2.3 Engineering Control Performance 31
2.2.3.1 Description with Basis 31
2.2.3.2 Modeling of Engineering Controls 31
2.2.4 Adaptive Management 31
2.2.4.1 Reporting and Model Update 31
2.2.4.2 Circumstances Triggering Modification 32
2.2.4.3 Options for Modified Performance 32
2.2.5 Reclamation and Long-Term Closure 32

2.2.5.1 Reclamation 32
2.2.5.1.1 Chemical Precipitation 33
2.2.5.1.2 Membrane Treatment 33
2.2.5.1.3 WWTP Reject Concentrate Management 33
2.2.5.2 Long-Term Closure 33
2.2.5.3 Financial Assurance 34
3.0 Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Cover System 35
3.1 Project Feature 35
3.2 Planned Engineering Control 35
3.2.1 Purpose 35
3.2.2 Design 35
3.2.2.1 Top Surface Grading and Drainage 40
3.2.2.2 Outslope Grading and Drainage 41
3.2.2.3 Downchutes 41
3.2.2.4 Stockpile Ramp Channels 41
3.2.2.5 Geomembrane Hydraulic Barrier Layer 42
3.2.3 Degree of Use in Industry 43
3.3 Engineering Control Performance Parameters 44
3.3.1 Description with Basis 44
3.3.1.1 Mechanisms for Percolation through Geomembrane Cover Systems 44
3.3.1.2 Methodology for Calculation of Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Percolation 48
3.3.1.3 Cover Construction Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) 50
3.3.2 Maintenance Program 51
3.3.3 Modeling of Engineering Controls 53
3.3.4 Impact on Transition to Non-Mechanical Treatment 56
3.4 Adaptive Management 59
3.4.1 Test Projects 59
3.4.2 Reporting and Model Update 59
3.4.3 Modified Design 60
3.4.3.1 Circumstances Triggering Modification 60
3.4.3.2 Options For Modified Performance 60
3.5 Reclamation and Long-Term Closure 61
3.5.1 Financial Assurance 62
4.0 Plant Site Adaptive Water Management 63

4.1 Overview 63
4.1.1 Water Management Systems 63
4.1.2 Water Resource Objectives 69
4.1.3 Monitoring 70
4.2 Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) 70
4.2.1 Purpose and Overview 70
4.2.1.1 Operations 70
4.2.1.2 Reclamation 71
4.2.1.3 Long-term Closure 71
4.2.2 Preliminary Design Basis 71
4.2.2.1 Preliminary Process Water Quantities 72
4.2.2.2 Preliminary Process Water Quality 73
4.2.2.3 Preliminary WWTP Unit Process Design 74
4.2.2.3.1 WWTP Preliminary Water Quality Targets 74
4.2.2.3.2 Preliminary WWTP Design Overview 75
4.2.2.3.3 Collection 76
4.2.2.3.4 Headworks 76
4.2.2.3.5 Filter Pretreatment 76
4.2.2.3.6 Greensand Filtration 76
4.2.2.3.7 Reverse Osmosis (RO) System 77
4.2.2.3.8 RO Permeate Stabilization 78
4.2.2.3.9 RO Concentrate Management 78
4.2.2.3.10 Site Layout 79
4.2.2.3.11 Building 79
4.2.2.3.12 Discharge Works 80
4.2.3 Engineering Control Performance 80
4.2.3.1 Description with Basis 80
4.2.3.2 Modeling of Engineering Controls 80
4.2.4 Adaptive Management 80
4.2.4.1 Reporting and Model Update 81
4.2.4.2 Circumstances Triggering Modification 81
4.2.4.3 Options for Modified Performance 81
4.2.4.3.1 Softening Pretreatment 81
4.2.5 Reclamation and Long-Term Closure 82
4.2.5.1 Reclamation 82
4.2.5.2 Long-term Closure 82

4.2.5.2.1 Financial Assurance 83
5.0 Flotation Tailings Basin (FTB) Pond Bottom Cover System 84
5.1 Project Feature 84
5.2 Planned Engineering Control 84
5.2.1 Purpose 84
5.2.2 Design 84
5.2.3 Degree of Use in Industry 88
5.3 Engineering Control Performance Parameters 89
5.3.1 Description with Basis 89
5.3.2 Maintenance Program 89
5.3.3 Modeling of Engineering Controls 90
5.3.4 Impact on Transition to Non-Mechanical Treatment 90
5.4 Adaptive Management 91
5.4.1 Test Projects 91
5.4.2 Reporting and Model Update 92
5.4.3 Modified Design 92
5.4.3.1 Circumstances Triggering Modification 92
5.4.3.2 Options for Modified Performance 93
5.5 Reclamation and Long-Term Closure 93
5.5.1 Financial Assurance 93
6.0 Non-Mechanical Treatment Systems 94
6.1 Overview 94
6.1.1 Purpose 94
6.1.2 Conceptual Design 94
6.1.2.1 Permeable Reactive Barriers 94
6.1.2.2 Constructed Wetlands 95
6.1.2.3 Permeable Sorptive Barriers (PSB) 96
6.1.3 Basis of Treatment 96
6.1.3.1 Permeable Reactive Barriers (PRBs) and Constructed Wetlands 96
6.1.3.2 Permeable Sorptive Barrier (PSB) 97
6.1.4 Degree of Use in Industry 98
6.1.4.1 PRBs 98
6.1.4.2 Constructed Wetlands 99
6.1.4.3 PSBs 100
6.1.5 Adaptive Management 101

6.2 Category 1 Stockpile Non-Mechanical Treatment System 101
6.2.1 Purpose 101
6.2.2 Conceptual Design 101
6.2.3 Development Plan 103
6.2.4 Financial Assurance 103
6.3 West Pit Overflow Non-Mechanical Treatment System 104
6.3.1 Purpose 104
6.3.2 Conceptual Design 104
6.3.2.1 Constructed Wetland 106
6.3.2.2 Permeable Sorptive Barrier (PSB) 107
6.3.2.3 Aeration Pond 107
6.3.3 Development Plan 108
6.3.4 Financial Assurance 108
6.4 Flotation Tailings Basin (FTB) Non-Mechanical Treatment System 109
6.4.1 Purpose 109
6.4.2 Conceptual Design 109
6.4.2.1 Constructed Wetland 111
6.4.2.2 Permeable Sorptive Barrier (PSB) 112
6.4.3 Development Plan 112
6.4.4 Financial Assurance 113
6.5 FTB Pond Overflow Post-Mechanical Treatment Options 113
6.5.1 Purpose 113
6.5.2 Conceptual Design 113
6.5.3 Development Plan 113
6.5.4 Financial Assurance 113
Revision History 115
References 116
List of Tables 121
List of Figures 122
List of Large Tables 123
List of Large Figures 123

Acronyms, Abbreviations and Units

Acronym	Stands For
ASTM	American Society for Testing and Materials
AWMP	Adaptive Water Management Plan (this document)
CN	Curve Number
CPS	Central Pumping Station
CSPE	Chlorosulfonate Polyethylene
EPDM	Ethylene Propylene Dieneter Polymer
FTB	Flotation Tailings Basin
FTMP	Flotation Tailings Management Plan
GCL	Geosynthetic Clay Liner
gpm	Gallons per minute
GPS	Global Positioning System
HBV	Health Based Value
HDS	High Density Sludge
HDPE	High Density Polyethylene
HELP	Hydrologic Evaluation for Landfill Performance Model
HRF	Hydrometallurgical Residue Facility
HRL	Health Risk Limit
ITRC	Interstate Technology and Regulatory Council
LLDPE	Linear Low Density Polyethylene
LTVSMC	LTV Steel Mining Company
MDNR	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
MPCA	Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
PM-12.2	Surface water monitoring location on the Embarrass River upstream of the FTB
PM-13	Surface water monitoring location on the Embarrass River downstream of the FTB
PP	Polypropylene
PRB	Permeable Reactive Barrier
PSB	Permeable Sorptive Barrier
PTM	Permit to Mine
PVC	Polyvinyl chloride
PWQT	Preliminary Water Quality Targets

QA/QC	Quality Assurance and Quality Control
RAA	Risk Assessment Advice
RO	Reverse Osmosis
ROMP	Rock and Overburden Management Plan
SCS	Soil Conservation Service
SD006	Current NPDES discharge location on southwest side of Tailings Basin Cell 2W
SD026	Current NPDES discharge location on south side of Tailings Basin Cell 1E
SDEIS	Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement
SDS	State Disposal System
SRB	Sulfate reducing bacteria
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
VFD	Variable Frequency Drive
VSEP	Vibratory Shear Enhanced Process
WMPM	Water Management Plan – Mine
WMPP	Water Management Plan – Plant
WWTF	Mine Site Waste Water Treatment Facility
WWTP	Plant Site Waste Water Treatment Plant
ZVI	Zero-valent iron

1.0 Introduction

This document describes the Adaptive Water Management Plan (AWMP) for the Poly Met Mining Inc. (PolyMet) NorthMet Project (Project) and presents the adaptive engineering control designs that manage water quality impacts. It is one of five interrelated documents that describe the overall water management plan and fixed engineering controls for the Project. The other four documents integral to the Project water management plan are:

- the Water Management Plan - Mine (Reference (1)) describes overall management of process water (Containment System, pipes, pumps and ponds) and stormwater (dikes, ditches, and sedimentation basins) and water quality and quantity monitoring plans at the Mine Site

- the Water Management Plan - Plant (Reference (2)) describes overall management of process water (seepage capture systems, pipes and pumps) and stormwater (dikes, ditches and sedimentation basins) and water quality and quantity monitoring plans at the Plant Site

- the Water Modeling Data Package Volume 1 - Mine Site (Reference (3)) and the Water Modeling Data Package Volume 2 - Plant Site (Reference (4)) define expected water quality and quantity at evaluation points and describe the models used to estimate water quality and quantity.

The Project includes engineering controls to manage the environmental impacts. Some engineering controls are fixed, and some are adaptive. Fixed engineering controls and contingency mitigation are described in the Water Management Plan – Mine (Reference (1)), Water Management Plan – Plant (Reference (2)), Mine Plan (Reference (5)), Rock and Overburden Management Plan (Reference (6)), Flotation Tailings Management Plan (Reference (7)) and Residue Management Plan (Reference (8)) (collectively referred to as Management Plans). Adaptive engineering controls are described in this document.

The AWMP and the Management Plans will be components of the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) Permit to Mine (PTM), MDNR Water Appropriations Permit, and Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) / State Disposal System (SDS) Permit and are interrelated. Table 1-1 shows the interrelationship between the AWMP and Management Plans. The Project Description (Reference (9)), AWMP and Management Plans are the Proposed Project evaluated in the Supplementary Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS).

The Project relies on mechanical treatment as long as needed to achieve water resource objectives, but during the long-term closure phase of the Project, the ultimate goal is to transition to non-mechanical treatment while still ensuring attainment of water resource objectives. The general water resource objective is to ensure compliance with applicable surface water and groundwater quality standards as required in permits issued by the MPCA. Specific water resource objectives associated with engineering controls are defined in Sections 2.1.2 and 4.1.2.

Table 1-1 AWMP / Management Plan Cross Reference

AWMP Sect	Sub Sect	Engineering Control	Note	Mgmt Plan	Sect
2.0	**Mine Site Adaptive Water Management**				
	2.1.1	Water Management Systems	AWMP refers to fixed engineering controls in ROMP and WMPM	ROMP WMPM	2.0 2.0
	2.1.3	Monitoring	AWMP refers to WMPM for details	WMPM	5.0
	2.2	Waste Water Treatment Facility			
	2.2.4.1	Reporting & Model Update	AWMP refers to WMPM for details	WMPM	6.1-4
	2.2.5.3	Financial Assurance	AWMP refers to WMPM for reclamation estimate	WMPM	7.4
3.0	**Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Cover System**				
	3.1	Project Feature	AWMP refers to ROMP for stockpile construction	ROMP	2.1.2.1
	3.2.2	Design	AWMP refers to ROMP for Cover System detailed design	ROMP	Attach. B
	3.2.2	Design	AWMP refers to ROMP for Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Groundwater Containment System details	ROMP	2.1.2
	3.4.2	Reporting & Model Update	AWMP refers to WMPM for details	WMPM	6.1-4
	3.4.3	Modified Design	AWMP refers to WMPM for adaptive management and contingency mitigation	WMPM	6.5-6
	3.5.1	Financial Assurance	AWMP refers to ROMP for reclamation estimate	ROMP	7.4
4.0	**Plant Site Adaptive Water Management**				
	4.1.1	Water Management Systems	AWMP refers to fixed engineering controls in WMPP	WMPP	2.0
	4.1.3	Monitoring	AWMP refers to WMPP for details	WMPP	5.0
	4.2	Waste Water Treatment Plant			
	4.2.4.1	Reporting & Model Update	AWMP refers to WMPP for details	WMPP	6.1-4
	4.2.5.3	Financial Assurance	AWMP refers to WMPP for reclamation estimate	WMPP	7.4

AWMP Sect	Sub Sect	Engineering Control	Note	Mgmt Plan	Sect
5.0	**Flotation Tailings Basin (FTB) Pond Bottom Cover System**				
	5.1	Project Feature	AWMP refers to FTMP for FTB reclamation details	FTMP	7.2
	5.4.2	Reporting and Model Update	AWMP refers to WMPP for details	WMPP	6.1-4
	5.4.3	Modified Design	AWMP refers to WMPP for adaptive management and contingency mitigation	WMPP	6.5-6
	5.5.1	Financial Assurance	AWMP refers to FTMP for reclamation estimate	FTMP	7.6
6.0	**Non-Mechanical Treatment Systems**				
	6.2	Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Groundwater Containment Non-Mechanical Treatment System			
	6.2.4	Financial Assurance	AWMP refers to ROMP for reclamation estimate	ROMP	7.4
	6.3	West Pit Overflow Non-Mechanical Treatment			
	6.3.4	Financial Assurance	AWMP refers to WMPM for reclamation estimate	WMPM	7.4
	6.4	Flotation Tailings Basin (FTB) Non-Mechanical Treatment System			
	6.4.4	Financial Assurance	AWMP refers to WMPP for reclamation estimate	WMPP	7.4
	6.5	FTB Pond Overflow Post-Mechanical Treatment Options			
	6.5.4	Financial Assurance	AWMP refers to FTMP and WMPP for reclamation estimate	FTMP WMPP	7.6 7.4

1.1 Purpose and Outline

The purpose of the AWMP is to:

- describe a system for implementing adaptive engineering controls that will ensure compliance with applicable surface water and groundwater quality standards at appropriate evaluation points as estimated by modeling and demonstrated by monitoring
- document performance parameters for adaptive engineering controls for use in modeling and changes to modeling parameters as a result of the application of those controls

- document how, in long-term closure, mechanical systems will have appropriate operating/maintenance programs and non-mechanical treatment systems will have appropriate development plans until non-mechanical treatment systems can be proven to ensure that, in subsequent long-term closure, such non-mechanical treatment can meet long-term water quality requirements as described in Minnesota Rules, parts 6132.0200 and 6132.3200, all of which will be financially assured

Sections 2.0 through 6.0 provide details on how the adaptive engineering controls will be implemented to meet water resource objectives. For cover systems (Sections 3.0 and 5.0), preliminary designs are presented along with modifications that could be made to achieve required performance. Because achievement of water resource objectives depends on the performance of these engineering controls, these sections include performance modeling and describe how the engineering control will be incorporated into the water quality model. For non-mechanical treatment systems (Section 6.0), conceptual design layouts are presented, with descriptions of the general mechanisms by which treatment will work and past successes in industry. Because achievement of water resource objectives does not depend on the non-mechanical treatment systems, detailed design and field demonstration are deferred until the non-mechanical treatment systems can be designed using relevant monitoring data and actual water to be treated. The outline of this document is:

Section 1.0 Overview including definitions and description of the adaptive management process.

Section 2.0 Overview of Mine Site adaptive water management and description of the Mine Site Waste Water Treatment Facility (WWTF)

Section 3.0 Description of the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Cover System including key factors driving the design, preliminary design, analog examples, potential modified designs, modeling to demonstrate performance and circumstances that would trigger a design change

Section 4.0 Overview of Plant Site adaptive water management and description of the Plant Site Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP)

Section 5.0 Description of the Flotation Tailings Basin (FTB) Pond Cover System including key factors driving the design, preliminary design, analog examples, potential modified designs and circumstances that would trigger a design change

Section 6.0 Descriptions of Non-Mechanical Treatment Systems for the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile, the West Pit Overflow and the FTB, including conceptual design, basis for achieving treatment, degree of use in industry and development plan

Because this document is intended to evolve through the environmental review, permitting (NPDES/SDS, Water Appropriations and PTM), operating, reclamation and long-term closure phases of the Project, some design details will not be provided until future versions of this document. This document will be reviewed and updated as necessary through the environmental

review and permitting process including permit renewals and annual permit reviews. A revision history is included at the end of the document.

1.2 Definitions

The following definitions apply in the context of this document and are illustrated in Figure 1-1.

Project: Consists of mining components (e.g., plant, FTB, pits, stockpiles, transportation corridor, etc.), engineering controls (e.g., liners, covers, WWTF, WWTP, etc.) and contingency mitigation that work as a system to accomplish the purpose of the Project and manage environmental impacts to water resources during and after mining activities. The Project also includes a process by which 1) adaptive engineering controls are implemented and adapted, if justified, (this document) and 2) mining components are reclaimed and closed (Reference (1), Reference (2), Reference (5), Reference (6), Reference (7), Reference (8), Reference (10)). Financial assurance will be provided to implement engineering controls necessary to ensure compliance with environmental standards and to conduct reclamation activities described in the Project.

Engineering Controls: Fixed or adaptive Project elements that control the environmental impacts of the Project to water resources. Fixed engineering controls are not expected to be modified during the life of the Project. Adaptive engineering controls may have their design, operation or maintenance modified before or after installation, if justified, either in scale or type. Except for non-mechanical treatment systems, all engineering controls are included in the water quality modeling of the Project and work in combination with one another to meet water resource objectives. Engineering controls are not contingency mitigation.

Adaptive Water Management Plan (AWMP): A management plan that describes adaptive engineering controls. The AWMP references other Management Plans that contain descriptions of fixed engineering controls, contingency mitigation and other details such as monitoring protocols. Contingency mitigation is a component of the overall adaptive management approach, but it is not discussed in the AWMP.

Contingency Mitigation: Feasible actions that could be undertaken should engineering controls be unable to ensure compliance with water resource objectives. These are not modeled as part of the Project. If monitoring or modeling indicates contingency mitigation is needed, it would become an engineering control and would then be financially assured. Contingency mitigation is a component of the adaptive management sections contained in Management Plans.

Management Plans: Documents that describe the Project in detail, including fixed and adaptive engineering controls and contingency mitigation. These plans form the basis for the Project definition. Note that Management Plans also include adaptive management and contingency mitigation for aspects of the Project other than water resources including air, wetlands and geotechnical.



Figure 1-1 Definitions Illustrated

1.3 Adaptive Management Process

Initial engineering controls to manage water quality have been designed by professional engineers following industry-accepted standards and practices. Designs have been developed to ensure compliance with water resource objectives based on current regulations and modeling using integrated probabilistic models of the Mine Site and Plant Site water quality and quantity. Sections 3.1 through 3.3 of Reference (3) describe the modeling framework.

The models will be updated annually during mining operations and reclamation, using monitoring results and waste characterization updates, as described in Sections 6 of Reference (1) and Reference (2). The annual monitoring and reporting associated with model updating will be financially assured.

The updated models will be used to determine if the design or operation of the adaptive engineering controls (other than non-mechanical treatment system) should be modified as described in the Modified Design portions of those sections, or if the transition to non-mechanical treatment can be made. The determination that modification or transition is warranted will be based on updated model results, measured water quality, available technology and regulations in place at the time. If modification or transition is warranted, the designs described in the AWMP will be revised and submitted for approval as part of annual PTM review. The adaptive engineering controls as described in the approved AWMP will be implemented at the times defined in the approved AWMP.

It is expected that an Initial Permitting Version of this document will be finalized as part of the MDNR's PTM and Water Appropriation process and MPCA's NPDES/SDS process and that revisions to the Initial Permitting Version will be made in conjunction with the annual reporting process for those permits.

2.0 Mine Site Adaptive Water Management

2.1 Overview

2.1.1 Water Management Systems

Water management systems at the Mine Site include fixed engineering controls (Reference (1), Reference (6)) and adaptive engineering controls. Adaptive water management features at the Mine Site include the WWTF and the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Cover System. The design of the WWTF is adaptive because treatment components can be modified and plant capacity can be adjusted to accommodate varying influent streams and discharge requirements. In addition, the time the WWTF is operated to remove constituent build-up from the East Pit and West Pit lake can be adjusted. The design of the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Cover System is adaptive because the cover system design can be modified before construction or adjusted after construction to achieve water resource objectives using data and experience gained during Project operations and reclamation.

Overviews of the Mine Site water management plan are provided on Figure 2-1 through Figure 2-5. A timeline showing Mine Site water management through time is provided on Figure 2-6.

Three types of water will be generated at the Mine Site during operations.

- Process water will be any water that contacts mining features – including the waste rock stockpiles, haul roads, OSP and mine pits. Process water will be collected and pumped to the WWTF with the exception of runoff from the Overburden Storage and Laydown Area (OSLA) which will not be treated at the WWTF.

- Construction water will be water generated during the construction of the waste rock stockpiles and other mining features. In particular, this will include water from dewatering of saturated overburden, which will have the potential to release dissolved metals and other constituents during the dewatering process. This water will not be treated using the WWTF processes, but will be captured and treated to remove turbidity and potentially suspended or dissolved materials prior to being recycled to the Plant Site along with WWTF effluent for use in the beneficiation process.

- Stormwater will be any water within the Mine Site that does not contact mining features and runoff from reclaimed areas. Stormwater will be directed to one of several stormwater sedimentation ponds and then discharged.

Additional details on the collection and management of process water, construction water, and stormwater at the Mine Site are described in Section 2.1 and Section 2.2 of Reference (1).

During operations (Figure 2-1 and Figure 2-2), process water from the waste rock stockpiles, haul roads, OSP and mine pits will be collected and treated at the WWTF. Reject concentrate (i.e., brine) from the WWTP will also come to the WWTF for treatment (Section 4.2.2.3.9).

Because the Project needs water at the Plant Site during this phase, the overall water management plan is to reuse Mine Site process water at the Plant Site. During operations, most of the WWTF effluent will be pumped to the FTB Pond for use in the beneficiation process. Starting in Mine Year 11, some effluent from the WWTF will be sent to the East Pit to help manage the water level in the pit as it is being backfilled and flooded. Incremental reclamation of the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile will begin in Year 14 and will be completed in Year 21, gradually reducing flows of stockpile seepage to the WWTF.

During the reclamation phase (Figure 2-3) pit dewatering will stop and the West Pit will begin to flood. Water from the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Groundwater Containment System will continue to be pumped to the WWTF and treated, as will reject concentrate from the WWTP. Water from the East Pit will also be pumped to the WWTF and treated. The reason for treating the East Pit water is to remove the flushing load of constituents added as waste rock was backfilled to the pit and the pit walls were inundated. WWTF effluent and water from the FTB will be pumped to the West Pit to augment the flooding process. WWTF effluent may also be used to manage water levels in the East Pit.



Figure 2-1 Mine Site Water Management Schematic - Initial Years of Operations (approximately Year 1 through Year 11)



Figure 2-2 Mine Site Water Management Schematic - Later Years of Operations (approximately Year 12 through Year 20)



Figure 2-3 Mine Site Water Management Schematic – Reclamation (approximately Year 21 through Year 40)

The ultimate goal of long-term closure (Figure 2-4 and Figure 2-5) is to transition from the mechanical treatment provided by the WWTF to non-mechanical treatment. Because non-mechanical treatment designs are very site-specific and very dependent on the quality of the water to be treated, it is assumed that the WWTF will operate in the long-term and the transition to non-mechanical treatment will take place only after the performance of a non-mechanical system has been proven.

During the long-term closure phase, water from the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile will continue to be treated by the WWTF until non-mechanical treatment with gravity discharge to the West Pit has been proven to provide appropriate treatment. The water level in the West Pit will be maintained below the natural overflow elevation by pumping water to the WWTF. Operation of the WWTF will occur year-round with the discharge directed to a small

watercourse that flows into the Partridge River until non-mechanical treatment has been proven to provide appropriate treatment. To achieve compliance with the 10 mg/L sulfate standard for wild rice, an RO treatment unit will be added to the WWTF before it begins discharging to the small watercourse that flows into the Partridge River. Reject concentrate from the RO unit will be evaporated and the residual solids disposed of offsite. The WWTF will operate as long as necessary and will be financially assured.



Figure 2-4 Mine Site Water Management Schematic - Long-term Mechanical Treatment



Figure 2-5 Mine Site Water Management Schematic - Long-term Non-mechanical Treatment



Figure 2-6 Mine Site Water Management Time Line with Mechanical Treatment

2.1.2 Water Resource Objectives

The water resource objectives at the Mine Site are to meet the applicable surface water discharge limits at the point where the WWTF discharges to a small watercourse that flows to the Partridge River and to meet the applicable groundwater standards at points of compliance downgradient of the West Pit. The applicable discharge limits and points of compliance will be finalized in NPDES/SDS permitting. At this time, the applicable surface water quality standards (Table 1–3 and Table 1–4 of Reference (11)) are assumed to be the applicable discharge limits and the applicable groundwater standards (Table 1¬2 of Reference (11)) are assumed to be applicable at the property boundary. The engineering control or combination of engineering controls that produces a 90th percentile probabilistic water quality impacts model result below the applicable discharge limit and groundwater standard meets the water resource objectives.

Meeting these objectives requires the integrated operation of all the fixed engineering controls described in Section 2.0 of Reference (1) and the adaptive engineering controls described in Sections 2.0 and 3.0 of this document.

2.1.3 Monitoring

The Project includes a comprehensive water quality and quantity monitoring program that will be finalized in NPDES/SDS permitting. The program includes monitoring the flow and water quality of water from Mine Site Project features, stormwater, groundwater and surface water. See Section 5 of Reference (1) for details.

2.2 Waste Water Treatment Facility (WWTF)

2.2.1 Purpose and Overview

During all phases of the Project – operations, reclamation, and long-term closure – the plan for operation of the WWTF will be to provide water that:

- meets the needs of the Project when the water is being treated for recycling or re-use, or
- meets requirements for discharge to the environment when the Project has excess water that cannot be reused.

The most recent approved version of Attachment B of Reference (3) will be used as a basis for defining the specific treatment targets needed during each phase. The WWTF will be designed to have the performance needed to achieve the treatment targets using the treatment processes described in Section 2.2.2.3. Additional details on the modeling and sizing of the treatment processes will be completed after the water modeling has been reviewed and approved by the appropriate regulatory agencies. In addition, the treatment processes and the operation of the WWTF can be adapted, as necessary, throughout every Project phase, to meet water resource objectives and the needs of the Project.

The Project is divided into three primary phases; operations, reclamation, and long-term closure. Each of these Project phases are described below in terms of the sources of water to the WWTF, the discharge location of the WWTF effluent, and the purpose of treatment.

2.2.1.1 Operations

During operations, the WWTF will treat process water from the waste rock stockpiles, haul roads, OSP and mine pits. For the first approximately 10 years, all WWTF effluent will be pumped to the Plant Site FTB Pond for reuse in the beneficiation process. The purpose of treatment during this period will be to maintain the water quality in the FTB Pond at concentrations that do not have an adverse impact on beneficiation operations or future reclamation of the FTB. A generalized schematic of the plan for management and treatment of process water during operations is shown on Large Figure 1.

Starting in Mine Year 11, some WWTF effluent will be sent to the East Pit to augment flooding as the pit is backfilled, with the remainder of the effluent continuing to go to the FTB. WWTF effluent (blended Nanofiltration/ VSEP Secondary Membrane permeate and chemical precipitation effluent) will be used to produce a slurry of the calcium carbonate filter cake

generated from the WWTF Recarbonation/Calcite Precipitation System (Section 2.2.2.3.3). This change in WWTF operations will result in a calcium carbonate slurry that will be delivered to the East Pit. The calcium carbonate slurry will contribute some alkalinity required to maintain circumneutral pH in the pit pore water as described in Section 5.1.2.3 of Reference (3). When additional alkalinity is needed to maintain circumneutral pH, the WWTF lime mix tank will be used to produce additional lime slurry which will be blended with the calcium carbonate slurry before it is pumped to the East Pit.

2.2.1.2 Reclamation

During reclamation (while the West Pit is flooding), the WWTF will continue to treat water from the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Groundwater Containment System, the reject concentrate from the WWTP and some water from the East Pit. WWTF effluent will be pumped to the West Pit to augment pit flooding, and to the East Pit to maintain water levels. At the beginning of reclamation (through approximately Mine Year 21) effluent pumped to the East Pit will be treated to increase alkalinity as described in Section 2.2.1.1. The purpose of treatment will be to manage the mass of dissolved constituents in the East and West Pits. Specifically, the primary purpose of treatment in the reclamation phase will be to remove the flushing load of constituents added as waste rock was backfilled to the pits and the pit walls were inundated.

A schematic view of the plan for management and treatment of process water during reclamation is shown on Large Figure 2.

2.2.1.3 Long-Term Closure

During long-term closure, the WWTF will treat water from the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Groundwater Containment System as well as water from the West Pit as needed to prevent overflow. WWTF effluent will be discharged to a small watercourse that flows into the Partridge River. The purpose of treatment will be to produce water that will meet the appropriate discharge limits for discharge to a small watercourse that flows into the Partridge River.

A schematic view of the plan for management and treatment of water during long-term closure is shown on Large Figure 3.

The ultimate goal is to transition from the mechanical treatment provided by the WWTF to a non-mechanical treatment system. Potential non-mechanical treatment systems are described in Sections 6.2 and 6.3. It is assumed that the WWTF at the Mine Site will continue to operate during long-term closure. The transition from mechanical to non-mechanical treatment will occur only after the site-specific design for a non-mechanical system has been proven and approved by the appropriate regulatory agencies.

2.2.2 Preliminary Design Basis

The design of the required treatment processes for the WWTF will be based upon the following factors:

- the quantity and quality of the Mine Site process water, from all locations, requiring treatment during various phases of the Project

- the purpose of treatment for each phase of the Project as described in Section 2.2.1.

The quantity and quality of the process water that will be delivered to the WWTF will be determined using the results from the version of the Mine Site water quality modeling (Reference (3)) prepared for NPDES/SDS permitting. The following paragraphs provide a preliminary summary of the expected influent water quantity and quality for the WWTF.

2.2.2.1 Preliminary Process Water Quantities

The estimated Mine Site process water quantities, by source, are summarized in Table 2-1 for operations, reclamation and long-term closure. The water quantity estimates summarized in Table 2-1 are the 90th percentile of the average annual flow rates from each of the process water source areas for the design year (maximum annual average flow) for the Mine Site water quality modeling results (Reference (3)).

Table 2-1 Mine Site Process Water Flows to the WWTF

Source	90th Percentile Estimated Average Annual Flow (gpm)		
	Operations[2]	Reclamation[3]	Long-Term Closure[4]
East Pit	420	1750[5]	--
Central Pit	60	--	--
West Pit	390	--	400
Haul Roads and Rail Transfer Hopper	65	--	--
Category 1 Stockpile	385	10	10
Category 2/3 Stockpile	145	--	--
Ore Surge Pile	25	--	--
Category 4 Stockpile	0	--	--
WWTP Reject Concentrate	150	175	--
Total[1]	1550	1925	400

(1) Flows are rounded to the nearest 5 gpm; column values do not sum to 90th Percentile total value due to probabilistic modeling (P90 of totals is not equivalent to the total of the P90s).
(2) Estimates based on Reference (3) for Year 14 (Design Year), 90th Percentile.
(3) Estimates based on Reference (3) for Year 25, 90th Percentile.
(4) Estimates based on Reference (3) for Year 75, 90th Percentile.
(5) Flow value is total of East and Central Pits.

Actual flow rates to the WWTF from each of the Mine Site sources will vary throughout the 20-year operating phase of the Project. For example:

- drainage from the waste rock stockpiles generally increases through Mine Year 5, is relatively constant up until Mine Year 12 to 15, and then decreases from Mine Year 15 to Mine Year 20

- beginning in Mine Year 11, waste rock from the Category 4 and Category 2/3 Waste Rock Stockpiles will be moved to the East Pit for subaqueous disposal so there no longer be water from these stockpiles requiring treatment

- dewatering water from the East Pit (including the Central Pit) increases through Mine Year 11, then decreases for a brief period while the waste rock relocated to the East Pit is covered by groundwater flowing into the pit and supplemented with effluent from the WWTF

- between Mine Years 13 and 16, dewatering of the East Pit will be necessary to maintain the desired water level, which is designed to keep as much of the relocated waste rock submerged as possible while still providing safe working conditions in the Central Pit

- starting in Mine Year 16 when the Central Pit mining is completed, the East and Central pit dewatering will be reduced to zero as these pits are allowed to flood

- dewatering from the West Pit increases rapidly through Mine Year 7 and then gradually increases through Mine Year 20

Water from other sources, including haul roads and ore handling areas, is relatively constant throughout Project operations. In addition, reject concentrate from the WWTP will be delivered to the WWTF for treatment in the chemical precipitation process units before being recycled to the secondary membrane treatment processes, if necessary. WWTP reject concentrate includes clean-in-place (CIP) waste and concentrate from the RO and secondary, Vibratory Shear Enhanced Processing (VSEP), membranes (Section 4.2.2.3.9).

In addition to long-term variations in flows during operations at the Mine Site, the influent flows to the WWTF are anticipated to fluctuate seasonally. The seasonal variation in flow including the spring flood, average summer, and average winter flow rates are summarized in Table 2-2 for the sources of process water at the Mine Site. Additionally, the operational plan for the Project has been designed using a three-day, very high volume pit dewatering event, which may occur during the spring flood season. The estimated discharge rates from this three-day design event are also included in Table 2-2.

During reclamation, the flows to the WWTF will originate primarily from the flooded East Pit and the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Groundwater Containment System. In addition, reject concentrate from the WWTP will continue to be delivered to the WWTF. The flows during reclamation are expected to vary less, both annually and seasonally, because operations will have ceased and flows will be originating from stable components of the Project.

During long-term closure, the two sources of water to the WWTF will be the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Groundwater Containment System and the West Pit. Because the West Pit will

receive direct precipitation, it is expected that the flow will vary seasonally. The majority of this variability will be dampened by the volume of the West Pit and management of the West Pit water level. However, it is likely that a spring event will need to be considered in the sizing of the WWTF processes for long-term closure in order to manage periods of high water levels and associated high flows.

2.2.2.2 Preliminary Process Water Quality

Water quality estimates by source are included in Large Table 1, Large Table 2, and Large Table 3 for all sources of water to the WWTF during operations, reclamation and long-term closure.

During operations a wide variety of input water quality is anticipated, so influent to the WWTF will be configured into two flow streams and routed through two treatment processes as shown on Large Figure 1 and described in Section 2.2.2.3. The Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Groundwater Containment System seepage is anticipated to contain low concentrations of metals and sulfate in Mine Year 1, with concentrations of these constituents increasing through Mine Year 10 and remaining constant thereafter. Drainage from the temporary Category 2/3 Waste Rock Stockpile, OSP and Category 4 Waste Rock Stockpile is anticipated to contain high concentrations of metals and sulfate throughout Project operations. Process water containing relatively high concentrations of metals and sulfate will be stored in the West Equalization Basin (West EQ Basin). Process water from mine pit dewatering is anticipated to contain relatively low concentrations of metals and sulfate throughout the operating phase of the Project. Process water containing relatively low concentrations of metals and sulfate will be stored in the East Equalization Basin (East EQ Basin).

Estimates for Mine Site water quality from the various waste rock stockpiles and operational areas were determined using the model described in Reference (3). The estimated water quality concentrations listed in Table 2-2 represent the 90th percentile water quantity estimates that correspond with the average annual flow from each process water source shown in Table 2-1. The quality of the blended streams in the West EQ Basin, and the East EQ Basin, and the WWTP reject concentrate are also shown in Table 2-2.

Table 2-2 Seasonal Variations in Mine Site Process Water Flows

Source	Estimated Spring Flood (3-day)[4, 7, 8]	Spring Flood (1-month)[4, 7, 8]	Average Summer[5, 6]	Average Winter Flow[5, 6]	Average Summer[5, 6]	Average Winter Flow[5, 6]	Average Summer[5, 6]	Average Winter Flow[5, 6]
	Estimated Spring Flood (3-day)/Spring Flood (1-month)/ Average Summer/ Average Winter Flow (gpm)							
	Operations [1]				Reclamation [2]		Long-Term Closure [3]	
East Pit	1,460	530	410	220	1745	1750	0	0
Central Pit	430	115	70	10	0	0	0	0
West Pit	2,650	715	450	70	0	0	325	310
Haul Roads & Rail Transfer Hopper	150	150	85	20	0	0	0	0
Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile	1,000	1,000	480	135	6	2	6	2
Category 2/3 Waste Rock Stockpile	340	340	185	50	0	0	0	0
Ore Surge Pile	70	70	30	10	0	0	0	0
Category 4 Waste Rock Stockpile	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WWTP Reject Concentrate	100	100	110	110	175	175	0	0
Total	6,200	3,020	1820	620	1925	1925	330	310

(1) Estimates for average summer and winter are based on Reference (3) for Year 14 (Design Year), average.
(2) Estimates for average summer and winter are based on Reference (3) for Year 25, average.
(3) Estimates for average summer and winter are based on Reference (3) for Year 75, average.
(4) Source: Conventional Hydrology Modeling December, 2012 and January, 2013.
(5) Source: GoldSim Model Simulations, Version 5.0, to be submitted February 2013.
(6) Average total flow to WWTF shown; column values do not sum to total value due to probabilistic modeling.
(7) Stockpile spring flood flows include surface water flows only, there is no groundwater component for stockpiles.
(8) Spring flood flow calculations for operations flows will be used to size the equalization basins.

During reclamation, the quality of the influent from the flooded East Pit, the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Groundwater Containment System and the reject concentrate from the WWTP are expected to be relatively stable. All will have relatively high concentrations of sulfate and other constituents, with the reject concentrate from the WWTP likely having the highest concentrations. The configuration of the WWTF from the operations phase that facilitates acceptance of the water of different quality into two different treatment processes will be maintained during reclamation, with the reject concentrate from the WWTP being routed to the

chemical precipitation processes first, as described in Section 2.2.2.3.5. The seepage from the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Groundwater Containment System will have relatively high concentrations of constituents but a relatively small flow that could be routed to either the chemical precipitation or the membrane units.

During long-term closure, it is anticipated that the quality the water collected by the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Groundwater Containment System will be consistent with the values seen during reclamation. The quality of the West Pit Overflow will likely have significantly lower concentrations than the water from the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Groundwater Containment System.

2.2.2.3 Preliminary WWTF Unit Process Design

2.2.2.3.1 WWTF Preliminary Water Quality Targets

The preliminary WWTF design is based on both the expected influent quantity and quality and on the desired effluent quality, or Preliminary Water Quality Targets (PWQTs). The PWQTs for some constituents depend on the effluent discharge location. The WWTF discharges to the FTB Pond during operations, to the West Pit during reclamation, and to the Partridge River during long-term closure, so PWQTs also vary by Project phase.

Operations and Reclamation

Because the WWTF discharges to the FTB Pond during operations and to the West Pit during reclamation, it is anticipated that the WWTF effluent will be considered an internal waste stream during these periods and not have discharge limits. However, there may be restrictions as part of an overall water management strategy.

To provide a preliminary design basis for the WWTF during environmental review, PWQTs were established for the WWTF effluent concentration using potentially applicable water quality standards (Table 2-3). The concept is to manage the internal receiving waters (FTB Pond and West Pit) so that seepage from the FTB Pond and West Pit will not cause the Project to exceed applicable standards at groundwater and surface water evaluation locations.

Effluent quality is also a factor in the GoldSim water modeling. Effluent concentrations used as inputs to the GoldSim water model are based on the PWQTs and the overall Project water management strategy. Large Table 5 shows the potentially applicable water quality standards, the PWQTs selected from those potential standards and the effluent concentrations used as inputs to the GoldSim model.

The WWTF chemical precipitation and membrane filtration units (Sections 2.2.2.3.3 and 2.2.2.3.4) are designed to achieve all of the operations and reclamation effluent concentrations used in the GoldSim model and all of the PWQTs. Because of the adaptive nature of the WWTF design, the treatment processes and the operation of the WWTF can be adapted, as necessary.

Long-Term Closure

Because the WWTF discharges to the Partridge River in long-term closure, discharge limits for the WWTF will be set by the MPCA during permitting.

To provide a preliminary design basis for the WWTF during environmental review, PWQTs were established for the WWTF effluent concentration using potentially applicable water quality standards (Table 2-3). An RO unit will be added at the WWTF before it discharges to the Partridge River (Section 2.2.5.2). As part of the progression from preliminary to final design, an RO pilot plant test has been conducted (Reference (12)). Effluent concentrations used as inputs to the GoldSim water model are based on the PWQTs, the results of the RO pilot plant test, and the overall Project water management strategy. Large Table 5 shows the potentially applicable water quality standards, the PWQTs selected from those potential standards and the effluent concentrations used as inputs to the GoldSim model.

The pilot plant test results (Reference (12)) demonstrate that all of the long-term closure effluent concentrations used in the GoldSim model and all of the PWQTs can be achieved by the planned design of the WWTF with the additional RO stage (Section 2.2.5.2).

Table 2-3 WWTF Preliminary Water Quality Targets (PWQTs)

Parameter[1]	Operations	Reclamation	Long-Term Closure	Basis
Metals/Inorganics (µg/L, except where noted)				
Aluminum	125	125	125	M.R.[4] 7050.0222 Class 2B (chronic standard)
Antimony	31	31	31	M.R.[4] 7050.0222 Class 2B (chronic standard)
Arsenic	10	10	10	Federal Standard (Primary MCLs)
Barium	2000	2000	2000	Minn. Groundwater (HRL, HBV, or RAA)
Beryllium	4	4	4	Federal Standard (Primary MCLs)
Boron	500	500	500	M.R.[4] 7050.0224 Class 4A (chronic standard)
Cadmium[3]	5.1	4.2	2.5	M.R.[4] 7052.0100 Class 2B (chronic standard)
Chromium[2]	11	11	11	M.R.[4] 7052.0100 Class 2B (chronic standard)
Cobalt	5	5	5	M.R.[4] 7050.0222 Class 2B (chronic standard)
Copper[3]	20	17	9.3	M.R.[4] 7052.0100 Class 2B (chronic standard)
Iron	300	300	300	Federal Standard (Secondary MCLs)
Lead[3]	10.2	7.7	3.2	M.R.[4] 7050.0222 Class 2B (chronic standard)
Manganese	50	50	50	Federal Standard (Secondary MCLs)
Nickel[3]	113	94	52	M.R.[4] 7052.0100 Class 2B (chronic standard)
Selenium	5	5	5	M.R.[4] 7052.0100 Class 2B (chronic standard)

Parameter[1]	Operations	Reclamation	Long-Term Closure	Basis
Silver	1	1	1	M.R.[4] 7050.0222 Class 2B (chronic standard)
Thallium	0.56	0.56	0.56	M.R.[4] 7050.0222 Class 2B (chronic standard)
Zinc[3]	260	216	120	M.R.[4] 7052.0100 Class 2B (chronic standard)
General Parameters (mg/L, except where noted)				
Chloride (mg/L)	230	230	230	M.R. 7050.0222 Class 2B (chronic standard)
Fluoride (mg/L)	2	2	2	Federal Standard (Secondary MCLs)
Hardness(mg/L)	250	200	100	M.R.[4] 7050.0100 Class 2B (chronic standard)
Sodium	60% of cations	60% of cations	60% of cations	M.R.[4] 7050.0224 Class 4A (chronic standard)
Sulfate (mg/L)	250	150	10	Operations: Federal Standard (Secondary MCLs) Long-term closure: M.R. 7050.0224 Class 4A (chronic standard)

(1) The Process Water Quality Targets parameter list has been updated from RS29T to include only the parameters modeled in GoldSim
(2) The Chromium (+6) standard of 11 µg/L is used rather than the total Chromium standard to be conservative.
(3) Standard based on hardness
(4) Minnesota Rules

2.2.2.3.2 Preliminary WWTF Design Overview

During operations, the WWTF process units will be designed to accommodate at least the Summer Average flows presented in Table 2-2 and the influent water quality shown in Large Table 4.

During operations, when the WWTF effluent is pumped to the FTB, the WWTF will be at its maximum hydraulic design capacity during the Spring Flood (1 month flow period) of the peak design year (Mine Year 14).) It is anticipated that during operations the WWTF will be designed to achieve all PWQTs for discharge to the FTB Pond when operating at its maximum hydraulic design capacity with the exception of sulfate. To compensate for lower sulfate performance during the limited time of the peak flow rate during Spring Flood period, sulfate discharge concentrations will be below the PWQT during non-Spring Flood operational periods. This design concept incorporates flexibility for operation of the process units while maintaining the sulfate discharge concentration within the PWQTs on a rolling average basis.

During mining operations, the process water stream containing relatively higher concentrations of metals and sulfate (West EQ Basin) will be routed to a chemical precipitation treatment train.

The process water stream containing relatively lower concentrations of metals and sulfate (East EQ Basin) will be routed to a membrane filtration treatment train. The membrane filtration system concentrate will contain metals and sulfate concentrations similar to the relatively high concentration process water stream and will be blended with that stream to form the influent to the chemical precipitation treatment train. The membrane filtration system permeate will be blended with the effluent from the chemical precipitation treatment train to form the WWTF effluent.

The effluent from the WWTF will flow by gravity to the Central Pumping Station (CPS) and then be blended with the OSLA runoff and any treated construction water, then pumped through the Treated Water Pipeline to the FTP Pond, or used to supplement flooding of the East Pit during backfilling of the East Pit after approximately Mine Year 11.

The detailed design of the treatment system components, including the sizing of units to accommodate the desired flow-rates, the chemical addition requirements, potential sludge generation and recycle rates will be developed using a combination of additional resources, including:

- analytical results from the pilot-testing program to evaluate treatment of the FTB Containment System water – which included evaluation of many of the same processes that will be used at the mine site and also evaluated chemical precipitation of the Vibratory Shear Enhanced Process (VSEP) Concentrate (Reference (12))

- additional information from process equipment vendors related to hydraulic and chemical treatment performance

- modeling of the overall WWTF unit operations using an integrated GoldSim and PHREEQC model

Additional design details and modeling results will be provided in the permit review submittal of the Adaptive Water Management Plan. The following paragraphs present a more detailed description of the components of the wastewater treatment systems for the WWTF.

2.2.2.3.3 Chemical Precipitation

The chemical precipitation treatment train will be used to remove metals and sulfate from the West EQ Basin flows, the membrane filtration system concentrate, and the reject concentrate from the WWTP. The chemical precipitation treatment train consists of three chemical reactor-clarifier systems that will be operated in series to precipitate metals, sulfate, and excess calcium as solid residuals. Metals will be removed via a high density sludge (HDS) process. Sulfate will be removed via high lime treatment. Excess calcium removal and final pH adjustment are achieved by recarbonation. These solid materials will be separated by gravity, dewatered via pressing, and managed at the Hydrometallurgical Residue Facility (HRF) (Reference (8)) during operations or disposed off-site at an appropriately licensed solid waste disposal facility. During reclamation and long-term closure, these solid materials will also be disposed at a licensed, off-site landfill.

The design plan will evaluate installing all metal and sulfate chemical precipitation reactors of the same size with the same operating equipment. This will provide additional adaptive flexibility to use any reactor for either metals or sulfate removal. Providing identical chemical precipitation reactors will also simplify operations and maintenance as the same replacement components and procedures could potentially be used for all units.

Hydraulic loading to the chemical precipitation train will be equalized via the West EQ Basin and, indirectly, via the East EQ Basin (which equalizes flow to the membrane filtration train). Overall hydraulic capacity of the chemical precipitation system will be based on summation of the following flow components:

- the design reject concentrate flow rate from the WWTP
- the flow rate required to drain the West EQ Basin in 60 days following the Spring Flood event in Mine Year 14
- the membrane filtration system concentrate flow rate resulting from membrane treatment of the flow required to drain the East EQ Basin in 60 days following the Spring Flood event in Mine Year 14

Treatment process equipment for the chemical precipitation treatment train will be constructed in two phases. Phase 1 will be constructed in Mine Year 1 when flows and required capacity are low. Phase 2 is expected to be constructed prior to Mine Year 5, depending on the observed flows and the treatment performance of the Phase 1 units. The first phase will comprise ½ of the overall hydraulic design capacity, and will consist of two parallel trains (approximately ¼ of the overall hydraulic design capacity each). Redundancy and peak flow capacity in the Phase 1 equipment will be achieved by providing duplicate clarifiers for each process. Each clarifier will be capable of treating the 90th percentile average summer flow rate and both clarifiers together can be used in parallel to provide sufficient hydraulic capacity to remove the Spring Flood from the equalization basins in 60 days or less.

Phase 2 will comprise the remaining half of the overall hydraulic design capacity, and will be constructed prior to Mine Year 5, depending on the flows. This train may use a single large clarifier for each process instead of two smaller clarifiers as constructed in Phase 1.

West Equalization Basin (West EQ Basin)

Flow from high-concentration sources is routed into the West EQ Basin for equalization prior to treatment in the chemical precipitation train. The West EQ Basin will be sized to provide sufficient storage to accommodate the following conditions:

- receipt of the Mine Year 14 Spring Flood event,
- inflow of the summer average flow following the Mine Year 14 Spring Flood event, and

- emptying of the West EQ Basin in 60 days from initiation of the Mine Year 14 Spring Flood event via pumping through the chemical precipitation train at the peak hydraulic capacity of the equipment.

Headworks

The chemical precipitation treatment train headworks will include a lift station located at the West EQ Basin equipped with two variable frequency drive (VFD) pumps and a flow splitter box.

High-Density Metals Precipitation

Removal of metals, including nickel, copper and cobalt, is accomplished in an HDS metals precipitation system. This system comprises rapid-mix tanks, high-density sludge reactors, and clarifiers. Lime is added to adjust the pH to the desired set-point (between pH 9 and 10). The system can recycle settled sludge from the clarifier back to the reactor to maintain a high sludge concentration to facilitate the co-precipitation of iron and metals. The design includes provisions for the addition of ferric chloride (to supplement iron concentration in the reactor) and polymer coagulant (to achieve the desired solids settling in the clarifiers), if necessary. Metals are removed from the system as sludge.

Gypsum Precipitation

Sulfate removal is achieved through the addition of lime to precipitate gypsum. This system comprises rapid mix tanks, HDS reactors, and clarifiers. Lime is added to adjust the pH to approximately 12. The system can recycle settled sludge from the clarifier back to the reactor to provide nucleation sites for gypsum precipitation, thereby enhancing precipitation kinetics. The design includes provisions for the addition of polymer coagulant to assist with solids removal in the clarifiers, if necessary. Sulfate is removed from the system as gypsum sludge.

Recarbonation/Calcite Precipitation System

Effluent from the gypsum precipitation system has a high pH and a high concentration of calcium, both of which are undesirable during transmission of the effluent to the FTP Pond. A recarbonation/calcite precipitation system comprising a rapid mix tank with carbon dioxide injection and a solids-contact clarifier provides for excess calcium removal. Carbon dioxide (CO2) will be stored on-site in outdoor, vertical liquid CO2 tanks. Liquid CO2 from the tanks will be converted to a gas in a vaporizer unit, then dissolved into a water feed stream in the equilibration system. The resulting carbonic acid will then be added to the rapid mix tank to achieve a pH set-point of approximately 10. This will facilitate the precipitation of calcium carbonate which is removed from the wastewater in the solids contact clarifier. The excess calcium is removed from the system as calcite sludge.

Effluent Neutralization

An in-line carbonic acid injection point downstream of the solids contact clarifier provides final neutralization of the chemical precipitation effluent to pH 8 or less.

Discharge Works

Discharge works for the chemical precipitation treatment train system will consist of a clear well. The clear well includes a pump for transferring chemical precipitation effluent to the VSEP unit (Section 2.2.2.3.4) for further treatment, if necessary, to achieve desired water quality targets. The clear well also has a gravity outlet for blending with membrane permeate and subsequent gravity flow to the CPS for pumping to the FTP Pond.

Sludge Storage and Dewatering

The chemical precipitation treatment train processes produce solid residuals in the form of chemical sludges, including a metal/iron sludge, gypsum sludge, and calcite sludge. These sludges are conveyed within the treatment plant by means of sludge pumps and piping. In the case of the metals and gypsum precipitation processes, some fraction of the sludge collected in the clarifiers is recycled to the precipitation reactors to maintain the necessary solids content in the reactors. Any excess sludge from these processes and all sludge collected in the calcite clarifiers will be pumped to sludge storage tanks. The sludge storage tanks will be equipped with agitators to prevent clogging of the cone with solids. Sludge accumulated in the sludge storage tanks will be dewatered by plate-and-frame filter presses over the course of one eight-hour shift each day. Filtered sludge will be transferred from the filter presses into trailers for hauling off site for disposal or, after the Hydrometallurgical Plant is operational, to the Hydrometallurgical Plant to recover metals or to the HRF for disposal.

2.2.2.3.4 Membrane Filtration

Membrane filtration will remove dissolved metals and sulfate from the East EQ Basin flows, and provide second-pass processing of chemical precipitation effluent as needed. Membrane filtration equipment at the Mine Site consists of the following treatment components:

- media (sand) filtration for pre-treatment and removal of fine particulate matter that will reduce the life of the membrane separation process components
- nanofiltration membranes for treatment of East EQ Basin water
- VSEP filtration for secondary management of the nanofiltration concentrate prior to chemical precipitation, or second-pass processing of chemical precipitation effluent, as needed

In the nanofiltration process multivalent ions (metals and sulfate) are retained by the membrane, while monovalent ions (e.g., chloride and sodium) are allowed to pass through. This results in a nanofiltration concentrate that has a relatively high concentration of metals and sulfate, but lower

conductivity than RO concentrate. The lower conductivity (activity) of the nanofiltration concentrate allows a greater amount of sulfate to be precipitated relative to RO concentrate.

A secondary membrane separation process will be used to reduce the volume of the nanofiltration concentrate prior to chemical precipitation. The VSEP filtration process is a trademarked secondary membrane separation process from New Logic Research that is capable of achieving a higher recovery than can be achieved via spiral-wound membrane configurations, due to its resistance to irreversible fouling by limiting salts. This process provides additional treatment of the nanofiltration concentrate to:

- reduce hydraulic loading to the chemical precipitation train, and
- increase sulfate removal efficiency by increasing the sulfate concentration of the VSEP concentrate

The VSEP filtration process can also be used in a second pass circuit to further process chemical precipitation effluent and increase sulfate and/or metals removal efficiency by increasing the concentrations of these constituents prior to re-introduction to the chemical precipitation system.

Additional description of all of the membrane filtration treatment train components is provided in the following paragraphs.

East Equalization Basin (East EQ Basin)

Flow from low-concentration sources is routed into the East EQ Basin for equalization prior to treatment in the membrane filtration train. The East EQ Basin will be sized to provide sufficient storage to accommodate the following conditions:

- receipt of the Mine Year 14 Spring Flood event, including a 3-day peak flow and a 30-day average flow,
- inflow of the summer average flow following the Mine Year 14 Spring Flood event, and
- emptying of the East EQ basin in 60 days from initiation of the Mine Year 14 Spring Flood event via pumping through the membrane filtration train at the peak hydraulic capacity of the equipment at cold water flux rates.

Headworks

The membrane filtration treatment train headworks, located at the East EQ Basin, will include a lift station with VFD pumps and an in-line strainer. The primary purpose of the strainer will be to remove relatively large objects that may damage the other filtration system components.

Media Filtration System (Pre-treatment)

The media filtration system will likely be a parallel configuration of granular sand media pressurized filter vessels. The media filtration vessels will require periodic backwashing. This backwash will be routed back into the East EQ Basin for settling. The media filtration system will discharge to a break tank where a pump will transfer the water to the nanofiltration system.

Nanofiltration System

Nanofiltration is an established membrane treatment technology for water treatment. Commercial scale nanofiltration systems typically use spiral-wound membranes with pore sizes of 1 to 10 nm to remove dissolved constituents from water. This technology is employed for removing sulfate from seawater and for industrial applications. Under pressures greater than the natural osmotic pressure, water will pass through the membrane pores and the dissolved solids will be retained on the feed side of the membrane (Reference (13)). The retained constituents are contained in a nanofiltration concentrate stream.

The rejection of constituents by the membranes depends on the membrane materials, membrane pore size, and the overall composition of the water. A variety of membrane types are available in the marketplace from several manufacturers. Most commonly, the membrane modules from these manufacturers are standardized as 4-inch or 8-inch diameter modules that can be readily be interchanged. The selection of membranes for each phase of the Project is another example of an adaptive engineering control available for the WWTF.

The nanofiltration system will be equipped with a high-pressure pump that will pump the water across spiral-wound nanofiltration membranes. The nanofiltration membranes will have a high selectivity for multivalent ions over monovalent ions. This is important because retention of monovalent ions in the nanofiltration concentrate has the potential to adversely affect subsequent precipitation processes in the chemical precipitation treatment train. The nanofiltration system will require periodic cleaning. Waste cleaning solution will be routed to the chemical precipitation treatment train system for treatment. If needed, antiscalants could also be used to reduce cleaning requirements.

VSEP Secondary Membrane System

A VSEP secondary membrane filtration system is included in the design to provide operational flexibility to achieve additional sulfate removal, if needed. The VSEP unit consists of vertical stacks of circular flat sheet RO or nanofiltration membranes mounted on a vibrating base. The shear introduced at the membrane surface due to high frequency vibration of the stack reduces fouling and allows higher recoveries than can be achieved with a spiral-wound membrane.

The VSEP system has the ability to operate either in continuous flow or batch mode. It can process either chemical precipitation effluent or nanofiltration concentrate to further reduce volume and further concentrate the sulfate in solution prior to chemical precipitation. The VSEP system is designed with a hydraulic capacity equal to the design flow rate for the nanofiltration concentrate.

The VSEP concentrate will be fed into the chemical precipitation system using head available from the membrane filtration machines, and directed to the applicable precipitation train via a splitter box.

Discharge Works

Nanofiltration permeate will discharge through a permeate holding tank. This holding tank will be equipped with a transfer pump and will supply process water to the rest of the plant for purposes such as feed water for the recarbonation system, feed water for the lime slurry system, and water for general cleanup/equipment washing.

Downstream of the permeate holding tank, the membrane filtration treatment train effluent will be blended with the chemical precipitation treatment train effluent at the clear well for discharge to the CPS.

2.2.2.3.5 WWTP Reject Concentrate Management

The reject concentrate from the WWTP will be transported to the WWTF via railcar, fed to the precipitation system via a transfer pump, and directed to the applicable precipitation train via a splitter box.

2.2.2.3.6 Site Layout

The WWTF will be located to the west of the RTH and north of Dunka Road. The preliminary location for the facility and the equalization basins is shown on Large Figure 4. The location of the WWTF will need to meet appropriate set-backs from mining operations. The location of the WWTF will also need to accommodate delivery of treatment chemicals (i.e., lime and CO2) and will need to have access for trucks removing filtered sludge or residual solids and rail-cars delivering WWTP reject concentrate.

Lime will be delivered to the WWTF via rail car and unloaded pneumatically to the WWTF lime silo. Rail delivery will be adequate to meet the lime needs for normal operation of the WWTF and to assist with maintenance of circumneutral pH in the East Pit pit pore water. If necessary, all of the neutralization needed to maintain circumneutral pH in the East Pit pore water could be supplied by rail delivery of lime to the WWTF.

2.2.2.3.7 Building

The preliminary design for the WWTF building envisions construction using precast concrete panels. The foundations for the WWTF building and the process units will be steel-reinforced-concrete. A back-up power supply sufficient to operate critical WWTF equipment during a power outage will be required. Potable water will not be available at the site but treated process water will be available for chemical feed systems, back-washing and general site housekeeping. Potable water for hygiene purposes will be delivered to the site. The building will also need to meet all appropriate State and local building codes.

2.2.3 Engineering Control Performance

2.2.3.1 Description with Basis

The overall performance of the treatment system will represent a compilation of the performance of each individual treatment unit. As noted in Section 2.2.2.3, the performance of each individual component will be determined in the permitting level design activities, which will include sizing of units to accommodate the desired flow-rates, defining the chemical addition requirements, and calculating the potential sludge generation and recycle rates. The design calculations that will be used to determine the construction and operating specifics for treatment units will be based upon:

- analytical results from the pilot-testing program to evaluate treatment of the FTB Containment System water – which included evaluation of many of the same processes that will be used at the mine site and also evaluated chemical precipitation of the VSEP Concentrate (Reference (12))

- additional information from process equipment vendors related to hydraulic and chemical treatment performance

2.2.3.2 Modeling of Engineering Controls

Modeling of the overall performance of the WWTF unit operations will be completed using an integrated GoldSim and PHREEQC model for the WWTF during operations, reclamation, and long-term closure. The modeling will be used to define the specific requirements for each treatment unit that will be needed to achieve the PWQTs listed in Table 2-3. The integrated GoldSim/PHREEQC modeling results will be included in a subsequent version of this document.

2.2.4 Adaptive Management

To achieve the specific purpose of treatment for each of the Project phases, the operating configuration and the operating requirements of individual process units within the WWTF or the capacity of the WWTF may need to be modified. Thus, the WWTF is considered an adaptive engineering control. The WWTF treatment processes can be adapted, as necessary, to meet the actual conditions encountered during the Project and estimated by water quality monitoring and continued model updating.

2.2.4.1 Reporting and Model Update

The Project includes a comprehensive water quality and quantity monitoring and reporting program that will be finalized in NPDES/SDS permitting (Section 5 of Reference (1)). The program includes annual comparison of actual monitoring to modeled results for the WWTF. This comparison will be used to refine the model. See Section 6 of Reference (1) for details.

2.2.4.2 Circumstances Triggering Modification

Circumstances that could trigger the need for one or more modifications to WWTF operating configuration include:

- variation in influent water quantity which could result in the need for more or less treatment system capacity
- variation of the influent water quality from the modeled water quality which could result in a change in the operating performance of one or more of the treatment processes.

2.2.4.3 Options for Modified Performance

Variations of either influent water quantity or quality can be addressed within the overall concept for the design, construction, and operation of the WWTF. Because the plan for construction of the WWTF already envisions a phased build-out of the capacity that will be needed when the maximum flow occurs (Year 14) variations in quantity can easily be addressed by either accelerating or delaying the installation of the additional equipment that is planned for the second Phase of the WWTF. Treatment performance issues that could occur from changes in influent water quality can be addressed by making adjustments to operating conditions.

It is not expected that softening pretreatment will be needed at the WWTF, because the nanofiltration unit allows enough ionic constituents to pass that the potential for scaling is reduced relative to the RO unit at the WWTP.

At most times throughout the year, it is expected that the WWTF will have excess hydraulic capacity, which can be used to modify treatment performance, for example by reducing the recovery rates for the membrane separation processes or increasing the hydraulic retention times in the chemical precipitation processes. This additional capacity can be used on an annual average basis to maintain treatment performance.

2.2.5 Reclamation and Long-Term Closure

2.2.5.1 Reclamation

During reclamation, the WWTF will receive water from the following sources:

- reject concentrate from the WWTP
- Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Groundwater Containment System seepage
- the backfilled East Pit

The reject concentrate will be routed directly into the chemical precipitation system, while the other sources will be routed into a single equalization basin for treatment in the membrane filtration system. All the unit process described for the WWTF during operation will remain in

use, although the flow rates and water quality will be somewhat different as denoted in Table 2-1 and Table 2-2. Effluent from the WWTF will either be routed to the West Pit for flooding or to the East Pit to assist with removal of additional constituent load from the backfilled waste rock. Additional details on the operation of the primary treatment trains are described below.

2.2.5.1.1 Chemical Precipitation

The chemical precipitation train used during operations (Section 2.2.2.3.3) will continue to be used during reclamation. No significant modifications to the individual process units are envisioned. However, operating conditions may be modified to optimize overall performance of the units. This can likely be accomplished without significant effort due to the operational adaptability that will be built into the WWTF.

Sludge produced by the chemical precipitation system will be dewatered via filter press and the filtered sludge hauled to an approved off-site landfill during reclamation.

2.2.5.1.2 Membrane Treatment

During reclamation, the membrane treatment train will receive Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Groundwater Containment System seepage and water from the East Pit. The membrane treatment system will consist of the same components described in Section 2.2.2.3.4.

During reclamation, a portion of the nanofiltration permeate will be returned to the East Pit to maintain a flooded condition. The remaining portion of the nanofiltration permeate will be routed to the West Pit for flooding, with second-pass nanofiltration treatment applied if needed based on required sulfate concentrations.

Nanofiltration concentrate will be routed to the VSEP unit. VSEP concentrate will be routed to the chemical precipitation train for removal of metals and sulfate and VSEP permeate will be routed to the East Pit.

2.2.5.1.3 WWTP Reject Concentrate Management

During reclamation, the chemical precipitation system will continue to treat reject concentrate from the WWTP, as described in Section 2.2.2.3.5.

2.2.5.2 Long-Term Closure

During long-term closure the WWTF will continue to treat water from the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Groundwater Containment System. It will also treat water from the West Pit as necessary to prevent the West Pit from overflowing. The WWTF treatment train during long-term closure will be reconfigured to consist of the following components:

- pretreatment via media filtration
- RO for removal of metals and sulfate

- VSEP filtration for second-stage volume reduction of RO concentrate
- thermal treatment of VSEP concentrate via evaporation/crystallization

Backwash water from pre-treatment will be routed to the West Pit. It is not expected that softening pretreatment will be needed for the RO unit in long-term closure because modeled water quality of WWTF influent in long-term closure is such that scaling is not anticipated. The RO permeate will be stabilized via treatment with lime/CO2/passive limestone bed prior to discharge to a small watercourse that flows into the Partridge River. Residual solids resulting from thermal treatment of VSEP concentrate will be transported offsite for disposal.

2.2.5.3 Financial Assurance

The cost for implementation of the WWTF including annual operating and maintenance will be included in the Contingency Reclamation Estimate that will be the basis for financial assurance. The estimate will be updated annually based on the liability at the end of the following year. See Section 7.4 of Reference (1) for details.

3.0 Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Cover System

3.1 Project Feature

The Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Cover System is an engineered geomembrane cover system that will be implemented progressively starting in Mine Year 14. It is expected to be fully constructed by the end of Mine Year 21. The Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile is the only permanent waste rock stockpile. It will contain about 168 million tons of low sulfur (maximum of 0.12%; average 0.06%) waste rock that is not projected to generate acid but is projected to release dissolved solids, including sulfate and metals (Section 2.1 of Reference (6)). Water quality modeling indicates that the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile will be the largest source of constituent load to the West Pit for many constituents. The Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Cover System is the primary engineering control that limits these loads.

The Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Groundwater Containment System, described in Section 2.1.2 of Reference (6), provides the ability to collect water passing through the stockpile. During operations, this water will be treated via the WWTF and sent to the FTP Pond or to the backfilled East Pit to flood the backfilled pit more rapidly. During reclamation and in long-term closure, this water will be treated via the WWTF and then be sent to the East or West Pit during pit flooding or will be combined with the treated West Pit water and discharged to a small watercourse that flows into the Partridge River.

3.2 Planned Engineering Control

3.2.1 Purpose

The purpose of the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Cover System is to reduce the constituent load that must be removed by the WWTF. This is accomplished by reducing the flow of water into the stockpile beyond the point that concentration caps are reached. The cover system percolation rate is the design parameter that controls how much water will flow into the stockpile – a lower percolation rate means less flow into the stockpile.

3.2.2 Design

The engineered geomembrane cover system to be used for reclamation of the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile will meet the applicable requirements of Minnesota Rules, part 6132.2200, subpart 2, items B and C. Attachment B of Reference (6) presents the preliminary design drawing set for the cover system. Detailed design including drainage features will be completed in PTM permitting and will be included in Reference (6) at that time. Section 3.3.1 provides a discussion of the basis for the design percolation rate. The Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile cover (Figure 3-2) will consist of, from top to bottom: 18 inches of rooting zone soil consisting of on-site overburden mixed with peat soils as needed to provide organic matter, 12 inches of granular drainage material with drain pipes to facilitate lateral drainage of infiltrating precipitation and snowmelt off the stockpile cover, a 40-mil (40/1000 of an inch) geomembrane barrier layer and a 6-inch soil bedding layer below the geomembrane. Included but not shown on the drawings will be additional soil below the 6-inch soil bedding layer, placed as needed to fill

surface voids in the waste rock, thereby providing a uniform foundation layer for the 6-inch soil bedding layer.

The cover system profile is modeled after requirements of Minnesota Rules, part 7035.2815, subpart 6, item D, which requires at least a 30/1000 of an inch thick geomembrane barrier layer, at least a 6-inch thick granular drainage layer, and a top layer at least 18 inches thick. The Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile cover utilizes a thicker geomembrane (40-mil instead of 30-mil) to better facilitate seaming. The 40-mil is an adequate thickness to perform the required hydraulic barrier function. Because the geomembrane is designed as a hydraulic barrier and not as a structural element in the cover system, the higher strength associated with thicker geomembranes is not needed. In addition, a thicker granular drainage layer (12-inch instead of 6-inch) is used for improved hydraulic performance and reduced risk of geomembrane damage during drainage layer placement. While Minnesota Rules, part 7035.2815 is applicable to mixed municipal solid waste land disposal facilities rather than waste rock stockpiles, these rules do serve as a reasonable guide as to the MPCA-accepted cover system profile for closure of waste storage facilities in Minnesota.

The stockpile slope, at 3.75 (horizontal) to 1 (vertical) (3.75H:1V), is flat enough that routine cover construction methods will be utilized (i.e., geomembrane panel deployment from crest to toe of slope, thin-spreading of lateral drainage layer material from defined truck unloading locations, placement of remaining cover soils and establishment of vegetation). The cover system will be placed on top of the waste rock contained in the stockpile after the stockpile has been appropriately shaped and prepared.



Figure 3-1 Conceptual Cross-Section: Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Cover System

The construction materials (except for the geomembrane) are expected to consist of unsaturated overburden, peat and other materials to be developed from on-site sources approved by the MDNR prior to construction. See Section 2.2.3 of Reference (6) for details on Mine Site construction materials. Materials used above the geomembrane are assumed to be non-reactive and to produce chemistry in the runoff water similar to background. On-site borrow sources will be supplemented by off-site sources as needed, identified in conjunction with material type and quantity requirements determined on during construction.

To minimize the potential for clogging of the granular drainage material, shallow-rooted grasses will be specified for the cover vegetation seed mix. This is standard practice for most cover systems despite the increased interest in utilizing deeper rooted vegetation types, shrubs and trees for closure vegetation. Surface drainage channels and down shoots will aid in directing clean surface water runoff from the stockpile, thereby reducing infiltration and build-up of hydraulic head in the geomembrane barrier layer and cover soils. Water in the lateral drainage layer will be collected by perforated drain pipes (not shown in Figure 3-1; see Attachment B of Reference (6)) placed in the lateral drainage layer. The pipes will discharge to downchutes (Section 3.2.2.3) and subsequently to the stormwater ditch to combine with other surface water runoff.

The stockpile has been designed to accommodate the geomembrane, as shown in Figure 3-2 and Figure 3-3, which show the Mine Year 13 stockpile interim configuration with waste rock at the angle of repose and the reclamation configuration with waste rock at 3.75H:1V fill slopes, respectively. The surface water drainage features have been evaluated for the stormwater modeling at the Mine Site and are described below.

As the cover is applied, the corresponding sections of the process water ditch component of the Category 1 Waste Rock Groundwater Containment System will be covered, diverting non-impacted surface water runoff from the stockpile cover to the stormwater ditch system. Containment system pipe risers will be extended to finished cover grade to provide access for pipe cleanout (Section 7.1.1.2 of Reference (6)).

Prior to placement of the geomembrane cover on the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile, the stockpile will be locally contoured to provide some topographic variety to the surface and to assist in the development of a surface drainage network. The interbench slope will be reduced to 3.75H:1V to facilitate placement of the geomembrane cover system. Drainage channels will be constructed on nominal 30-foot wide benches, constructed at nominal 40-foot vertical intervals at 2% typical gradients. A drainage system using the benches has been developed to manage stormwater runoff from the cover. When reclamation contouring is complete, the geomembrane cover system will be constructed and seeded with grasses.

Stormwater runoff from the cover will be managed using a system of top channels and outslope bench channels that convey runoff to a series of riprap-lined downchutes. The design of top channels, outslope channels and downchutes was conducted using design criteria related to:

- the design storm event
- watershed characteristics

- design flow rates
- flow velocities
- erosion control



(see Drawing 3X "Ultimate Limits Interim Configuration" in Attachment B of Reference (6))

Figure 3-2 Plan View: Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Interim Configuration – Mine Year 13



(see Drawing 7 "Ultimate Limits Closure Configuration" in Attachment B of Reference (6))

Figure 3-3 Plan View: Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Reclamation Configuration

The channels are designed to convey the estimated peak flows resulting from the 100-year, 24-hour design storm with runoff volume estimated using the Soil Conservation Service Curve Number (CN) method and the peak flow and routing performed using the kinematic wave method. The channel geometry and peak flows were used as inputs in the Manning's equation to solve for normal depth and velocity. Channel depth is based on providing 1.0 foot of freeboard and channels lined with riprap are designed using a minimum factor of safety of 1.5 for riprap size selection. A conventional system of outslope channels, stockpile ramp channels, downchutes and perimeter channels is designed to manage stormwater on the reclaimed stockpile outslopes. All of these channels were designed to convey the 100-year, 24-hour storm event to the perimeter stormwater ditches and dikes, which are described in Section 2.2.2 of Reference (1). Design of the drainage system is described in Section 2.2 of Reference (1) and in the following sections.

3.2.2.1 Top Surface Grading and Drainage

The top surface and the exposed benches of each lift of the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile will be graded to provide a minimum nominal slope of 1.0% post settlement. The 1.0% slope is selected based on a variety of factors including:

- Safe travel and dumping operations of the 240-ton mine trucks and bulldozers is paramount. The 1.0% final top slope is selected to provide safe travel and operations during the construction of the final surface of the stockpile.

- The waste rock is virtually incompressible and not subject to significant differential settlement once placed. Post-construction slopes are expected to remain at grades very near the final as-constructed grades.

- The waste rock will be difficult to re-grade on flat surfaces due to its large size (rock diameters up to approximately 7 feet). Once placed at a 1.0% final top slope it will remain at that slope.

- The stockpile cover performance modeling (Section 3.3.3) shows that the desired hydraulic performance of the stockpile cover system can be achieved at the 1.0% slope.

According to waste rock stockpile research by Eger and Lapakko (Reference (14)), little to no surface runoff is likely to occur from the uncovered stockpile due to the coarse nature of the material. Although surface flows are not expected on a regular basis, they could occur during major storm events. Temporary dikes will be constructed along the perimeter of the stockpile top and stockpile ramps where trucks are hauling, which will minimize surface runoff over the sides. Stockpile benches may be designed to encourage infiltration and evaporation by grading the bench to flow into the stockpile, forcing infiltration or evaporation to occur. Therefore, in general, flow paths on the uncovered stockpile will direct surface flows into the stockpile or to ditches down the stockpile ramps, which will be gradual, further encouraging infiltration or evaporation.

Typical design details were developed to illustrate the management of stormwater on the regraded top surface of the stockpile. The stormwater management system consists of one or more channels on the top surface with a minimum estimated post-settlement longitudinal slope of 1.0% that will drain stormwater from the top surface to either downchutes or to channels along stockpile ramps.

The proposed 1.0% minimum top surface and drainage channel slopes are on the basis of the limited susceptibility of the stockpile to long-term settlement after final top surface and drainage channel grading. In addition to the relatively low compressibility of the waste rock, the final grading will occur after the bulk of the stockpile has already been in place for at least 13 years. Therefore, unlike for municipal solid waste landfills and other solid waste management facilities where long-term settlement can be expected and where 2.0 to 3.0% minimum slopes are warranted to accommodate future settlement; such settlement is not anticipated in the waste rock stockpile, and the flatter 1.0% minimum slope is justified.

3.2.2.2 Outslope Grading and Drainage

Outslope channels will be constructed on the re-graded outslope reclamation benches and spaced to limit the sheet flow distance. Waste rock materials will be redistributed from the angle of repose to a 3.75H:1V interbench slope with 30-foot wide benches every 150 feet, (measured from interbench slope toe to slope crest) using the maximum bench to bench elevation of 40 feet in accordance with Minnesota Rules, part 6132.2400, subpart 2, item C.

Analysis of stability of cover soils on the 3.75H:1V stockpile slopes is presented in Geotechnical Data Package – Volume 3 (Reference (15)). In summary, the stability of cover soils is a function of the interface shear strength between the geomembrane barrier layer and the overlying cover soil component. Interface shear strength is a function of the specific soil type in contact with the geomembrane and the membrane type and surface texture (i.e., linear low-density polyethylene performs differently than high density polyethylene; textured geomembrane performs differently than smooth geomembrane). As presented in Section 6.1 of Reference (15), an adequate slope stability safety factor can be achieved using the geomembrane types (Section 3.2.2.5) and soil types proposed for the stockpile cover system. For reference, the State of Minnesota has previously approved and achieved success with slopes at least as steep as 3.5H:1V (i.e., steeper than the 3.75H:1V proposed) for cover systems utilizing geomembrane barrier layers.

Preliminary layouts displaying the direction of flow for the outslope bench channels have been developed with a nominal 2% reclamation slope. Each channel will be constructed on a 30 foot wide reclamation bench and will discharge to a downchute or stockpile ramp channel. A typical outslope channel detail was developed using the maximum estimated peak discharge and a nominal channel slope of 2%, resulting in a design channel depth of 2.4 feet, which includes one foot of freeboard.

3.2.2.3 Downchutes

Downchutes will be constructed on the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile slopes that are reconfigured to a 3.75H:1V slope to collect and convey stormwater runoff from the outslope bench channels and top channels into perimeter channels and off-site through the stormwater system. The downchutes are designed for a continuous 22% slope without grade breaks at the benches, with energy dissipation provided at the base of each downchute. The downchute channels will be armored. Armoring options include riprap or other engineered approved equivalents (e.g., articulated concrete blocks) to provide erosion protection from the potentially high velocities in the downchute channels during storm events.

An energy dissipation basin will be constructed to dissipate the high-energy flow at the outfall of the downchute channel from supercritical to subcritical flow prior to entering the perimeter stormwater channel.

3.2.2.4 Stockpile Ramp Channels

Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile ramp channels will be located along the inboard slopes of the reconstructed haul road ramps. While the stockpile is being reclaimed, the ramps will also be

reclaimed with cover soil and the reclamation channels will be constructed. At this time, the ramps will be reconfigured and reclaimed to slope towards the channels at 2% (minimum). Stockpile ramp channels will collect flow from the top surface, outslope benches and the ramps. The stockpile ramp channels will be armored with riprap or other approved revetment. Other engineered equivalents may be used to provide erosion protection for the potentially high velocities in the stockpile ramp channels during reclamation and long-term closure. An energy dissipation basin will be constructed to dissipate the flow energy at the outfall of the ramp channel prior to entering the perimeter stormwater channel.

3.2.2.5 Geomembrane Hydraulic Barrier Layer

The Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Cover System cross-section is shown on Figure 3-2. The hydraulic barrier layer of the cover system will be a geomembrane. Geomembranes represent the largest group of synthetic liner materials. Geomembranes are nearly impervious polymeric sheets used primarily for lining and covering facilities intended to contain liquids or solids (Reference (16)). Common geomembrane materials include high-density polyethylene (HDPE), linear low-density polyethylene (LLDPE), polypropylene (PP), polyvinyl chloride (PVC), chlorosulfonated polyethylene (CSPE), and ethylene propylene dieneterpolymer (EPDM).

For the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile hydraulic barrier a geomembrane was selected based on a number of factors, such as material availability, ease and rate of installation, industry use and acceptance (experience), resistance to long-term physical and chemical degradation, puncture and tear resistance, interface shear strength and economics. An HDPE or LLDPE geomembrane will be used for the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile hydraulic barrier layer because they are generally regarded as the most durable and have the longest service life available (Reference (17)). LLDPE and HDPE geomembranes are extruded into thin sheets then rolled for delivery and installation. Raw materials used in the manufacture of LLDPE and HDPE geomembranes are nearly the same. Both HDPE and LLDPE meet performance requirements of the stockpile cover system.

Geomembrane panels will be joined by thermal fusion welding using a dual-track welder (primary seams) or an extrusion welder (secondary details). The dual-track welder bonds the sheets with two rows of welds with an air channel in between. The air channel is pressurized to verify the fusion weld does not contain leaks. Extrusion welders use heat and extra polymer to create welds in detail areas that cannot be accessed by a dual-track welder. Welds prepared by an extrusion welder are checked by applying vacuum or by spark-testing (Reference (18)).

After field-seaming of geomembrane sheets, selective destructive test samples are taken and shear and peel tests performed on the completed seams (Reference (18)). Typically, one sample is taken per 500 to 1000 feet of seam, but frequency is determined on a project-by-project basis. The sample is usually 3 feet in length, with 1/3 being evaluated onsite, 1/3 being sent to a quality assurance laboratory for testing, and the other 1/3 kept for archival storage. Areas where destructive test samples are taken require repair and must also be tested non-destructively after destructive testing is completed. Non-destructive testing of areas patched by extrusion welding is performed using a vacuum box to confirm patch integrity.

3.2.3 Degree of Use in Industry

Geomembranes have been used in the mining industry since the 1970's (Reference (19)). Geomembrane cover systems are widely used throughout the world in mining and other industries that have to address long-term containment of wastes(e.g., power plants for coal ash, water treatment plants for filtered solids, and municipal solid waste landfills). Because cover systems using geomembranes as the primary hydraulic barrier have been widely used and studied for decades, geomembrane selection, design, construction and quality control procedures required for successful implementation are well understood.

While geomembranes have been widely used for decades, there has not been significant demand for geomembranes in waste rock stockpile covers (Reference (20)). A small sampling of geomembrane-based cover systems (Reference (21)) is summarized in Table 3-1 for a variety of material types over relatively small areas (average project size is less than 30 acres). While the projects listed generally do not use geomembranes for stockpile covers, Barr's experience designing and monitoring construction of geomembrane cover systems indicates that a properly sloped waste rock stockpile exhibits the characteristics necessary for successful use of geomembrane covers [i.e., a very stable foundation material (the waste rock) capable of supporting the necessary construction equipment and remaining stable indefinitely].

Table 3-1 GSE 2012 Mining Project Summary – Cover Systems

Date	Projects with Geomembrane Cover	Location	Size (acres)
2012	Lynn Lake Mine Tailings Cap	North America	140
2012	Farley Mine – Lynn Lake Cap	North America	48
2012	Farley Nickel Mine Cap	North America	32
2012	Mosaic Gypsum Stack	North America	18
2012	Cubiertas Flotantes	Latin America	13
2012	Tolko Mines Tailings Cap	North America	7
2012	Lynn Lake May	North America	6
2012	Motiva North-South	North America	3
2012	Impermeabilizacion Hormigon Tanque Acidos Coloso	Latin America	2

Literature and internet searches were conducted to identify mining sites where geomembranes have been used in covers placed over waste rock. This review indicated that most reclamation projects employed earthen covers rather than covers with geosynthetic materials due to the large surface area and the higher cost associated with geosynthetic materials relative to earthen materials. Three mine sites were identified where geomembranes were used in the cover as a hydraulic barrier over waste rock. These mine sites and the cover profiles are summarized in Table 3-2.

Table 3-2 Examples of Covers with Geomembrane Barriers for Waste Rock Stockpiles

Site	Location	Waste Rock Type	Cover Profile	Status
Blackfoot Bridge Mine	Near Afton, WY	Seleniferous waste rock from phosphate mining	1.5 feet topsoil, 1 foot alluvium, 1 foot sand drainage layer, 40 mil geomembrane laminated on GCL, chert subgrade	Approved EIS. Construction begins in 2013. Site area is approx. 300-acres.
Dunka Mine	Babbitt, MN	Taconite mining waste rock stockpiles	Soil over 30 mil LLDPE geomembrane	Constructed in 2007 and in service. Site area is approx. 54 acres.
Lava Cap Mine	Nevada County, CA	Gold mining waste rock	1.5 feet soil, geocomposite drain, 60 to 80 mil LLDPE geomembrane, nonwoven geotextile	Constructed in 2007 and in service. Site area is approx. 20 acres.

Geomembrane manufactures and suppliers routinely provide geomembranes for covering other waste types (i.e. municipal solid waste, coal ash). Other representative large-scale geomembrane cover projects in the region include the geomembrane cover systems at the Waste Management Sanitary Landfill in Burnsville, Minnesota (roughly 200-acres in area and over 100 feet in height) and the BFI, Inc. Municipal Solid Waste Landfill in Inver Grove Heights, Minnesota (nearly 200-acres in area and unknown height). Geomembrane use for cover systems began at these facilities in the late 1990s to early 2000s and continues today.

3.3 Engineering Control Performance Parameters

3.3.1 Description with Basis

3.3.1.1 Mechanisms for Percolation through Geomembrane Cover Systems

Intact geomembranes are essentially impermeable (Reference (22)). The majority of liquid migration through HDPE and LLDPE geomembranes occurs through defects introduced during manufacture, installation, and covering of the geomembrane (Reference (23)). The potential for defects to occur, particularly during installation, depends on the rigor of the QA/QC implemented during installation.

Because geomembrane sheets are essentially impermeable, the magnitude of percolation through a geomembrane cover depends upon the number and size of defects (pinholes, holes) in the geomembrane, available hydraulic head over the geomembrane to force liquid through the defects, the installation of the geomembrane such that wrinkles are eliminated to the extent

practicable, and the characteristics of the geomembrane subgrade material. Each of these parameters plays a role in the performance of the geomembrane cover.

Some information in the following sections is based on a literature review, which generally documents leakage through liner systems rather than cover systems. However, because geomembrane type and manufacturing procedures, construction methods and construction QA/QC procedures are similar whether the geomembrane is used as a hydraulic barrier in a liner or cover, it is reasonable to assume that the findings apply to cover systems.

Defects in Geomembranes: Manufacturing processes and the chemical structure of polymers produce intact geomembranes with extremely low permeabilities (Reference (24)). Manufacturing defects are identified by on-line spark testing, which is an effective and reliable quality control method. As part of the manufacturing process, the geomembrane sheet is passed over a steel roller with a high-voltage wand placed immediately above the geomembrane. Should any pinhole defects exist in the sheet, current will pass through the pinhole triggering a shutdown in the machinery, and the sheet will then be scrapped. Spark-tested geomembrane rolls are guaranteed to have zero pinhole defects prior to shipping.

The number of defects in an installed geomembrane cover system depends on the methods used during installation, quality control used during installation, punctures incurred during placement of overlying materials, and post-construction maintenance. Defects introduced during handling and installation may include punctures, tears, cuts, and defects in welds. Based on field studies, Giroud and Bonaparte (Reference (25) and Reference (26)) recommend assuming a defect frequency of 1 to 2 holes per acre for rigorous QA/QC during geomembrane installation. Industry standards suggest that “excellent” installation with state-of-the-art QA/QC results in a defect frequency of 0.5 to 1 defects per acre, while a “good” installation results in 1 to 4 defects per acre (Reference (27)). Giroud and Bonaparte (Reference (25)) compute leakage rates for composite liners ranging from 1x10-5 to 0.02 gallons per acre per day when good QA/QC is performed.

Leak detection studies by Forget et al. (Reference (28)) evaluated several large-scale (greater than 2.5 acres) projects for total number of leaks in a comparison of projects with a rigorous QA/QC program to projects lacking a QA/QC program. For this study, electrical leak detection surveys were performed on exposed geomembranes and soil covered geomembranes. For projects with good QA/QC programs for all aspects of geomembrane construction (described below), any defects found were repaired. For covered geomembranes, testing was performed prior to covering the geomembrane and after placement of the soil cover. For 80-mil geomembranes on projects with a good QA/QC program, exposed geomembranes contained an average of 1.3 leaks per acre, and soil-covered geomembranes (subjected to double testing) contained an average of less than 0.1 leaks per acre in the second test. For 80-mil geomembranes on projects lacking a QA/QC program, soil-covered geomembranes contained an average of 6.2 leaks per acre (these geomembranes were not tested prior to soil covering). Data were nonexistent or insufficient to define defect frequencies for a 40-mil geomembrane.

A survey of defects in geomembranes by Nosko and Touze-Foltz (Reference (29)) as cited by Needham et al., Reference (30)) determined that 24% of defects were caused during installation

and 73% were caused by mechanical damage during placement of cover soils, whereas only 2% of defects were attributed to post-construction wear and less than 1% were geomembrane seam test coupon locations. Forget et al. (Reference (28)) concluded that only 6% of perforations were caused during the cover material installation. Thus, the conclusion in Nosko is probably valid only in cases where no rigorous QA/QC program has been implemented (Reference (28)). By comparison of Nosko et al. to Forget et al., it appears that the frequency of defects formed during placement of cover soils is expected to be lower when more emphasis is placed on QA/QC during placement of cover soils.

Defects can range widely in size, depending on the quality of the installation. Nosko and Touze-Foltz (Reference (29) as cited in Forget et al., Reference (28)) summarize leak sizes measured at more than 300 sites in 16 countries independent of QA/QC procedures, covered or exposed geomembranes, and geomembrane thickness. The results of this data analysis indicate that the majority of leaks are above 0.5 cm^2 and that half (50%) of the leaks fall within the range of 0.5 to 2.0 cm^2. The data also indicate that 85% of leaks are smaller than 10 cm^2. A leak size frequency plot based on these data is provided in Figure 3-4.



Data from Nosko and Touze-Foltz, 2000, Reference (29)

Figure 3-4 Frequency and Distribution of Leak Size

Studies of root intrusion into geomembranes by Holl in 2002 (Reference (31)), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) in 2006 (Reference (32)), and Phifer in 2012 (Reference (33)) show that roots are blocked by intact geomembranes and grow laterally above the surface of the geomembrane. Consequently, geomembranes are commercially marketed as

root barriers (Reference (33)). Accordingly, no accommodation is necessary for defects due to root penetration of the geomembrane.

Based on a limited literature search, research is not readily available regarding the ability of insects and animals to burrow through geomembranes and the resulting impacts of insect and animal burrows on the integrity of cover systems using geomembrane hydraulic barriers. Crouse and Watson in 2002 (Reference (34)) indicate that rats were unable to penetrate geomembranes. A more extensive literature search will be required to substantiate whether animals routinely burrow through geomembrane barrier layers in cover systems. Theoretically, only materials harder than a burrower's teeth or claws can survive an attack, but vulnerability is unknown (Reference (35)). Absent evidence that animal burrows through geomembranes are a significant concern, an accommodation in cover-system performance modeling was made for the general possibility that additional defects in geomembranes could occur and that defects will vary in size (i.e., a five-times increase in defect frequency will be modeled). However, as indicated in Section 3.3.2 routine inspection to observe for impacts from burrowing animals will occur and if impacts are identified, the condition will be remedied to minimize or prevent potential impacts from burrowing animals.

Hydraulic Head above Geomembrane: The percolation rate through the geomembrane is in part a function of the hydraulic head on the geomembrane. Hydraulic head on the geomembrane is primarily a function of the rate of precipitation, runoff and evapotranspiration, the hydraulic conductivity of the material overlying the geomembrane, the distance between drainage features of the cover system, and the type and density of surface vegetation and its rooting depth and density. These factors collectively determine the rate at which water accumulates on the surface of the geomembrane. The hydraulic head is the force that drives liquid through the defects in the geomembrane. As hydraulic head increases, percolation through defects in the geomembrane increases.

Except for precipitation, each of the factors that affect hydraulic head on the geomembrane can be controlled and are considered as part of stockpile cover design. Hydraulic conductivity of the soil layer immediately above the geomembrane is selected to facilitate drainage of infiltrated precipitation to drainage pipes while also protecting the geomembrane from damage during and after installation. The type of vegetation is selected to achieve a dense vegetative cover that promotes evapotranspiration while limiting soil erosion from surface water runoff. These factors collectively yield a low average hydraulic head on the geomembrane cover, thus resulting in very little driving force and very low percolation through defects in the geomembrane cover.

Characteristics of the Geomembrane Subgrade Material: Leakage through a geomembrane is computed based in part on the hydraulic conductivity of the underlying soil layer, contact between the geomembrane and underlying soil layer, and the head on the geomembrane (Reference (23)).

Summary: The factors affecting leakage through geomembrane barrier layers used in covers are primarily the frequency and size of defects that remain in the geomembrane after construction is complete, the hydraulic head on the geomembrane, and the hydraulic conductivity of the soils underlying the geomembrane.

3.3.1.2 Methodology for Calculation of Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Percolation

The HELP Model (Reference (27)) was used to estimate the percolation rate for the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile geomembrane cover system using the stockpile design and Project climate conditions.

The HELP Model is a tool commonly used to estimate percolation through geomembrane cover systems. The HELP model was developed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to provide landfill designers and regulators with a tool to quickly and economically screen alternative cover designs. The HELP model is a quasi-two-dimensional hydrologic model of liquid migration across, through and out of landfills. Inputs include weather information, soil data, and cover system configuration. The HELP model accounts for snowmelt, runoff, surface storage, infiltration, evapotranspiration, vegetative growth, field capacity, lateral subsurface drainage, unsaturated vertical drainage, and percolation through cover systems. Version 3 of the model was enhanced to account for defects in geomembrane barrier layers, either due to manufacturing or installation. HELP models both surface and subsurface hydrologic processes. The major assumptions and limitations of the HELP model include:

- Runoff is computed with the Soil Conservation Service (SCS) method, based on daily rainfall and snowmelt, assuming that the area of interest acts as an independent watershed, without receiving additional runoff from adjacent areas. This is the case for the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile, which is elevated with no surrounding tributary area contributing surface water run-on to the stockpile surface.

- Intraday distribution of rainfall intensity is not considered. While the model cannot provide accurate estimates of runoff volumes for individual storm events (peak daily values), the model provides reasonable long-term estimates (average annual values).

- Gravity drainage dominates the flow through homogeneous soil and waste layers and through barrier soil liners.

- Geomembranes are assumed to leak primarily through defects, input as number of pinholes (manufacturing defects with a diameter of 1 mm) and installation defects (holes with an area of 1 cm^2) per acre. The model assumes the hydraulic head on the defects can be represented by the average hydraulic head across the entire geomembrane cover system. Because geomembranes are now guaranteed by the manufacturer to be defect free, pinhole defects due to manufacturing are not included in modeling; only installation defects are included in modeling.

- Aging of materials can be modeled by successive simulations. The number and size of defects cannot vary as a function of time within a single model run.

The HELP model inputs are subdivided by the layers that constitute the final cover system. These layers include the rooting zone soil (called a Vertical Percolation Layer in HELP), the granular cover soil over the geomembrane (called a Lateral Drainage Layer in HELP), the geomembrane (a Geomembrane Barrier Layer in HELP), and the soil layer directly below the

geomembrane barrier layer (another Vertical Percolation Layer in HELP). HELP Model input for each layer is summarized in Large Table 7.

Of note in the preceding table is the use of "good" geomembrane installation quality, which corresponds to 1 to 4 defects per acre; the frequency recommended in the HELP User's Manual (Reference (27)) for "good" installation quality. This is supported by the research previously reported in Section 3.3.1.1. However, for HELP Modeling, a more conservative approach has been taken by modeling with 2 defects per acre and with 10 defects per acre (a five-time increase from 2 as described in Section 3.3.3).

Khire et al. (Reference (36)) and Albright et al. (Reference (37)) evaluated the accuracy of HELP models for estimating the hydrology of final cover systems. Both studies used data from large-scale test sections simulating covers that were constructed at or as part of actual waste Containment Systems. The test sections incorporated drainage lysimeters to monitor all components of the water balance. Water balance data from the lysimeters were compared with HELP model estimates and input parameters for HELP that were measured in the field. Khire et al. (Reference (36)) evaluated HELP for covers with a clay barrier layer using data from sites located in northern Georgia and eastern Washington. Albright et al. (Reference (37)) evaluated HELP for covers with geomembranes as the primary barrier layer using data from seven sites located in the Midwest and western United States. Both studies indicate that HELP estimates the seasonal trends in the water balance, but the accuracy of the estimates vary from site to site. The study by Albright et al. (Reference (37)) is directly relevant to the Project site because the study evaluated estimates for covers with geomembrane barrier layers.

Albright et al. (Reference (37)) show that HELP tends to overestimate runoff and underestimate evapotranspiration for covers with geomembrane barrier layers, and that the errors in estimates of runoff and evapotranspiration typically offset each other. Soil water storage in the cover soils overlying the geomembrane is underestimated by HELP, and lateral flow in the lateral drainage layer is overestimated, because the flow algorithm in HELP ignores the capillary barrier effect formed by the textural contrast between the lateral drainage layer and the overlying vertical percolation layers. This causes the model to estimate too much drainage out of the vertical percolation layer and into the lateral drainage layer. Percolation typically was overestimated slightly when field data was used to accurately represent the hydraulic properties of the cover soils in the HELP model input. Estimated percolation rates for geomembrane covers typically ranged from 0.01 to 0.6 in/yr, whereas measured percolation rates ranged from nil to 0.4 in/yr. Higher percolation rates were measured for one cover that was constructed with poor quality control and was believed to have extensive puncturing in the geomembrane.

The HELP model considers the hydraulic conductivity of the soil layers above the geomembrane to be constant over time. In reality, hydraulic conductivity of the vertical percolation layer and lateral drainage layers may change over time. The changes that could occur in the vertical percolation layer (function = rooting zone layer; root penetration is considered, freeze-thaw effects on hydraulic conductivity are not considered) could result in increased infiltration through this layer if hydraulic conductivity increases due to freeze-thaw cycles. The changes that could occur in the lateral drainage layer (function = drainage away from top of geomembrane; clogging

of layer is not considered) could result in decreased rate of drainage away from the top of geomembrane but also reduced rate of infiltration into the lateral drainage layer. Because the changes indicated above do not affect the geomembrane defect size and/or frequency and because defects in the geomembrane primarily control quantity of percolation through the cover system, potential changes in hydraulic conductivity of the vertical percolation layer and lateral drainage layer of the cover system are not considered.

3.3.1.3 Cover Construction Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC)

Consistent with Minnesota Rules, 6132.2200, subpart 2, item C, construction QA/QC for cover systems includes documenting compliance with specifications, material testing during construction, and conformance testing of materials before they arrive on site. Specification requirements include earthwork procedures, material testing, installation procedures, geomembrane seam testing (destructive and non-destructive), visual inspections, and specific installation requirements.

In general, geomembrane QA/QC dictates panel deployment, trial welds, field seaming, field testing (destructive and non-destructive), and repair of defects. The QA/QC manual will include test methods, test parameters, and testing frequencies. Documentation from QA/QC personnel includes observations of the geomembrane during storage, handling, seam preparation, seam overlap, and verification of the adequateness of the underlying soils.

Geomembrane cover systems in Minnesota are typically installed during the prime earthwork construction season from roughly late May/early June to late November. This allows for installation and seaming of geomembrane sheets in temperatures above freezing, thereby avoiding the requirement for membrane pre-heating and modified seaming rates that can slow the installation rate and increase the installation cost in sub-freezing temperatures. Geomembrane manufacturers provide guidelines for geomembrane installation in sub-freezing conditions and these guidelines will be followed in the event that geomembrane installation occurs in sub-freezing conditions.

Destructive geomembrane testing involves removing a sample from the geomembrane or seam for QC testing by the geomembrane installer and for QA testing by an independent third party (Reference (38)). Destructive testing of geomembrane seams includes shear testing and peel testing. Destructive testing of geomembrane sheets involves tensile testing. Minimum frequencies of sampling and testing are dictated by project specifications. If destructive test results do not meet acceptance criteria, additional testing proceeds in the immediate area to determine the extent of unacceptable material or seams. This allows failing areas to be corrected with such measures as re-seaming or seaming a patch over the affected area (Reference (38)).

Common non-destructive methods for testing seams include pressure testing for double fusion welds and vacuum testing for extrusion welds. Electrical leak detection tests or surveys can also be used to identify defects in the installed geomembrane. This method provides a proactive approach to locating and repairing leaks in the constructed geomembrane cover system. Electrical leak detection was developed in the early 1980s and has been commercially available since the mid-1980s. Test methods are outlined in ASTM Methods D6747, D7002, and D7007.

In these test methods, a voltage is applied across the geomembrane. Because a typical geomembrane is relatively non-conductive, discontinuities in electrical flow indicate a leak in the geomembrane (i.e., current passes through the leak to the conductive materials surrounding the geomembrane). Electrical leak detection can be applied to both exposed and covered geomembranes in order to reveal defects caused during geomembrane installation and placement of cover soils, respectively.

The minimum detectable leak size for electrical leak detection ranges from 0.006 cm^2 to 0.323cm^2, depending on the method used. Based on Figure 3-4, less than 10% of expected geomembrane defects fall below this size range. That is, electrical leak detection tests can locate most geomembrane defects, greatly reducing the number of geomembrane defects that are undetected and unrepaired.

Cover soils are specified to be free-draining to provide a highly transmissive layer to ensure low hydraulic head on the cover system. Cover soils must be spread in a manner that minimizes the potential for damage to the geomembrane. Cover soil is placed in a thick lift in traffic zones and initial cover soil dumping locations, and then pushed from these locations to the specified lift thickness using a low ground pressure dozer. Depending on the configuration of the cover system, electrical leak location surveys may then be conducted to detect damage that may have occurred. In addition, continuous visual observation of cover soil placement and spreading can be used as a means of detecting damage during cover soil placement. If the geomembrane is damaged, the soil is manually removed and the geomembrane is cleaned and repaired. If cover soil will not be placed in a timely fashion after geomembrane deployment, a protective sheet can be used to shield the geomembrane from construction damage.

3.3.2 Maintenance Program

Once the cover system geomembrane barrier layer is installed and protected by soil cover, further testing of the geomembrane is not required. However, consistent with Minnesota Rules, part 6132.2200, subpart 2, item C, the stockpile cover system will require annual maintenance to remain effective. Annual maintenance will consist of repair of erosion that threatens to expose the geomembrane, removal of deep-rooted woody plant species (as permits require), repair of impacts from burrowing animals, and any other conditions that, if left unresolved, could impair performance of the cover. Periodic inspections (typically each spring and fall and after rainfall events approaching or exceeding the design event) will be conducted to identify any areas requiring repair. For example, if deep animal burrows are observed that may penetrate the geomembrane, the geomembrane will be uncovered, inspected, and repaired if damaged.

Over the last two decades, considerable research has been conducted to evaluate degradation of HDPE geomembranes and factors that affect geomembrane service life. If a geomembrane is not damaged by intrusive processes such as erosion or borrowing, research has shown that temperature and constituents present in liquid contacting the geomembrane are the primary factors affecting service life. Both factors affect the rate at which antioxidants within the geomembrane are released or consumed, and the rate at which oxidation reactions break down polymer molecules in the geomembrane. The degradation process is known to occur in three stages: (i) antioxidant depletion, (ii) oxidation induction, and (iii) active polymer degradation.

The most comprehensive and long-term studies on geomembrane degradation have been conducted at Queen's University in Ontario (Reference (39)). Research at Queen's University has involved tests with durations as long as 10 years and has included conventional immersion tests on geomembrane coupons as well as large-scale physical models simulating engineered barrier systems. The research has shown that temperature, the presence of water at the geomembrane surface, and the constituents present in the contacting water influence the rate of each stage of degradation. In particular, degradation occurs more rapidly as the temperature increases, when the geomembrane is submerged (i.e., saturated conditions), and when the water contains surfactants that enhance release of antioxidants from the geomembrane.

In a cover application in a northern climate, the temperature of the geomembrane is relatively cool, the contacting soil is unsaturated, and the water contacting the geomembrane contains little if any surfactants, all of which will promote long service life. For a 60-mil HDPE geomembrane immersed in liquid with surfactants at 68°F, Rowe et al. (Reference (39)) indicate that the service life is on the order of 1000 years. Under unsaturated conditions and at substantially cooler temperatures (the average annual temperature at the Project site is approximately 38°F), the analysis in Reference (39) indicates a life expectancy for a 60-mil HDPE geomembrane of more than 2000 years.

This research is generally consistent with research conducted by the Geosynthetic Institute, which suggests a service life of at least 450 years at 68°F (Reference (40)) based on antioxidant depletion (i.e., first stage degradation). Similarly, Bonaparte and Koerner in their 2002 Assessment and Recommendations for Improving the Performance of Waste Containment Systems (Reference (41)) estimates the service lifetime of a 60-mil high density polyethylene geomembrane to be on the order of 970 years at 68°F. Field studies on geomembranes in covers conducted under sponsorship of the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Reference (42)) show that antioxidant depletion rates in the field are similar to those estimated based on laboratory tests.

The rate of degradation of geomembranes is controlled by diffusion of antioxidants out of the geomembrane and diffusion of oxygen into the geomembrane, which are affected by the distance over which diffusion occurs. In particular, the rate scales by the ratio of the square of the geomembrane thickness. Thus, a 40-mil geomembrane typically used in a final cover will have a service life that is approximately 2.25 times shorter than a 60-mil geomembrane [(60 x 60) ÷ (40 x 40) = 2.25]. If the service life is assumed to be at least 2000 years at 38°F for a 60-mil HDPE geomembrane, then the service life for a 40-mil geomembrane will be approximately 900 years. If full depletion of constituents from the stockpile requires more than 1000 years, the geomembrane may need to be replaced in the future.

If periodic testing (i.e., testing of geomembrane coupons removed from cover, visually inspected for signs of degradation and physically tested for strength) of the geomembrane confirms that the geomembrane no longer meets performance requirements, then replacement will occur. Replacement would include removal of surface vegetation from the site and systematic removal of soils overlying the geomembrane, removal of the geomembrane, compaction and fine-grading of the subgrade as needed, placement of a new geomembrane, and replacement of the overlying

layers. Reconstruction would follow the construction and QA/QC procedures that were employed originally, or have been adopted as best practices by industry at the time of replacement. Procedures will be adjusted for new geomembrane types that are likely to be available hundreds of years in the future. Geomembrane replacement, if needed, would be conducted incrementally over areas that can reasonably be reconstructed each construction season (e.g., 50 to 75 acres each season).

3.3.3 Modeling of Engineering Controls

The Mine Site water quality model (Reference (3)), which estimates the impacts of the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile includes the following calculations and assumptions:

- in general, release rates for each constituent have been determined from comprehensive laboratory tests of NorthMet waste rock
- the scale factor (which is used to convert release rates measured in lab-scale tests to field-scale conditions) has been determined based on field data from similar stockpiles
- the mass of waste rock in the stockpile, as a function of time, has been determined from the waste rock placement plan presented in Table 2-2 of Reference (6)
- the mass of each constituent made available for transport in a given time period is calculated as release rate (i.e., constituent mass / rock mass / time) X scale factor X mass of waste rock X time-period duration
- the percolation rate is the amount of precipitation exiting the base of the cover system and entering the underlying waste rock, and is a function of the stockpile cover system configuration, as-built properties of the cover materials and characteristics of the vegetation (i.e., soil types, hydraulic barrier layer type and corresponding defect size and frequency, surface slope and drainage features, vegetation type and density)
- the volume of water draining from the stockpile in a given time period is calculated as percolation rate X stockpile area X time-period duration
- the potential concentration (assuming no concentration cap) of each constituent in drainage exiting the base of the stockpile is calculated as mass of constituent available for transport / volume of water draining from the stockpile
- if the potential concentration is greater than the concentration cap (thermodynamic maximum) then the concentration in drainage is equal to the concentration cap – otherwise the concentration in drainage is equal to the potential concentration
- any constituent mass retained in the stockpile due to concentration caps is available for later release from the stockpile at the level of the concentration cap until the constituent is fully depleted from the waste rock

The model assumes that the oxidation process will not be limited by oxygen (that is, the cover does not limit oxygen transport into the stockpile) and that all constituents released from the rock will ultimately be transported out of the stockpile regardless of the type of cover implemented. Collectively this means that the constituent load leaving the stockpile at any point in time can only be modeled to be reduced by limiting the amount of water percolating through the cover system to the point where concentration caps come into effect. This engineering control – the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Cover System – reduces the amount of water draining through the waste rock beyond the point where concentration caps come into effect, thus reducing the constituent load to the West Pit.

The Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Cover System has been incorporated into the Mine Site water model. The following changes have been made to the model to reflect this engineering control:

- The stockpile will remain bare (no cover) until the geomembrane is installed.
- Geomembrane installation will begin at the beginning of Mine Year 14 and be completed 8 years after it begins (end of Mine Year 21).
- Percolation through the geomembrane will be modeled as an uncertain variable with a lognormal distribution, similar to the modeling for the geomembrane liners on the temporary stockpiles (Section 5.2.2.3 of Reference (3)). Percolation rates (as a percent of precipitation) will be randomly-selected once per realization and will remain constant for the remainder of the realization.

The Hydrologic Evaluation of Landfill Performance (HELP) Model was used to estimate percolation from the base of the cover into the stockpile. The relatively flat areas (1.0% slope areas; 175 acres total) and the 3.75H:1V slope areas (26.7% slope areas; 351 acres total) of the stockpile were modeled. With the expected geomembrane defect frequency of 2 holes per acre, percolation of precipitation through flat areas of the cover is estimated to be 0.22 inches/year (0.79% of the 27.68 inches of average annual precipitation). This estimated percolation translates to 1.99 gallons/minute; or 0.0057 gallons/minute/defect. Percolation of precipitation through the side slopes of the stockpile is estimated to be 0.03 inches/year (0.11% of precipitation). This estimated percolation translates to 0.54 gallons/minute; or 0.0008 gallons/minute/defect. The expected percolation rate for the stockpile as a whole of 0.09 inches/year (0.34% of precipitation; 2.45 gallons/minute; or 0.0023 gallons/minute/defect) is established by computing the weighted average percolation through the entire stockpile ((Flat Area Percolation Rate x Flat Area) + (Sloped Area Percolation Rate x Sloped Area))/(Flat Area + Sloped Area). The weighted average percolation rate is computed to accommodate performance modeling, which treats the stockpile as a single mass of rock.

A second case was modeled to represent a scenario where animal burrowing into the geomembrane occurs and is temporarily left unrepaired (i.e., it is not possible to locate and repair burrows through the geomembrane, if they occur, immediately upon their occurrence). This is modeled by assuming that the defect frequency on the entire stockpile increases to 10 defects per acre. For this case, estimated percolation through flat areas increases to 1.01 inches/year (3.65%

of precipitation) and estimated percolation through sloped areas increases to 0.16 inches/year (0.58% of precipitation). The resulting percolation rate for the stockpile as a whole for this case is 0.44 inches/year (1.60% of precipitation), which is assumed to represent the 95th percentile of possible stockpile-wide conditions based on professional judgment of the likelihood of this scenario existing across the entire stockpile. The HELP Model input and output on which the water quality modeling is based in summarized in Large Table 7.

The water quality modeling includes the potential for both cases described above. Percolation through the geomembrane cover, as a percent of precipitation, is treated as an uncertain variable, sampled once per realization. The first case presented above, with two defects per acre, represents the most likely scenario that will occur. It is assumed that the expected stockpile percolation rate for this case of 0.34% of precipitation represents the median percolation rate that will occur, and that the percolation rate for the case with 10 defects per acre, 1.60% of precipitation, represents the 95th percentile percolation rate. The resulting lognormal distribution fit through these two points is shown on Figure 3-5. The resulting distribution has a 10th percentile percolation rate of 0.1% of precipitation (0.03 in/yr), a mean of 0.53% of precipitation (0.146 in/yr) and a 90th percentile percolation rate of 1.1% of precipitation (0.30 in/yr). Using this modeled mean value, the mean total percolation through the stockpile corresponds to approximately 4 gpm. This modeled mean percolation rate is used in the remainder of this document as the mean stockpile percolation.



Figure 3-5 **Probability Density Function and Cumulative Distribution Function for Percolation Rate from Cover with Geomembrane**

3.3.4 Impact on Transition to Non-Mechanical Treatment

In the operation, reclamation, and long-term closure phases of the Project the WWTF is the engineering control that provides compliance to water resource objectives. The Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Cover System has no direct impact on compliance because its function is to reduce the constituent load that must be removed by the WWTF.

However, the performance of the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Cover System will impact the likelihood of achieving the long-term closure goal of transitioning to non-mechanical treatment. To illustrate the effect that cover performance has on this goal, the long-term steady-state conditions of the West Pit lake have been evaluated using the water quality model. This evaluation considers the water and mass loading to the West Pit lake from the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile, as well as and other sources of water and constituent mass to the pit lake such as

direct precipitation and watershed runoff. For this illustration, there are four water quality criteria considered:

- sulfate concentration in the West Pit lake less than or equal to 100 mg/L –at a sulfate concentration of 100 mg/L, groundwater seepage from the pit does not result in the Partridge River being over 10 mg/L at SW-005 (the most upstream location designated as a water used for the production of wild rice)

- cobalt concentrations less than or equal to 5 µg/L – this is the surface water standard for cobalt at the estimated hardness of the West Pit lake

- nickel concentrations less than or equal to 52.2 µg/L – this is the surface water standard for nickel at the estimated hardness of the West Pit lake

- copper concentrations less than or equal to 9.3 µg/L – this is the surface water standard for copper at the estimated hardness of the West Pit lake

Figure 3-6 shows the modeled percent of mass removal that will be necessary from the Category 1 Stockpile Containment Non-Mechanical Treatment System (Section 6.2) with median flow and load inputs in order to meet the West Pit lake water quality criteria listed above. With the modeled mean percolation rate from the geomembrane cover of 0.53% of precipitation (Figure 3-5), neither mechanical nor non-mechanical treatment of the water collected by the Containment System will be required to meet the West Pit lake water quality criteria for sulfate, cobalt, or nickel. However, if the percolation rate were higher, some load will need to be removed by the non-mechanical treatment in order to meet the West Pit lake water quality criteria. For example, if the percolation rate was 5% of precipitation (a percolation rate more likely for an engineered soil cover), the non-mechanical treatment would need to remove 73% of the sulfate load, 81% of the cobalt load, and 89% of the nickel load in order to meet the West Pit lake water quality targets. Above a percolation rate of approximately 16% of precipitation, West Pit lake water quality criteria for nickel most likely could not be met by non-mechanical treatment of the Category 1 Stockpile Groundwater Containment System water alone.

The sulfate, cobalt, and nickel criteria can be met for the West Pit Lake under a variety of percolation rates and non-mechanical treatment removal rates because the stockpile is the primary source of load to the West Pit for these constituents. This is not the case for copper, where the pit walls also provide significant load to the pit lake. For the overflow from the West Pit lake to meet the water quality criteria for copper, the West Pit Overflow Non-Mechanical Treatment System (Section 6.3) will also be needed, regardless of the amount of removal possible by the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Containment Non-Mechanical Treatment System.



Figure 3-6 Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Percolation and Non-Mechanical Treatment Mitigation – Sulfate, Cobalt and Nickel

Figure 3-7 shows the amount of copper removal that would be needed by the West Pit Overflow Non-Mechanical Treatment system under a variety of different Category 1 Stockpile Cover System percolation rates and Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Containment Non-Mechanical Treatment System removal rates. With a percolation rate through the geomembrane cover of 5% of precipitation, if there is no mass removal by the Containment System non-mechanical treatment (0% curve in Figure 3-7), the overflow non-mechanical treatment would need to remove 88% of the copper mass in order to meet the water resource objectives. With increased removal by the Containment System non-mechanical treatment (30%, 60% and 90%), the amount of mass removal that must be provided by overflow non-mechanical treatment is lower. The actual amount of copper removal possible by the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Containment Non-Mechanical Treatment System will be based on the results from the pilot scale treatment testing (Section 6.2.3). However, the removal efficiencies shown on Figure 3-7 are within the range of removal efficiencies presented in literature (Reference (43)) as well as other references provided in Section 6.1.3 and Section 6.1.4.

In summary, the performance of the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Cover System strongly affects the mass of cobalt, nickel and sulfate the non-mechanical treatment for must remove, but

has very little effect on the mass of copper removal that would be necessary for the Project to transition to non-mechanical treatment in the future.



Figure 3-7 Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Percolation and Non-Mechanical Treatment Mitigation – Copper

3.4 Adaptive Management

3.4.1 Test Projects

There are no test projects planned for the waste rock stockpile groundwater Containment System.

3.4.2 Reporting and Model Update

The Project includes a comprehensive water quality and quantity monitoring and reporting program that will be finalized in NPDES/SDS permitting (Section 5 of Reference (1)). The program includes annual comparison of actual monitoring to modeled results for Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile. This comparison will be used to refine the model. See Section 6 of Reference (1) for details.

3.4.3 Modified Design

If the monitored quantity or quality of water collected by the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Groundwater Containment System, or annual updates to the model indicate that modifications are needed to meet water resource objectives, modifications could be made to the cover system, the Containment System, or the WWTF. This section describes potential adaptive management actions for the cover system. Potential contingency mitigation for the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Groundwater Containment System are described in Section 2.1.3.2 of Reference (6), and potential adaptive management aspects of the WWTF are described in Section 2.2.4.3. Additional potential adaptive management actions for water quality at the Mine Site are described in Sections 6.5 and 6.6 of Reference (1).

The cover system design can be modified up to the point of construction. The current version of this document will determine the design to be installed. After installation, post installation adjustments can be made.

3.4.3.1 Circumstances Triggering Modification

Circumstances that could trigger a request for design modification approval include:

- Demonstration by analog sites that a modified cover design will limit the percolation rate to the extent required.
- Demonstration by actual field monitoring of the Project and model updating that the percolation rate requirement has changed and that a modified design can achieve that rate. The percolation rate requirement could change for various reasons:
    - modeled performance of other fixed or adaptive engineering controls (Section 2.2 Reference (6), Reference (1)) could change,
    - modeled constituent load from backfilled Category 2, 3 and 4 waste rock, pit walls or Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile could change, and/or
    - modeled groundwater inflow or surface runoff into the pits could change.

3.4.3.2 Options For Modified Performance

Prior to installation, the design of the geomembrane cover system can be adjusted to modify performance if approved by the MPCA and MDNR. Options include:

- increased or decreased thickness of the geomembrane material to modify the potential for defects to be created during installation and to modify the life of the geomembrane,
- increased or decreased soil cover thickness above the geomembrane material to modify water storage capacity,

- increased or decreased soil hydraulic conductivity of the granular drainage layer above the geomembrane to modify lateral drainage capacity,
- increased or decreased uninterrupted slope length to modify lateral drainage capacity,
- modified soil type and/or thickness below the geomembrane to modify leakage rate through potential geomembrane defects, and/or
- including a geosynthetic clay liner below the geomembrane to modify leakage rate through potential geomembrane defects.

After installation, the installed geomembrane cover system can be adjusted to modify performance if approved by MPCA and MDNR. Options include:

- overseeding and/or fertilizer application to improve vegetation density,
- organic matter addition to rooting zone layer to improve vegetation density,
- increased or decreased thickness of rooting zone layer to modify vegetation density and soil moisture storage,
- increased or decreased frequency of cover system maintenance to modify vegetation density and erosion of the cover system, and/or
- long-term conversion to engineered vegetated store and release evapotranspiration cover system.

3.5 Reclamation and Long-Term Closure

The cover system will be implemented progressively starting in Mine Year 14 and is expected to be fully implemented by end of Mine Year 21. Construction sequencing is shown on Figure 3-8. The cover system will be required to function until constituents have been depleted from the stockpile or the release rates of constituents from the stockpile have decreased to the point where West Pit lake concentrations result in achieving water resource objectives without limiting drainage. The 200-year model does not show that the sulfur in the waste rock has been depleted or that constituent release rates have decreased.



Figure 3-8 Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Cover Construction Sequencing

3.5.1 Financial Assurance

The cost for implementation of the cover system including reshaping of the stockpile, annual maintenance, and cover replacement will be included in the Contingency Reclamation Estimate that will be the basis for financial assurance. The estimate will be updated annually based on the liability at the end of the following year. See Section 7.4 of Reference (6) for details.

4.0 Plant Site Adaptive Water Management

4.1 Overview

4.1.1 Water Management Systems

Water management systems at the Plant Site included fixed engineering controls (Reference (2) and adaptive engineering controls. Adaptive water management features at the Plant Site include the WWTP and the FTB Pond Bottom Cover System. The design of the WWTP is adaptive because treatment components can be modified and plant capacity can be adjusted to accommodate varying influent streams and discharge requirements. The design of the FTB Pond Bottom Cover System is adaptive because it can be modified to achieve the desired hydraulic conductivity based on operational experience, field monitoring, test projects, or availability of new construction materials or techniques.

Overviews of the Plant Site water management plan are provided on Figure 4-1 through Figure 4-5. A time line showing Plant Site water management through time is provided on Figure 4-6.

During operations (Figure 4-1), the FTP Pond will be the primary collection and distribution point for water used in the beneficiation process. The primary sources of water to the FTP Pond will include water from the Beneficiation Plant used to transport Flotation Tailings to the FTB, direct precipitation, stormwater run-on, treated process water from the WWTF (Section 2.2), and water collected by the FTB Containment System and the South Seepage Management System. Surface (referred to collectively as the seepage capture systems). Water collected by the seepage capture systems will be returned to the pond to the extent possible (Section 2.1 of Reference (2)), and any excess water will be sent to the WWTP. Effluent from the WWTP will be discharged near existing discharge locations SD-006 and SD-026 and to the Trimble Creek and Mud Lake Creek (Years 1-7 only) watersheds just downstream of the FTB Containment System. Reject concentrate will be sent to the WWTF



Figure 4-1 Plant Site Water Management Schematic – Operations (Year 1 through Year 20)

During the reclamation phase (Figure 4-2 and Figure 4-3) while the FTB is being reclaimed, a blend of WWTP effluent and untreated collected Tailings Basin seepage will be pumped to the Mine Site to accelerate flooding of the West Pit. The WWTP will also treat drainage and decanted pond water from the HRF as it is reclaimed. Most WWTP effluent will sent to the West Pit, but a small portion may also be used to maintain the designed water volume within the FTB Pond. Reject concentrate from the WWTP will continue to be sent to the WWTF.

When West Pit flooding is complete, the bottom of the FTP Pond will be augmented with bentonite (Section 5.0). The FTB Pond Bottom Cover System will reduce the percolation from the FTP Pond, maintaining a permanent pond, that will, in combination with the bentonite

amended soil covers for the beaches and exterior slopes of new dams provide an oxygen barrier around the Flotation Tailings to reduce oxidation and resultant production of chemical constituents. FTP pond water will be pumped to the WWTP as necessary to prevent any overflow from the pond.



Figure 4-2 Plant Site Water Management Schematic – Reclamation: West Pit Flooding (approximately Year 21 through Year 30)



Figure 4-3 Plant Site Water Management Schematic – Reclamation: Pond Closure (approximately Year 31 through Year 40)

The ultimate goals of long-term closure (Figure 4-4 and Figure 4-5) are to transition from the mechanical treatment provided by the WWTP to non-mechanical treatment, and to allow overflow of the FTP Pond by demonstrating that water in the FTP Pond can be directly discharged as stormwater. Because non-mechanical treatment designs are very site-specific and very dependent on the quality of the water to be treated, it is assumed that the WWTP will operate in the long-term and the transition to non-mechanical treatment will be only after the design for a non-mechanical system has been proven. Water from the pond will be continue to be pumped to the WWTP to prevent pond overflow until the pond water has been demonstrated to be stormwater and to meet the applicable water quality standards.

During the long-term closure phase (after the FTB is reclaimed and hydrology has stabilized), FTB seepage will continue to be collected and discharged via the WWTP until non-mechanical treatment has been demonstrated to provide appropriate treatment. Pond water will be pumped to the WWTP as necessary to prevent any overflow, until it can be demonstrated that the pond water is stormwater and meets all applicable surface water quality standards. The WWTP will be upgraded to include an evaporator. Reject Concentrate from the WWTP RO unit will be evaporated and the residual solids disposed of offsite. The WWTP will operate as long as necessary and will be financially assured.



Figure 4-4 Plant Site Water Management Schematic - Long-term Mechanical Treatment



Figure 4-5 Plant Site Water Management Schematic - Long-term Non-mechanical Treatment



Note: Actual start and end years are variable due to uncertainties and variability in the water and chemical balances. Dates shown are approximate.

Figure 4-6 Plant Site Water Management Timeline with Mechanical Treatment

4.1.2 Water Resource Objectives

The water resource objectives at the Plant Site are to:

- meet the applicable surface water standards (Table 1-2 and Table 1-3 of Reference (44)) in three Embarrass River tributaries (Trimble Creek, Mud Lake Creek and Unnamed Creek) at their headwaters near the FTB (at this time, the 90th percentile probabilistic model result being below the applicable standard is assumed to meet the water resource objectives)

- meet the applicable groundwater standards (Table 1-4 of Reference (44)) at the property boundary (at this time, the 90th percentile probabilistic model result being below the applicable standard is assumed to meet the water resource objectives)

- meet MPCA criteria with regard to sulfate at the three tributary headwaters (no increase in sulfate load relative to the modeled no action condition), at PM-13 (decrease in concentration relative to the modeled no action condition), and at the Embarrass River

(modeled concentration at PM-13 less than or equal to modeled concentration at PM-12.2)

Meeting these objectives requires the integrated operation of all the fixed engineering controls described in Section 2 of Reference (2) and the adaptive engineering controls described in Sections 4.0 and 5.0 of this document.

4.1.3 Monitoring

The Project includes a comprehensive water quality and quantity monitoring program that will be finalized in NPDES/SDS permitting. The program includes monitoring the flow and water quality of water from Plant Site project features, stormwater, groundwater and surface water. See Section 5 of Reference (2) for details.

4.2 Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP)

4.2.1 Purpose and Overview

During all phases of the Project – operations, reclamation, and long-term closure – the plan for operation of the WWTP will be to provide water that:

- meets the needs of the Project when the water is being treated for recycling or re-use, or
- meets requirements for discharge to the environment when the Project has excess water that cannot be reused.

The most recent approved version of Attachment B of Reference (4) will be used as a basis for defining the specific treatment targets needed during each phase. The WWTP will be designed to have the performance needed to achieve the treatment targets using the treatment processes described in Section 4.2.2.3. Additional details on the modeling and sizing of the treatment processes will be completed using the Plant Site water modeling results submitted for NPDES/SDS permitting. In addition, the treatment processes and the operation of the WWTP can be adapted, as necessary, throughout every Project phase, to meet water resource objectives and the needs of the Project.

The Project is divided into three primary phases; operations, reclamation, and long-term closure. These three Project phases are described below in terms of the purpose of waste water treatment at the Plant Site.

4.2.1.1 Operations

During operations, the WWTP will treat any water collected by the seepage capture systems that cannot be reused. The primary purpose of treatment for the WWTP will be to meet the appropriate discharge limits.

A schematic view of the plan for management and treatment of process water during operations is shown on Large Figure 1.

4.2.1.2 Reclamation

At the start of reclamation, the volume of water treated by the WWTP will increase relative to operations. Influent sources during reclamation include excess FTB pond water, water collected by the seepage capture systems, and HRF pond water and drainage. The purpose of treatment during the reclamation phase will be will be to provide a source of clean water to the West Pit as it is flooded. Treatment will be designed to achieve constituent concentrations within the flooded West Pit that will not result in exceedance of appropriate groundwater and surface water standards at appropriate compliance points downstream of the West Pit during long-term closure.

A schematic view of the plan for management and treatment of process water during reclamation is shown on Large Figure 2.

4.2.1.3 Long-term Closure

During long-term closure, the WWTP will continue to treat water collected by the seepage capture systems as well as excess water from the FTP Pond as needed to prevent overflow. The primary purpose of treatment for the WWTP will be to meet the appropriate discharge limits.

A schematic view of the plan for management and treatment of water during long-term closure is shown on Large Figure 3.

The ultimate goal is to transition from the mechanical treatment provided by the WWTP to a non-mechanical treatment system. A potential non-mechanical treatment system for the Plant Site is described in Section 6.4. It is assumed that the WWTP will continue to operate during long-term closure. The transition from mechanical to non-mechanical treatment will occur only after the site-specific design for a non-mechanical system has been proven and approved by the appropriate regulatory agencies.

4.2.2 Preliminary Design Basis

The design of the required treatment processes for the WWTP will be based upon the following factors:

- the quantity and quality of water collected by the seepage capture systems requiring treatment during various phases of the Project
- the quantity and quality of FTB pond water requiring treatment to prevent overflow during the various phases of the Project
- the quantity and quality of HRF pond water as the pond is drained during reclamation

- the results of pilot-testing of the primary and secondary treatment unit operations as described in the Final Pilot-Testing Report (Reference (12))

- the purpose of treatment for each phase of the Project as described in Section 4.2.1

The quantity and quality of the process water that will be delivered to the WWTP will be determined using the version of the Plant Site water quality modeling results (Reference (4)) prepared for NPDES/SDS permitting. The following paragraphs provide a preliminary summary of the expected influent water quantity and quality for the WWTP.

4.2.2.1 Preliminary Process Water Quantities

The estimated water quantities flowing to the WWTP from the seepage capture systems, the FTP Pond, and the HRF during the three phases of the Project are summarized in Table 4-1. The water quantity estimates summarized in Table 4-1 are the annual average of the 90th percentile flow rates from the seepage capture systems from the Plant Site water modeling (Reference (4)).

Table 4-1 Water Flows to the WWTP

Source	90th Percentile Estimated Average Annual Flow (gpm)[1]		
	Operations[2]	Reclamation[3]	Long-Term Closure[4]
Seepage Capture Systems	2970	3370	2020
HRF	0	150	0
FTB Pond	0	0	700

(1) The 90th Percentile flows from each source do not occur in the same year and therefore are not additive.
(2) Estimate based on Reference (4) for Year 15 (Design Year), 90th Percentile.
(3) Estimate based on Reference (4) for Year 25, 90th Percentile.
(4) Estimate based on Reference (4) for Year 60, 90th Percentile.

Actual flow rates from the seepage capture systems will vary throughout the 20-year operating phase of the Project. Generally the flow to the seepage capture systems will increase throughout the Project as the FTB is built up. In addition, significant changes in flow could occur when the two FTP Ponds are combined in Year 8. Treated water will be used in the beneficiation plant, if needed; otherwise the treated water will be discharged. While the flow to the WWTP will gradually trend upward, the volume of water discharged from the Project will vary over time due to seasonal variations as described below.

In addition to long-term variations in flows over the operating life of the Plant Site, the influent flows to the WWTP are anticipated to fluctuate seasonally. The seasonal variation in flow including the spring flood, average summer, and average winter flow rates are summarized in Table 4-2.

Table 4-2 Seasonal Variations in WWTP Flows

Source	Estimated Flow (gpm)[1][2]								
	Operations[3]			Reclamation[4]			Long-Term Closure[5]		
	1-Month Maximum	Average Summer	Average Winter	1-Month Maximum	Average Summer	Average Winter	1-Month Maximum	Average Summer	Average Winter
Seepage Capture Systems	3500	3030	2750	3370	3370	3370	2670	2250	1790
HRF	0	0	0	150	150	150	0	0	0
FTB Pond	0	0	0	0	0	0	1400	1120	260

(1) The 90th Percentile flows from each source do not occur in the same year and therefore are not additive.
(2) For this table summer is May through October; winter November through April.
(3) Estimate based on Reference (4) for Year 15 (Design Year), 90th Percentile.
(4) Estimate based on Reference (4) for Year 25, 90th Percentile.
(5) Estimate based on Reference (4) for Year 60, 90th Percentile.

The maximum flow to the WWTP is expected during reclamation. From this maximum flow rate, the flow to the Containment System is expected to decline as the water stored in the FTB drains out and the pond bottom cover is constructed, decreasing the seepage rate (Section 5.0). The effluent from the WWTP during reclamation will primarily be used to augment West Pit flooding. A small portion of the WWTP effluent may also be used during reclamation to maintain the designed water volume within the FTB Pond.

HRF drainage will also be directed to the WWTP during reclamation. This flow will represent a relatively small volume of water compared to other flows to the WWTP. Capping of the HRF at the end of operations is expected to reduce the flow rate from drainage from an initial value of 150 gpm to virtually 0 gpm by the end of the reclamation phase of the Project.

During long-term closure, it is expected that the flow to the WWTP from the seepage capture systems will be relatively stable.

4.2.2.2 Preliminary Process Water Quality

The average quality of water that reports to the RO unit of the WWTP is expected to vary slowly during the operations, reclamation, and long-term closure phases of the Project (Large Table 9). Estimated influent water quality is based on the quantity and quality of water from the seepage capture systems and the FTB Pond. During reclamation HRF drainage will be blended with the RO concentrate and sent to the VSEP unit.

The initial quality of water that will be captured by the seepage capture systems is known based on the results from ongoing groundwater monitoring activities. The Project will result in changes in the quality of water leaving the toes of the Tailings Basin, but it will take several years for these effects to be observed given the slow travel time for water through the basin. The seepage

water concentration for each constituent will respond uniquely to changes in operation of the FTB during operations and reclamation (Attachment M of Reference (4)). During long-term closure the concentrations of most constituents in the water collected from the seepage capture systems and the FTB Pond will approach a long-term equilibrium value.

4.2.2.3 Preliminary WWTP Unit Process Design

4.2.2.3.1 WWTP Preliminary Water Quality Targets

The preliminary WWTP design is based on both the expected influent quantity and quality and on the desired effluent quality, or Preliminary Water Quality Targets (PWQTs).

Because the WWTP will discharge to tributaries of the Embarrass River during operations, reclamation and long-term closure, discharge limits for the WWTP will be set by the MPCA during permitting.

To provide a preliminary design basis for the WWTP during environmental review, PWQTs were established for the WWTP effluent concentration using potentially applicable water quality standards (Table 4-3). As part of the progression from preliminary to final design, an RO pilot plant test has been conducted (Reference (12)). Effluent concentrations used as inputs to the GoldSim water model are based on the PWQTs, the results of the RO pilot plant test, and the overall Project water management strategy. Large Table 10 shows the potentially applicable water quality standards, the PWQTs selected from those potential standards and the effluent concentrations used as inputs to the GoldSim model.

The RO pilot plant test (Reference (12)) demonstrated that the planned design is capable of achieving all the effluent concentrations used in the GoldSim model and all of the PWQTs.

Table 4-3 WWTP Preliminary Water Quality Targets (PWQTs)

Parameter[(1)]	Operations, Reclamation and Long-Term Closure	Basis
Metals/Inorganics (µg/L, except where noted)		
Aluminum	125	M.R. 7050.0222 Class 2B (chronic standard)
Antimony	31	M.R. 7050.0222 Class 2B (chronic standard)
Arsenic	10	Federal Standard (Primary MCLs)
Barium	2000	MN Groundwater (HRL, HBV, or RAA)
Beryllium	4	Federal Standard (Primary MCLs)
Boron	500	M.R. 7050.0224 Class 4A (chronic standard)
Cadmium[(3)]	2.5	M.R. 7052.0100 Class 2B (chronic standard)
Chromium[(2)]	11	M.R. 7052.0100 Class 2B (chronic standard)

Parameter[1]	Operations, Reclamation and Long-Term Closure	Basis
Cobalt	5	M.R. 7050.0222 Class 2B (chronic standard)
Copper[3]	9.3	M.R. 7052.0100 Class 2B (chronic standard)
Iron	300	Federal Standard (Secondary MCLs)
Lead[3]	3.2	M.R. 7050.0222 Class 2B (chronic standard)
Manganese	50	Federal Standard (Secondary MCLs)
Nickel[3]	52	M.R. 7052.0100 Class 2B (chronic standard)
Selenium	5	M.R. 7052.0100 Class 2B (chronic standard)
Silver	1	M.R. 7050.0222 Class 2B (chronic standard)
Thallium	0.56	M.R. 7050.0222 Class 2B (chronic standard)
Zinc[3]	120	M.R. 7052.0100 Class 2B (chronic standard)
General Parameters (µg/L, except where noted)		
Chloride (mg/L)	230	M.R. 7050.0222 Class 2B (chronic standard)
Fluoride (mg/L)	2	Federal Standard (Primary MCLs)
Hardness(mg/L)	100	M.R. 7052.0100 Class 2B (chronic standard)
Sodium	60% of cations	M.R. 7050.0224 Class 4A (chronic standard)
Sulfate (mg/L)	10	M.R. 7050.0224 Class 4A (chronic standard)

(1) The Process Water Quality Targets parameter list has been updated from RS29T to include only the parameters modeled in GoldSim.
(2) The Chromium (+6) standard of 11 µg/L is used rather than the total Chromium standard to be conservative.
(3) Standard based on hardness.

4.2.2.3.2 Preliminary WWTP Design Overview

During operations, the WWTP process units will be designed to accommodate at least the Summer Average flows presented in Table 4-2 and the influent water quality shown in Large Table 10.

A schematic of the WWTP during operations is shown in Large Figure 1. All of the flow will initially be treated using a single treatment pathway that will include several branches for secondary management of the residuals generated by the primary treatment systems. The preliminary designs for all of the treatment components are described in the following sections.

Several of the proposed treatment processes have been pilot-tested using available water from the tailings basin. The results of these testing activities have been submitted to the MPCA for review (Reference (12)). For the unit operations that were included in the pilot-testing, the sections below provide limited information related to the pilot-test results.

The detailed design of the treatment system components, including the sizing of units to accommodate the desired flow-rates, the chemical addition requirements, potential sludge generation and recycle rates will be developed using the pilot-test results as well as other resources, including:

- additional information from process equipment vendors related to hydraulic and chemical treatment performance
- modeling of the overall WWTP unit operations using an integrated GoldSim and PHREEQC model

Additional design details and modeling results will be provided in the permit review submittal of the Adaptive Water Management Plan. The following paragraphs present a more detailed description of the components of the wastewater treatment systems for the WWTP.

4.2.2.3.3 Collection

During operations, influent to the WWTP will be collected using the FTB Containment System described in Section 2.1 of Reference (2). In reclamation, additional water will be collected from the FTP Pond and the HRF drainage collection system.

4.2.2.3.4 Headworks

All flows into the WWTP will be pumped to the headworks, which will be used to control the flow through to the WWTP.

4.2.2.3.5 Filter Pretreatment

In the event that influent iron and manganese concentrations are greater than those estimated by Reference (4), pretreatment may be necessary ahead of the greensand filters to reduce loading, reduce backwash frequency, and optimize greensand filtration operations. Pretreatment (ahead of the greensand filter) may consist of a clarifier or plate settler to remove iron solids that precipitate automatically when the water is pumped from the Containment System. Allowing for this potential pretreatment option is an example of the adaptive engineering controls available at the WWTP.

4.2.2.3.6 Greensand Filtration

Greensand filtration was evaluated in the pilot- test and will be used as pretreatment to the RO system to remove particulate matter that could irreversibly foul the RO membranes. Pretreatment to remove particulate matter is needed because of anticipated elevated iron and manganese concentrations in the influent.

To reduce the elevated concentrations of dissolved iron and manganese, potassium permanganate will be added to the influent to oxidize iron and manganese so they can be removed by the greensand filtration. After oxidation, both metals will be removed from the influent by media

filtration. The addition potassium permanganate also serves to regenerate the manganese oxide coating on the greensand media, which helps to remove additional manganese by adsorption. Periodically, the filters will be backwashed – based either on head-loss across the filters and/or filter runtime – to restore their filtration capacity. Filter backwash water will be conveyed to the FTP Pond, and the filtrate will proceed on to RO treatment. The greensand filters will be installed as modular pressure filters to provide adaptability.

4.2.2.3.7 Reverse Osmosis (RO) System

RO is a well-established membrane treatment technology for water treatment. Commercial scale RO systems typically use spiral-wound membranes with pore sizes of one nm or less to remove dissolved constituents from water. This technology is employed for desalination, for the production of drinking water from seawater, and for industrial applications such as boiler feed water and water reuse. Under pressures greater than the natural osmotic pressure, water will pass through the membrane pores and the dissolved solids will be retained on the feed side of the membrane (Reference (13)). The retained constituents are contained in a concentrate stream. The performance of a pilot-scale RO system for treating water from the Plant Site was recently evaluated and the results have been reported in the Final Pilot-Testing Report (Reference (12)).

The rejection of constituents by the membranes depends on the membrane materials, membrane pore size, and the overall composition of the water. A variety of membrane types are available in the marketplace from several manufacturers, including membranes for general brackish water treatment or general desalting to more specialized membranes for boron removal or specific industrial applications. Most commonly, the membrane modules from these manufacturers are standardized as 4-inch or 8-inch diameter modules that can be readily be interchanged. The selection of membranes for each phase of the Project is another example of an adaptive engineering control available for the WWTP.

The RO system will have high pressure feed pumps, cartridge filtration on each skid for additional particulate removal, and skid-mounted membrane housings, membrane modules, and chemical feed systems. It will be equipped with a control package that will integrate the RO system with the overall WWTP control system.

Key design parameters for an RO treatment system will be based on the results of pilot-testing, which have been submitted to the MPCA for review. These key design parameters will include membrane type, operating pressures, rejection rate, and cleaning strategies needed to meet the water quality discharge limits for the Project, as determined during NPDES/SDS permitting.

Chemical Pretreatment

Antiscalants will be used for chemical pretreatment of water entering the WWTP RO system to minimize the formation of insoluble salts such as calcium carbonate, barium sulfate, and calcium sulfate or other constituents such as silica that may otherwise accumulate and foul the membrane. Antiscalants are commonly dosed immediately ahead of the RO system and improve the recovery of the membrane system by minimizing the natural tendency for solids accumulation on the membranes, which increases pressures and reduces throughput (capacity).

Antiscalants interfere with crystallization and deposition on the membrane, slow the crystallization process, or otherwise create conditions to maintain solubility of the salts (e.g. by lowering pH). Antiscalants used in the pilot-testing are reported in Reference (12).

Residuals Management

The RO system will generate two main classes of residuals: cleaning waste and RO concentrate.

The RO membranes will need to be cleaned periodically to remove accumulated scale and/or foulants. Cleaning will be accomplished by a clean-in-place (CIP) process in which chemical solutions are circulated through the membrane system. The CIP process will consist of two-steps: an acid clean and a base/alkaline clean. Each step will use chemicals to remove a different class of foulants (e.g. acid to remove metals or carbonates and base to remove silica or biofilm). The CIP waste will be sent to the WWTF for treatment as part of the reject concentrate stream.

RO concentrate management is described in Section 4.2.2.3.9.

4.2.2.3.8 RO Permeate Stabilization

The RO permeate will require stabilization prior to discharge. The RO permeate will have a very low concentration of dissolved solids, an elevated concentration of dissolved carbon dioxide, and a depressed pH. Due to these conditions, the RO permeate, prior to stabilization, is expected to be acidic and corrosive.

PolyMet conducted bench tests of stabilization methods, as part of its RO pilot-testing program (Reference (12)). The goals of the stabilization bench tests were to identify methods and chemicals to adjust pH, restore buffering capacity, reduce corrosiveness, and ultimately to meet the discharge water quality requirements. The results of this work showed that the effluent could be stabilized using either hydrated lime or crushed limestone to achieve dissolved solids concentrations that were within the required discharge limits while also producing a stable (non-corrosive) and non-toxic effluent.

4.2.2.3.9 RO Concentrate Management

RO Concentrate Volume Reduction

The RO concentrate will be further reduced in volume by a secondary membrane system. VSEP, a trade-marked process developed by New Logic Research was the secondary membrane system evaluated during the pilot-testing (Reference (12)). The VSEP system consists of vertical stacks of circular flat sheet RO membranes mounted on a vibrating base. The shear introduced at the membrane surface due to high frequency vibration of the stack reduces fouling and allows higher recoveries than can be achieved with a spiral-wound membrane. The VSEP system has the ability to operate either in continuous flow or batch mode. The VSEP system evaluated in the pilot-test was able to reduce the RO concentrate volume and further concentrate sulfate prior to chemical precipitation at the WWTF. The VSEP system at the WWTP will have hydraulic capacity equal to the design flow rate for the RO concentrate.

The VSEP system shares a number of general similarities with the primary RO system:

- A number of membrane types are available for selection and use in the VSEP system. These membranes are modified flat sheet membranes that are commonly available from the large membrane suppliers such as Dow or Hydranautics.

- The VSEP system will require chemical pretreatment. It is expected that acid and an antiscalant will be used for pretreatment.

- The VSEP membranes will require regular chemical cleaning to maintain their capacity. The cleaning process will likely require at least two chemicals (acid and base, generally).

As with the primary RO system, the VSEP system will be equipped with a high-pressure pump that will pump the water across RO membrane. The RO CIP waste, the VSEP CIP waste and VSEP concentrate (combined stream is the WWTP reject concentrate) will be conveyed to the WWTF for treatment. The VSEP permeate will be blended with the RO permeate for stabilization and discharge.

PolyMet will use the results from the pilot-test of the VSEP technology to determine the values of key design parameters for the system (operating pressure, influent pH, and cleaning frequency) and select a membrane type for the operations phase of the Project.

WWTP Reject Concentrate Disposal

During operations, WWTP Reject Concentrate (VSEP concentrate and the CIP waste solutions) will be conveyed to the WWTF via rail car. At the WWTF, the Reject Concentrate will be directed to the chemical precipitation system for treatment, as described in Section 2.2.2.3.5.

4.2.2.3.10 Site Layout

The WWTP will be located near the FTB. A preliminary location for the WWTP is shown on Large Figure 5. An alternative location is still under consideration at the Area 2 Shops, or elsewhere near the Plant Site. Final location of the facility will be determined during the preliminary design phase of the Project for NPDES/SDS permitting. The location of the WWTP will need to accommodate delivery of treatment chemicals (i.e. lime and carbon dioxide) and will need to have access for trucks removing residual solids and rail-cars loading reject concentrate for delivery to the WWTF.

4.2.2.3.11 Building

The preliminary design for the WWTP building envisions construction using precast concrete panels. The foundations for the WWTP building and the process units will be steel-reinforced-concrete. A back-up power supply sufficient to operate critical WWTP equipment during a power outage will be required. Potable water will not be available at the site but treated process water will be available for chemical feed systems, back-washing and general site housekeeping.

Potable water for hygiene purposes will be delivered to the site. The building will also need to meet all appropriate State and local building codes.

4.2.2.3.12 Discharge Works

During operations, effluent from the WWTP will be discharged from existing permitted outfalls SD-006 and/or SD-026. In addition, treated water from the WWTP may be discharged along the west, north-west, and north perimeter of the FTB – beyond the Containment System – to replenish the flow of groundwater to the surrounding wetlands. This discharge strategy will limit the potential for secondary wetland impacts due to reduced flow from the FTB to the wetlands.

4.2.3 Engineering Control Performance

4.2.3.1 Description with Basis

The overall performance of the treatment system will represent a compilation of the performance of each individual treatment unit. A noted in Section 4.2.2.3, the performance of each individual component will be determined in the permitting level design activities, which will include sizing of units to accommodate the desired flow-rates, defining the chemical addition requirements, and calculating the potential sludge generation and recycle rates. The design calculations that will be used to determine the construction and operating specifics for treatment units will be based upon:

- analytical results from the pilot-testing program to evaluate treatment of the FTB Containment System water – which included evaluation RO and VSEP treatment along with chemical stabilization of the discharge water, and

- additional information from process equipment vendors related to hydraulic and chemical treatment performance

4.2.3.2 Modeling of Engineering Controls

Modeling of the overall performance of the WWTP unit operations will be completed using an integrated GoldSim and PHREEQC model for the WWTP during operations, reclamation, and long-term closure. The modeling will be used to define the specific requirements for each treatment unit that will be needed to achieve the PWQTs as listed in Table 4-3. The integrated GoldSim/PHREEQC modeling results will be included in a subsequent version of this document.

4.2.4 Adaptive Management

To meet the specific treatment targets for each of the Project phases, the operating configuration and the operating requirements of individual process units within the WWTP or the capacity of the WWTP may need to be modified. Thus, the WWTP is considered an adaptive engineering control. The WWTP treatment processes can be adapted, as necessary, in response to the actual conditions encountered during the Project, the monitoring results, and the conditions estimated by continued model updating.

4.2.4.1 Reporting and Model Update

The Project includes a comprehensive water quality and quantity monitoring and reporting program that will be finalized in NPDES/SDS permitting (Section 5 of Reference (2)). The program includes annual comparison of actual monitoring to modeled results for the WWTP. This comparison will be used to refine the model. See Section 6 of Reference (2) for details.

4.2.4.2 Circumstances Triggering Modification

Circumstances that could trigger the need for one or more modifications to the WWTP operating configuration include:

- variation in influent water quantity which could result in the need for more or less treatment system capacity.
- variation of the influent water quality from the modeled water quality which could result in a change in the operating performance of one or more of the treatment processes.

4.2.4.3 Options for Modified Performance

Variations of either influent water quantity or quality can be addressed within the overall concept for the design, construction, and operation of the WWTP. Because the plan for construction of the WWTP envisions a phased build-out of the capacity that will be needed when the maximum flow occurs, variations in quantity can easily be addressed by either accelerating or delaying the installation of the additional equipment that is planned for the expansion of the WWTP. Treatment performance issues that could occur from changes in influent water quality can be addressed by making adjustments to operating conditions.

Other examples of how the WWTP can be adapted during the Project to modify treatment performance include:

- selection of alternative membranes for either the Reverse Osmosis (RO) or the Vibratory Shear Enhanced Processing (VSEP) process units to modify the removal efficiencies of some parameters across these systems
- chemical addition to increase metals removal by the WWTP
- softening pretreatment (Section 4.2.4.3.1)

4.2.4.3.1 Softening Pretreatment

One potential performance issue that has been identified in relation to treatment performance is the potential uncertainty related to influent quality and the potential need to address this with additional pre-treatment. Uncertainty in the influent quality is due to the un-balanced ionic charge that is included in the water quality modeling, due to the assumptions used in the development of the model. Multiple methods are being considered for balancing the charge to

allow for the development of the integrated GoldSim/PHREEQC models used in the design of the WWTP. This is an important issue at the WWTP because RO membranes reject virtually all ions in solution (unlike the nanofiltration membranes at the WWTF). At least one method for balancing this charge could result in model estimates indicating the need to remove excess hardness prior to membrane treatment to protect the RO membranes during operations. Excess hardness can increase precipitation on the membranes, which will result in reduced membrane life and increased operating costs.

Softening pretreatment could be added at the WWTP if operational experience indicates precipitation on the forward side of the membranes is reducing the life of membranes in the reverse osmosis and VSEP components to a level that is not acceptable for the overall operating cost of the treatment systems. The need for pretreatment will be determined during the operations phase of the Project using measured water quality data in combination with operational experience and modeling results.

Softening pretreatment could include adding a chemical reaction, coagulation, and precipitation unit similar to the HDS or sulfate removal units in the chemical precipitation train at the WWTF. Chemical feed systems for the addition of lime and soda ash could also be needed and additional solid wastes will be generated that will need to be filter-pressed and disposed along with the solids from the chemical precipitation treatment train at the WWTF. Potential ripple effects on other environmental aspects of the Project due to the addition of softening pre-treatment could include increased fugitive emissions, increased point source emissions and increased solid waste. Generally, ripple effects from this adaptive management strategy will be small compared to current impacts and could be effectively mitigated.

4.2.5 Reclamation and Long-Term Closure

4.2.5.1 Reclamation

All of the unit operations described in Section 4.2.2.3 for operations will also be used during reclamation, with the exception of the discharge works. During reclamation treated water will be pumped to the Mine Site, to speed flooding of the West Pit, by reversing the direction of flow in the Treated Water Pipeline that will deliver treated Mine Site process water to the FTP Pond during operations. A small portion of treated water may also be used to maintain the designed water volume within the FTB Pond.

4.2.5.2 Long-term Closure

During long-term closure, all of the unit operations described in Section 4.2.2.3 for operations will also be used, with the exception of the reject concentrate management system. During long-term closure, the reject concentrate will be thermally treated with the use of an evaporation/crystallization unit. The distillate from the evaporation/crystallization unit will be blended with the RO permeate and VSEP permeate for discharge while the residual solids generated from thermal treatment will be transported offsite for disposal.

4.2.5.2.1 Financial Assurance

The cost for implementation of the WWTP including annual operating and maintenance will be included in the Contingency Reclamation Estimate that will be the basis for financial assurance. The estimate will be updated annually based on the liability at the end of the following year. See Section 7.4 of Reference (2) for details.

5.0 Flotation Tailings Basin (FTB) Pond Bottom Cover System

5.1 Project Feature

The reclamation plan for the FTB includes bentonite amendment to the upper layer of Flotation Tailings below the FTP Pond. The FTB Pond Bottom Cover System has been designed to maintain a permanent pond that will act as an oxygen barrier, reducing oxidation of the Flotation Tailings and resultant products of oxidation. It will also reduce seepage through the Flotation Tailings, thereby reducing the amount of flow to be collected via the FTB Containment System and treated at the WWTP. When the FTB hydrology stabilizes, following installation of the pond bottom cover, it is likely that the FTB Pond will be perched. New FTB dam exterior slopes and Flotation Tailings beaches will also be amended with bentonite to reduce the oxygen diffusion and precipitation percolation into the tailings (Section 7.2 of Reference (7)).

5.2 Planned Engineering Control

5.2.1 Purpose

The purpose of the FTB Pond Cover System is to reduce the percolation from the FTP Pond, thereby maintaining a permanent pond that will provide an oxygen barrier above the Flotation Tailings to reduce oxidation and resultant production of chemical constituents. It will also reduce the amount of water collected by the FTB Containment System.

5.2.2 Design

The FTB final reclamation plan includes bentonite amendment of the FTP Pond bottom to reduce percolation. The FTB final reclamation system will be designed and constructed in accordance with applicable requirements of Minnesota Rules, part 6132.2500, subpart 2. The proposed method of adding bentonite to the pond bottom is by broadcasting (Figure 5-1). Bentonite injection, or placement of a geosynthetic clay liner, are alternate methods. With broadcasting, granular or pelletized bentonite will be systematically fed through a broadcast spreader system to uniformly distribute the bentonite across the area of the pond (Figure 5-1). Typical global positioning system (GPS) survey and path tracking equipment will be utilized to track and confirm uniform spreading of the bentonite. The bentonite will subsequently settle to the pond bottom where it will hydrate, swell and due to its inherently low hydraulic conductivity, reduce percolation from the pond bottom.

An alternate to the proposed broadcasting method is to inject bentonite into the pond bottom, then mix the Flotation Tailings at the pond bottom with the injected bentonite. This is shown schematically on Figure 5-2, and is similar to the method used in agriculture to inject manure and fertilizers below the ground surface, but with the addition of a mixing apparatus just behind the point of injection.



Figure 5-1 Bentonite Broadcasting



Figure 5-2 Bentonite Injection

A second alternative to the proposed broadcasting method is placement of a geosynthetic clay liner (GCL) on the pond bottom. This is shown schematically on Figure 5-3, and is similar to the method used on some sediment remediation sites where sediment in bays or rivers is covered in place.



Figure 5-3 Geosynthetic Clay Liner

The application rate (most likely in pounds per acre) will be determined at the time of implementation on the basis of the percolation rate that must be achieved. A field testing and demonstration program will be conducted to evaluate the efficacy of the proposed method and to select a method that is effective, efficient, and economical. By this test method the hydraulic conductivity of the bentonite amended Flotation Tailings can first be estimated in the laboratory and the necessary bentonite application rates can then be confirmed in the field. The combined hydraulic conductivity and bentonite layer thickness will be specified to achieve performance requirements. A systematic construction method will be used to achieve a uniform rate and distribution of bentonite application as dictated by pre-application laboratory test results.

As part of initial FTP Pond reclamation work, the selected construction contractor will be required to demonstrate that the means and methods selected for bentonite application to the pond bottom will yield the desired uniformity of bentonite application to result in a completed reclamation pond bottom having the specified mean hydraulic conductivity. The contractor will also be required to demonstrate that the bentonite application can be accomplished without exceeding air quality permit requirements for fugitive dust emissions.

It is important to note that the required percolation rate is a mean percolation rate; not a maximum percolation rate. Therefore, there can and will be portions of the pond bottom where percolation rates greater than the mean exist due to the less than perfectly uniform application of

bentonite. There will be other portions of the pond bottom where percolation rates lower than the mean result from placement of an excess amount of bentonite.

During bentonite amendment of the FTB beaches (described in Section 7.2 of Reference (7)) and pond bottom, pond water level will be managed to facilitate construction of an overlap zone; a zone where the bentonite amendment of the pond bottom overlaps the bentonite amendment of the FTB beaches. This will create the required continuity in the overall bentonite amended Flotation Tailings system. Rip-rap will be placed along the edge of the pond, in the zone subject to wave action and the associated potential for erosion. The riprap will be hauled in by truck and spread by dozer in the winter, when the FTB surface and pond is frozen. The riprap will settle into place as the ice thaws in the spring. Riprap rock types, size and gradation will be specified on the basis of pond fetch and wave run-up computations completed just prior to the time that riprap placement is required.

5.2.3 Degree of Use in Industry

Bentonite is a highly plastic (can be deformed without cracking), swelling (volume increases with increasing moisture content), naturally occurring clay (usually forms from weathering of volcanic ash) consisting mostly of the clay mineral montmorillonite. Montmorillonite swells appreciably when it absorbs water if the predominant cation on the clay surface is monovalent (commonly sodium). Chemically, montmorillonite is a hydrated sodium calcium aluminum magnesium silicate hydroxide (Na,Ca)0.33(Al,Mg)2(Si4O10)(OH)2•nH2O. Potassium, iron, and other cations commonly substitute isomorphically within the crystal structure; the exact ratio of cations varies with source.

Bentonite has been used for many geotechnical, hydrogeological, and petroleum applications for more than a century. Bentonite is used in the geotechnical exploration and oil drilling industry as a component of drilling mud. Bentonite is also used as a soil additive to hold soil water in drought prone soils, in the construction of earthen dams and levees to prevent the seepage of fluids, as an additive to water to create liquid slurry for groundwater flow cutoff walls, (a.k.a. slurry walls) and to facilitate construction within excavations below groundwater elevations. Bentonite is also used as the primary hydraulic barrier in geosynthetic clay liners (GCLs, which are factory-manufactured clay liners) and as a soil admixture to produce hydraulic barriers for pond liners, earthen dams, and liners and covers for waste Containment Systems.

Bentonite amended soil cover systems have been used for many years in a wide variety of applications including closure of municipal and industrial solid waste disposal facilities, mine tailings facilities and for related components such as for groundwater flow cutoff walls and as hydraulic barriers in earthen dams.

Use of bentonite amended soils is typically dictated by the lack of other suitable nearby construction materials such as a high quality local clay source, by limitations in construction season and time available for placement of other natural soil types, and by the need for a hydraulic barrier of lower hydraulic conductivity than might be available from other clay sources.

CETCO (a manufacturer and distributor of powdered and granulated bentonite and manufactured geosynthetic clay liners world-wide) is one of several companies with a long history of providing bentonite-based products and associated research and specifications for use by design engineers, facility owners and construction contractors involved in the design and construction of bentonite-amended soils for hydraulic barriers and other applications. Wyo-Ben is another manufacturer and worldwide distributer of bentonite products used in the construction industry for projects such as bentonite amended cover systems.

5.3 Engineering Control Performance Parameters

5.3.1 Description with Basis

The performance parameter for the bentonite amended Flotation Tailings is hydraulic conductivity (a.k.a. permeability). The hydraulic conductivity and the layer thickness of bentonite amendment and the overlying hydraulic head are the basis for computing flow through the bentonite amended layer. Flow through the layer is expressed by Darcy's Law as:

$$Q=KiA, \text{ where } i = \Delta h/L \qquad \textbf{Equation 5-1}$$

where:

Q = the rate of flow in units of volume per time such as gallons per day
K = the measured hydraulic conductivity of the bentonite amended layer; in units of length per time such as centimeters per second
i = the hydraulic head driving flow through the bentonite amended layer, computed as $\Delta h/L$ (unitless)
Δh = the hydraulic head above the bentonite amended layer (soil suction below the amended layer is assumed to be negligible relative to hydraulic head above the amended layer)
L = the saturated thickness of bentonite amended layer
A = the area over which flow is being computed

The desired limitations on flow will be achieved by specifying and constructing the desired bentonite amended layer and by controlling the hydraulic head above the bentonite amended layer. Hydraulic head will be controlled primarily by permitted discharge of any excess water via the WWTP, with occasional discharge via the emergency overflow channel for the FTB in cases where precipitation from extreme storm events, which occur rarely over the course of any given year, cannot be immediately accommodated by the WWTP.

5.3.2 Maintenance Program

The planned FTB Pond Bottom Cover System requires very little maintenance to remain effective. Along the pond perimeter where wave action and freeze-thaw cycles occur, the bentonite layer will require protection from wave erosion and some confinement to resist freeze-thaw impacts. This protective layer will require periodic inspection early in the life of the reclaimed pond to confirm that the selected erosion control and freeze-thaw protection method

(typically well graded rip rap) is effective and to repair and upgrade riprap in any areas showing signs of erosion and/or freeze-thaw impacts.

5.3.3 Modeling of Engineering Controls

The FTB Pond Bottom Cover System is modeled in the water quality model with a mean percolation rate of 6.5 in/yr (percolation rate from the Tailings Basin MODFLOW model, Section 6 of Reference (4)). The three-dimensional flow model previously established for computing seepage rate from the entire FTB will continue to be used to model performance of the bentonite-amended pond bottom. This model relies on Darcy's Law (Equation 5-1) for computation of seepage using defined as-built conditions (hydraulic conductivity, layer thickness, hydraulic head) in discrete areas of the FTB. Seepage from the discrete areas is aggregated by the model to obtain the total seepage rate from the FTB.

For illustration of the seepage calculation, consider the modified version of Darcy's Law (shown in Equation 5-2) normalized to a unit area [A], where q is the flow through a unit area.

$$\frac{Q}{A} = q = K\frac{\Delta h}{L}$$ **Equation 5-2**

Using this equation, if the average pond depth is 5.0 feet [Δh] and the average bentonite amended layer thickness is 0.2 feet [L], the average hydraulic conductivity of the bentonite amended layer [K] required to achieve a mean percolation rate of 6.5 inches/year [q] can be calculate as follows:

$$6.5\frac{in}{yr} = K\frac{5.0ft}{0.2ft}$$ **Equation 5-3**

Solving for K, the average hydraulic conductivity required will be 0.26 inches/year or 2.1 x 10^{-8} cm/sec. For comparison, GSE, Inc. (www.gseworld.com) and CETCO (www.cetco.com) produce geosynthetic clay liners that are roughly one-quarter inch in thickness and have a manufactured maximum hydraulic conductivity of 5.0 x 10-9 cm/sec under 2.2 feet of hydraulic head.

5.3.4 Impact on Transition to Non-Mechanical Treatment

The WWTP is the engineering control that provides compliance with water resource objectives. The FTB Pond Bottom Cover System has no direct impact on compliance because its function is to reduce the volume of water that must be treated by the WWTP.

However, the performance of the FTB Pond Bottom Cover System will impact the likelihood of achieving long-term non-mechanical treatment (Section 6.4). The pond bottom cover reduces both constituent loading and flow to the toes of the Tailings Basin. A change in the amount of water that needs to be treated results in a change in the required size of the non-mechanical treatment system. Figure 5-4 shows the relationship between the amount of percolation from the

FTP Pond and the required volume of the non-mechanical treatment system, assuming a 5-day residence time. At the end of operations, the average percolation rate from the FTP Pond with no cover is approximately 25 inches/year (this seepage rate reflects conditions during operations when additional water is added to the pond). With this seepage rate, the non-mechanical treatment system will need a volume of approximately 45,000 cubic yards. The design percolation rate of 6.5 in/yr will require a 20,000 cubic yard system.



Figure 5-4 Relationship between FTB Pond percolation and required size of non-mechanical treatment

5.4 Adaptive Management

5.4.1 Test Projects

A field demonstration project will be conducted in conjunction with construction of the bentonite layer to confirm that the construction methodology will achieve the required reduction in percolation. This demonstration project will be developed based on the state of practice existing when the pond bottom cover system is to be implemented. Prior to implementation of the demonstration project, a demonstration project plan will be submitted to the MDNR for review and approval. In addition to providing a description of the demonstration project approach, the plan will include criteria and methods for evaluating demonstration project outcomes.

5.4.2 Reporting and Model Update

The Project includes a comprehensive water quality and quantity monitoring and reporting program that will be finalized in NPDES/SDS permitting. The program includes performance monitoring for the FTB Containment System and the South Seepage Management System (quantity and quality of the water collected by the seepage capture systems), which will provide an indication of cover system performance. See Section 5 of Reference (7)) for details. The program includes annual comparison of actual monitoring to modeled results for the water collected by the seepage capture systems, the tributaries and PM-13. This comparison will be used to refine the model. See Section 6 of Reference (2) for details.

5.4.3 Modified Design

If the monitored quantity or quality of water collected by the seepage capture systems, or annual updates to the model indicate that modifications are needed to meet water resource objectives, modifications could be made to the pond bottom cover system, the FTB Containment System, or the WWTP. This section describes potential adaptive management actions for the FTB Pond Bottom Cover System. Potential adaptive management actions for the FTB Containment System are described in Section 2.1.3.2 of Reference (6), and potential adaptive management aspects of the WWTP are described in Section 4.2.4.2. Additional potential adaptive management actions for water quality at the Plant Site are described in Sections 6.5 and 6.6 of Reference (2).

The pond bottom cover design can be modified up to the point of installation. The current version of this document will determine the design to be implemented. After installation, post installation adjustments can be made.

5.4.3.1 Circumstances Triggering Modification

Circumstances that could trigger a request for design modification approval include:

- Development of new construction materials or techniques that would achieve the required limits on percolation
- Confirmation by field monitoring that the actual percolation rate differs from that planned. Actual percolation could differ from plan for various reasons:
    - average pond depth differs from plan, and/or
    - actual performance of the bentonite amendment differs from plan
- Demonstration by actual field monitoring of the Project and model updating that the required limits on percolation have changed and that a modified design can achieve that performance. The required amount could change for various reasons:
    - modeled performance of other adaptive engineering controls (FTB Containment System or WWTP) could change, and/or

- modeled constituent load from FTB could change.

5.4.3.2 Options for Modified Performance

Prior to installation, the design of the pond bottom cover system can be adjusted to modify performance if approved by MPCA and MDNR. Options include:

- increased or decreased thickness of the bentonite amendment (decreases/increases flow [Q] by decreasing/increasing hydraulic conductivity [K] in Equation 5-1), and/or
- increased percent of bentonite (decreases Q by decreasing K in Equation 5-1), and/or
- combination of increased/decreased thickness and increased/decreased percent bentonite

After installation, the design of the installed pond bottom cover system can be adjusted to modify performance if approved by MPCA and MDNR. Modified performance after installation can be achieved by the same methods listed for initial installation, and/or:

- the bentonite amended layer could be excavated from portions of the pond bottom

5.5 Reclamation and Long-Term Closure

The FTB Pond Bottom Cover System will be implemented during reclamation and will be required to function until constituents have been depleted from the portion of the FTB that is subject to oxidation, and/or the release rates of constituents from the FTB have decreased to the point where water resource objectives can be achieved without the cover system. The 200 year model does not show that the sulfur in the tailings has been depleted or that constituent release rates have decreased.

The bentonite, as a naturally occurring by-product of volcanic activity, is expected to perform its intended function for a very long time in this subaqueous application. The performance of the bentonite can be expected to be supplemented by the build-up of organic matter on the pond bottom that will occur over time. As noted in Section 5.3.2, some inspection and possibly some maintenance will be required to establish a pond bottom cover system that will achieve the required long-term performance.

5.5.1 Financial Assurance

The cost for implementation of the pond bottom cover system, including periodic maintenance, will be included in the Contingency Reclamation Estimate that will be the basis for financial assurance. The estimate will be updated annually based on the liability at the end of the following year. See Section 7.4 of Reference (7) for details.

6.0 Non-Mechanical Treatment Systems

6.1 Overview

6.1.1 Purpose

The purpose of the Non-Mechanical Treatment Systems is to replace mechanical water treatment at the WWTF and the WWTP with low-maintenance, low-energy non-mechanical treatment systems during the long-term closure phase of the Project. Non-mechanical treatment systems will be designed and tested to treat water from the Category 1 Stockpile Groundwater Containment System, the West Pit Overflow, the FTB Containment System and the FTB South Seepage Management System.

6.1.2 Conceptual Design

The non-mechanical treatment systems are expected to include constructed wetlands or Permeable Reactive Barriers (PRBs) to remove sulfate, trace metals, and other dissolved or suspended constituents from water. Constructed wetlands and PRBs are flow-through treatment systems containing a porous medium (or multiple porous media) that remove constituent mass through physical, chemical, and/or biological treatment processes. The mechanisms of treatment for constructed wetlands and PRBs are described further in Section 6.1.3.1.

Non-mechanical treatment systems for the West Pit Overflow and the seepage capture systems will also use Permeable Sorptive Barriers (PSBs) to provide a contingency system for additional metals removal downstream of the constructed wetlands, if needed. The fundamental operation of a PSB is described in Section 6.1.3.2.

6.1.2.1 Permeable Reactive Barriers

A PRB is a flow-through treatment system containing a porous medium (or multiple porous media) that removes constituent mass through physical, chemical, and/or biological treatment processes. The water to be treated in a PRB can be directed either horizontally or vertically, and vertical flows may be directed either upward or downward, depending on the treatment requirements. The portion of the PRB that treats the water is the treatment unit. Within the treatment unit, native soils will be supplemented with: 1) materials to induce the chemical and/or biological conditions desired for constituent mass removal, such as solid or liquid phase organic substrate, nutrients, or chemical amendments; and 2) coarse materials (sand and gravel) to promote even distribution of the flow within the treatment unit.

The basic design factors for PRBs include:

- Sufficient hydraulic retention time in the treatment unit to achieve required treatment. Hydraulic retention time on the order of 5 days is typically required in colder climates (Reference (45)).

- A hydraulic design that provides an even distribution of flow through the treatment unit. This is typically accomplished by using gravel media and drain tile to evenly distribute the flow into and out of the treatment unit (Reference (46)) and incorporating coarse materials into the treatment unit.

- A drain field or other access points to allow the replacement/replenishment of organic substrate and any supplemental material in the treatment unit, if necessary.

Additional basic PRB design guidance is available from numerous sources, including the Interstate Technology and Regulatory Council (Reference (47)).

6.1.2.2 Constructed Wetlands

A constructed wetland is a flow-through treatment system that removes constituent mass through physical, chemical, and/or biological treatment processes. This is similar to a PRB, but the constructed wetland also includes actively growing wetland vegetation to further support microbial communities and to facilitate other biologically based chemical transformations. The water to be treated in a constructed wetland may be directed either horizontally or vertically, and vertical flows may be directed either upward or downward, depending on the treatment requirements. The portion of the constructed wetland that treats the water is the treatment unit. Within the treatment unit, native soils and wetland plant communities may be supplemented with: 1) materials such as slowly degradable organic matter to promote biological activity, and 2) coarse materials (sand and gravel) to promote even distribution of the flow within the treatment unit.

The basic design factors for a constructed wetland include:

- Sufficient hydraulic retention time in the treatment unit to achieve required treatment. Hydraulic retention time on the order of 2 to 5 days may be required in colder climates (Reference (45)).

- A hydraulic design that provides an even distribution of flow through the treatment unit. This is typically accomplished by using gravel media and drain tile to evenly distribute the flow into the treatment unit (Reference (46)), by installing control structures to manage the flow of surface water away from the top of the treatment unit, and by adding some coarse materials within the treatment unit.

To provide the proper hydraulic configuration, constructed wetland design includes water delivery and collection systems above and below the treatment unit to distribute flow evenly. The sub-surface delivery system typically consists of a gravel filled layer with distribution piping. The surface water management system is designed to promote the free flow of water onto or off the top of the treatment unit while maintaining saturated conditions in the treatment unit. Additional basic constructed wetland design guidance is available from numerous sources, including the USEPA (Reference (48) and Reference (49)).

6.1.2.3 Permeable Sorptive Barriers (PSB)

A PSB is a treatment unit containing a solid-phase media with an affinity for sorption of metals. Because they are chemical/physical removal mechanisms, PSBs have a finite capacity, however, that capacity can provide significant duration of treatment if sized properly. The purpose of the PSB is to provide a contingency system that will be in place if needed. The PSB media will be placed at the downgradient end of the constructed wetland or PRB so that water can flow by gravity through the sorptive media.

Generally, an empty bed (the volume of the media is not typically considered in the design of sorption systems) contact time of greater than 30 minutes is adequate for sorption systems.

6.1.3 Basis of Treatment

6.1.3.1 Permeable Reactive Barriers (PRBs) and Constructed Wetlands

PRBs and constructed wetlands rely on the same combination of processes acting in concert to facilitate the removal of sulfate, trace metals and other dissolved or suspended constituents from water including:

- biochemical reduction of sulfate to sulfide using sulfate reducing bacteria (SRB).
- sorption to solid phase surfaces such as iron oxides or organic matter.
- chemical precipitation to convert dissolved phase constituents to solid phase particles.
- physical filtering of solid phase particles.

Within PRBs and constructed wetlands, sulfate can be reduced to sulfide by SRB (Reference (50)). This process occurs in anaerobic environments and has the benefit of precipitating dissolved metals as insoluble metal sulfides. The reduction of sulfate is enhanced in situ by the addition of a degradable organic substrate (Reference (51)). The organic substrate maintains biologic activity. Supplemental materials can also be added including nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorous) and zero-valent iron (ZVI). The ZVI promotes abiotic chemical reduction, providing conditions favorable for SRB (Reference (52)). The ZVI also provides dissolved iron to the solution that helps to precipitate any excess sulfide generated during the process.

Effective biological sulfate reduction in PRBs and constructed wetlands requires an organic substrate and a matched microbial community that will maintain anoxic conditions. The submerged sediments of most natural wetlands in Minnesota contain all of the components necessary to promote sulfate reduction and metal precipitation; however, they may not have the appropriate hydraulic configuration to provide the needed hydraulic retention times and the even flow distribution.

Sorption of trace metals on to solid phases has been studied extensively. For example, the USEPA recently published a literature review of sorption coefficients for dissolved chemicals to soil, sediment and other solid phases (Reference (53)). Historical work on the sorption of trace metals onto peat was also reported by the MDNR (Reference (54)), among others.

Chemical precipitation of metal sulfides is a well-established process that is considered to occur instantaneously when metal cations and sulfide anions are both present in solution (Reference (55)). A recent review of metal sulfide precipitation (Reference (56)) summarizes the significant elements of the body of knowledge associated with metal sulfide precipitation. It also provides additional support for the fundamental processes involved in the removal of trace metals from water within PRBs and constructed wetlands that rely on SRB. For example, a laboratory study performed by Lindsay, et al. (Reference (57)), reported removal efficiencies of greater than 99.9%for cobalt, nickel and zinc, primarily due to the formation of metal sulfides. Lower removal efficiencies could occur when influent concentrations are lower or when inadequate retention time is provided for the biological generation of sulfide (Reference (51)).

The final treatment mechanism observed in PRBs and constructed wetlands is physical filtering of particulates. This process has been reported in both natural and constructed wetlands for many years (Reference (58)). Physical removal mechanisms rely on very slow water velocities over a large cross-sectional area which allows for laminar flow and intimate contact between the water phase and solid surfaces within the wetland matrix.

6.1.3.2 Permeable Sorptive Barrier (PSB)

Copper and many other metals in solution preferentially sorb onto various solid phase media. Sorption of metals onto solid surfaces has been well-documented in a literature review of numerous sorption tests completed by the USEPA (Reference (53)). In addition, site-specific testing with unconsolidated soil from the Mine Site demonstrated that copper sorption was likely near the high end of the reported range for soils (Reference (59)). The basis for the higher than average sorption capacity for copper in site soils may be due to the above average iron content or to other factors that were not evaluated. Given these results, a sorptive barrier for the reduction of copper concentrations in solution is a viable method of achieving the water resource objectives.

Sorption is a finite process for a defined volume of solids. While site soils will provide an excellent sorptive material, other media specifically designed for metal sorption are available, if necessary. One such material, which is produced from peat in Minnesota, is APTsorb. This material is manufactured by American Peat Technology, Inc. of Aitkin, MN has been demonstrated to sorb copper and cobalt in studies by the MDNR using mining influenced water from the Soudan Mine State Park (Reference (60)).

6.1.4 Degree of Use in Industry

6.1.4.1 PRBs

The development and use of PRBs to treat groundwater was initiated in the 1990s (Reference (47)). Recently, PRBs have been applied extensively at sites with groundwater impacts. This has resulted in refinement of the techniques needed to design PRB systems to achieve required site-specific performance. PRB technology was developed as a method to enhance natural processes that contribute to the transformation/degradation of organic compounds or the transformation of dissolved inorganic constituents into insoluble products (Reference (47)). Most PRB systems have been installed below ground for the treatment of groundwater, which facilitates year-round operation and relatively stable operating temperatures. Over 200 full-scale PRBs have been installed to treat groundwater at a variety of sites, and a recent guidance document on PRB systems provides 13 specific case histories of PRB implementation (Reference (47)). The development of PRBs specific to mine water drainage originated in the 1990s (Reference (51)) building on earlier work on non-mechanical treatment of acid mine drainage in a variety of configurations that all have similar operating characteristics (Reference (61)).

Of particular interest to the Project is a treatment system that was installed in northern Quebec at the Cadillac Molybdenum Mining site and was operated successfully through winter conditions as reported by Kuyucak, et al. (Reference (62)). In this system, a solid-phase organic medium was used to generate favorable conditions for SRB. The following concentration reductions (calculated from influent and effluent values in Table 2 of Reference (62)) were reported for this full-scale system:

- the treatment system reduced copper concentrations from 300 µg/L to an average effluent concentration of 8 µg/L, which is a removal efficiency of 97%
- the treatment system reduced nickel concentrations from 0.6 mg/L to an average effluent concentration of 0.01 mg/L, which is a removal efficiency of 98%
- the treatment system reduced zinc concentrations from 1.35 mg/L to an average effluent concentration of 0.012 mg/L, which is a removal efficiency of 99%
- the treatment system reduced sulfate concentrations from 887 mg/L to an average effluent concentration of 360 mg/L, which is a removal efficiency of 59%

This successful operation of a PRB at an industrial site where the climate and the constituents of concern are similar to the Project site demonstrates that a PRB has the potential to significantly reduce the load of metals and sulfate in the water collected during long-term closure at the Mine Site and Plant Site.

6.1.4.2 Constructed Wetlands

The ability of wetlands and other flow-through systems to improve water quality has been studied and documented for many years (Reference (58); Reference (48); Reference (49)). Numerous guidance documents for the development of constructed wetlands have been published by both State and Federal governments (Reference (63); Reference (64); Reference (61); Reference (49)).

Data from analog sites on potential performance of a non-mechanical system for the removal of copper, cobalt, nickel, lead, boron and sulfate is presented below.

- Copper: A constructed wetland treatment system at the Savannah River Site was designed specifically to remove copper by the formation of a solid-phase copper-sulfide precipitate that would remain sequestered within the wetland sediments (Reference (65)). The constructed wetland covers 8.8 acres (including perimeter access areas and multiple locations for hydraulic control) and was designed to treat flows ranging from 0.25 to 2.6 MGD (170 to 1,740 gpm), with an average flow of approximately 1 MGD (690 gpm). The system was installed in 2000 and has been monitored since the spring of 2001. During the first year of performance monitoring (March 2001 to April 2002) influent copper concentrations ranged from 10 to 47 µg/L and effluent concentrations ranged from 3 to 11 µg/L with an average effluent copper concentration of 6 µg/L (Section 3 and Figure 4 of Reference (65)). Additional monitoring of the system through 2005 showed that the system performance continued with minimal maintenance (Reference (66)). The performance of this full-scale system provides a realistic analog for removal of dissolved metals, particularly copper, to a consistent effluent value. The constructed wetland at the Savannah River Site is designed to allow the growth of plants to provide all of the substrate necessary to support microbial activity by SRB and, ultimately, to sequester copper as copper sulfides, subaqueously, within the wetland soil matrix.

- Cobalt: Cobalt was monitored in the performance of a full-scale constructed wetland treatment system for the treatment of leachate from a coal ash landfill (Reference (67)). This work demonstrated that cobalt was effectively removed from an influent concentration of approximately 5 to 20 µg/L to effluent concentrations consistently less than 2 µg/L in the second year of operation (Figure 3 of Reference (67)).

- Nickel: Nickel was present at high concentrations in the leachate from a nickel sulfide tailings operation in Norway and was effectively removed using a constructed wetland treatment system (Reference (68)). Although this treatment system only had an 8.5 hour hydraulic retention time and was treating water with influent nickel concentrations ranging from 1.75 to 5.61 mg/L, effluent concentrations below the detection limit of 10 µg/L were achieved once consistent anaerobic conditions were established (Table 1 of Reference (68)). Removal of nickel in this system occurred within the anaerobic section of a multi-cell system and was most effective in the summer months.

- Lead: Removal of lead from wastewater to low concentrations has been reported in a constructed wetland treatment system by Hawkins, et al. (Reference (69)). This constructed wetland system, which treated refinery wastewater, reported removal of lead from an average influent concentration of 10.5 µg/L to an average effluent concentration of 2.2 µg/L (Table 5 of Reference (69)).

- Boron: Boron exists in the environment as a weak acid. The primary attenuation mechanism for boron is adsorption. Sartaj (Reference (70)) demonstrated that the adsorption of boron is negatively impacted by lower pH. Adsorption is optimal at a pH of approximately 9 and drops off by 70% as pH is reduced to 7.5. This is likely related to the weak acid characteristics of the borate acid. The pKa of boric acid is 9.24. Thus, at lower pH most of the boric acid will be protonated and less strongly adsorbed. However, the degree of adsorption also depends on the strength of the adsorption bond. However, Sartaj (Reference (70)) demonstrated that peat can effectively remove boron from landfill leachate that has near neutral pH. In a two year field demonstration at the Huneault Waste Management landfill near Ottawa, Canada, a 1.4 meter (4.6 feet) thick bed of peat removed boron from the leachate, with influent concentrations averaging 14 mg/l boron, and the effluent averaging 1.1mg/l. The pH of the influent pond and in the peat ranged from 6.5 to 7.6. This pH range is consistent with the expected conditions. Sartaj (Reference (70)) also demonstrated that temperature impacts the adsorption of boron, with slightly higher sorption at lower temperatures.

- Sulfate: As noted in Section 6.1.3.1, sulfate is reduced in the subsurface to sulfide by SRB (Reference (50)). The rate of this reaction is dependent on many factors including influent concentration, temperature, pH, organic carbon availability, and redox potential within the treatment system. Long-term concentration reductions of approximately 50 mg/L per day of retention time have been reported in the literature and observed in site-specific bench testing of sulfate removal processes from tailings basin groundwater (Reference (71)). Additional testing of sulfate removal will be completed as part of the development plan described in the following section.

6.1.4.3 PSBs

The use of sorptive media is a demonstrated technique to address water quality and reduce concentrations of dissolved copper, cobalt, and other metals. The sorptive capacity of APTsorb for metals, particularly copper and cobalt, has been demonstrated in field testing conducted in cooperation with the MDNR at the former Soudan Underground Mine, which is now the Soudan Mine State Park (Reference (60)). Copper concentrations were decreased by 90% from an average influent concentration of 80 µg/L to an effluent copper concentration of generally less than 8 µg/L. Similarly, cobalt influent concentrations of approximately 6 to 20 µg/L were consistently decreased to below 5 µg/L.

6.1.5 Adaptive Management

The Non-mechanical treatment systems are adaptive engineering controls because they will be designed and operated based on site-specific conditions using the knowledge that is gained during the operating and reclamation phases of the Project. The specific adaptive management approach for each non-mechanical system is outlined in the development plans (Sections 6.2.3, 6.3.3, and 6.4.3).

6.2 Category 1 Stockpile Non-Mechanical Treatment System

6.2.1 Purpose

The purpose of the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Non-Mechanical Treatment System is to replace mechanical treatment of the water collected by the Containment System with a low-maintenance, low-energy non-mechanical treatment system during the long-term closure phase of the Project.

6.2.2 Conceptual Design

The Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Non-Mechanical Treatment System is expected to include two permeable reactive barriers (PRBs) for metal precipitation and solids removal.

For the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Non-Mechanical Treatment System, the modeled mean flow is approximately 4 gpm, based on modeling of the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile geomembrane cover discussed in Section 3.3.3. Using the design flow rate of 4 gpm, a design hydraulic retention time of 5 days, and an effective porosity of 30%, the required volume of a treatment unit can be calculated using Equation 6-1:

$$\text{Volume} = \frac{4\ gal}{min} \times 5\ day\ \times \frac{1{,}440\ min}{day} \times \frac{1\ ft^3}{7.48\ gal}\ x\ \frac{1}{0.3} \qquad \textbf{Equation 6-1}$$

The design volume is 12,800 cubic feet. Assuming a minimum working treatment depth of three feet results in a 0.1 acre treatment unit or two 0.05 acre treatment units. Potential locations for PRBs are shown on Figure 6-1. These locations could vary, depending on the final hydraulic plan for discharge from the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Groundwater Containment System into the West Pit. Using a PRB at each of these locations could take advantage of gravity flow.

Figure 6-1 Conceptual Plan View: Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Non-Mechanical Treatment System

6.2.3 Development Plan

The performance of a PRB system will depend on site-specific conditions and the actual water being treated. The site-specific design of a PRB system for the water collected by the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Groundwater Containment System must be pilot-tested to prove its performance before one or more PRBs could be installed and operated to replace mechanical treatment. A pilot-scale PRB will be designed, installed and monitored after the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Groundwater Containment System has been completed and the water quality of the seepage is comparable to that expected during long-term closure. Based on current modeling, water quality is estimated to stabilize at levels comparable to the long-term water quality that could be directed to the PRB system after approximately Mine Year 22, when the stockpile is completely reclaimed (several more years may be needed in order for previously-accumulated water within the stockpile and the surficial deposit to completely reach the Containment System). Monitoring of the actual seepage quality during operations will be used to evaluate when the PRB testing could be initiated.

The pilot-scale non-mechanical treatment system will be constructed at the Mine Site and use a slip stream of the water from the Containment System as inflow. It is anticipated that several years of pilot-testing will be required to obtain the data needed to understand the effects of seasonal variations in temperature and other factors on the performance of the PRB. After the pilot-testing has been completed and the results of the work have been accepted by the MDNR and MPCA, the design and installation of a full-scale PRB system can be initiated if the proven performance is sufficient to allow replacement of mechanical treatment.

Another important factor in consideration of non-mechanical treatment is the useful life of the system. This will depend on the design configuration as well as site-specific factors and will be evaluated during the pilot-testing program.

The design and timing of the pilot-testing program will be developed during PTM permitting and included in this document at that time.

6.2.4 Financial Assurance

The cost of the development of the Category 1 Stockpile Non-Mechanical Treatment System (Section 6.2.3) will be included in the Contingency Reclamation Estimate that will be the basis for financial assurance. The costs for installation, operation and maintenance of the full-scale non-mechanical treatment system will not be included in the financial assurance estimate because these costs are assumed to be less than the costs for the mechanical treatment system that would be replaced. The cost estimate will be updated annually based on the liability at the end of the following year. See Section 7.4 of Reference (6) for details.

6.3 West Pit Overflow Non-Mechanical Treatment System

6.3.1 Purpose

The purpose of the West Pit Overflow Non-Mechanical Treatment System is to replace mechanical treatment of the West Pit overflow water with a low-maintenance, low-energy non-mechanical treatment system during the long-term closure phase of the Project.

6.3.2 Conceptual Design

The West Pit Overflow Non-Mechanical Treatment System is expected to be a multistage system consisting of the following:

- a constructed wetland for metal (copper, cobalt, nickel and lead) precipitation and solids removal
- a permeable sorptive barrier (PSB) for polishing
- an aeration pond.

On an annual basis, the mean flow rate from the West Pit to the small unnamed watercourse that discharges to the Partridge River is expected to be 320 gpm (Section 6 of Reference (3)). However, the non-mechanical system will be designed to discharge only during a portion of the year, to comply with the seasonal discharge criterion for wild rice downstream of the Mine Site. The design of the West Pit Overflow Non-Mechanical Treatment System is based on a discharge period of two months, September and October. The two month discharge period results in a higher flow rate and larger treatment system than would be required for continuous discharge. The seasonal design discharge rate is approximately 1,920 gpm.

Figure 6-2 shows a conceptual layout for the West Pit Overflow Non-Mechanical Treatment System and Figure 6-3 shows a conceptual cross-section of the proposed system, showing each of the three stages. For this system it is likely that the flow will be directed vertically upward through the treatment unit as shown on Figure 6-3. Each of these stages is described briefly in the following paragraphs.

Figure 6-2 Conceptual Plan View: West Pit Overflow Non-Mechanical Treatment System



Figure 6-3 Conceptual Cross-Section: West Pit Overflow Non-Mechanical Treatment System

6.3.2.1 Constructed Wetland

Using the design discharge rate of 1,920 gpm, a design hydraulic retention time of 48 hours for summer and early fall operation, effective porosity of 30%, and a design depth of three feet, the required area for the constructed wetland, calculated in **Equation 6-2**, is approximately 18.9 acres (not including access roads).

$$Area = \frac{1{,}920\ gal}{min} \times 2\ day \times \frac{1{,}440\ min}{day} \times \frac{1\ ft^3}{7.48\ gal} \times \frac{1}{0.3} \times \frac{1\ Acre}{43{,}560\ ft^2} \times \frac{1}{3ft} \qquad \textbf{Equation 6-2}$$

Additional volume, which would increase retention time, could be created, if necessary, by increasing the area or depth of the constructed wetland. For example, a 5-day retention time would increase the area of the system to 47 acres, if the depth remained constant.

It may be beneficial to adjust the pH of the West Pit water before it enters the wetland system. If this is needed, pH adjustments could be made to the West Pit overflow with lime treatment upstream of the wetland or to the West Pit lake during flooding as part of contingency mitigation (Section 6.6 of Reference (1) presents contingency mitigation options for the West Pit).

Because the treatment system would be designed for a 2-month discharge period, the system has a larger footprint than a system designed for year-round discharge, but it also has several advantages compared to a system that would operate year-round, including:

- avoiding the need for winter operation and potential complications due to freezing
- allowing the discharge to occur during a period when the water will still be relatively warm which would increase SRB activity and reduce the design hydraulic retention time, as noted in Equation 6-2.
- allowing the wetland vegetation to build up a supply of degradable carbon within the wetland during the growing season that can be consumed by SRB and other microorganisms to support biological sulfate reduction in the fall when plant activity and the diffusion of oxygen into the subsurface decreases.

During non-discharge periods, the wetland will need to be maintained in a saturated condition. This will be accomplished by limiting the outflow from the wetland and realizing inflows from

direct precipitation and clean stormwater from surrounding areas entering the wetland. If necessary, the inflow to the wetland could also be supplemented with a small volume of gravity discharge from the West Pit to maintain saturated conditions. Any flow from the West Pit would only be used to re-supply water lost to evapotranspiration during the growing season. These operations will make the wetland system self-sustaining in support of biological sulfate reduction and metal sulfide precipitation.

The constructed wetland will potentially be located within the previously disturbed areas (Overburden Storage and Laydown Area) of the Mine Site to the southeast of the proposed West Pit overflow. The overflow from the West Pit would flow by gravity to the constructed wetland and then by gravity out of the wetland into the PSB.

6.3.2.2 Permeable Sorptive Barrier (PSB)

PSBs will be constructed to provide a contingency system for additional removal of metals, if needed. Using the design discharge rate of 1,920 gpm and a design contact time of one hour (twice the typical design time to be conservative), the required minimum volume for the PSB at the outfall of the constructed wetland, calculated using Equation 6-3, is 15,400 cubic feet of sorptive media.

$$Volume = \frac{1{,}920\ gal}{min} \times 1\ hr \times \frac{60\ min}{hr} \times \frac{1\ ft^3}{7.48\ gal} \qquad \textbf{Equation 6-3}$$

The PSB media will be placed at the downgradient end of the constructed wetland so that water can flow by gravity through the sorptive media and into an aeration pond as described in the following section. Increasing the volume of the media within the sorptive barrier would decrease the required frequency for replacement of the media.

6.3.2.3 Aeration Pond

An aeration pond will provide time for water exiting the PSB to re-equilibrate with the atmosphere, and in particular to increase the concentration of dissolved oxygen before the water is discharged to a small watercourse that flows into the Partridge River. The design time for retention in an aeration pond is one day. However, a cascade spillway or other design components could reduce the time required to reach equilibrium with the atmosphere. Again, the proposed limited discharge period will eliminate the need to operate when the aeration pond would be covered with ice or snow, thus eliminating a potential limiting factor for aeration.

Using the design discharge rate of 1,920 gpm, a design hydraulic retention time of one day, and a pond depth of at least 3 feet, the maximum surface area required for the aeration pond, calculated in Equation 6-4, is approximately 2.8 acres.

$$Area = \frac{1{,}920\ gal}{min} \times 1\ day \times \frac{1{,}440\ min}{day} \times \frac{1\ ft^3}{7.48\ gal} \times \frac{1\ Acre}{43{,}560\ ft^2} \times \frac{1}{3\ ft} \qquad \textbf{Equation 6-4}$$

A potential location for the aeration pond (shown in Figure 6-2) is in an area where a stormwater pond will exist during mining operations.

6.3.3 Development Plan

The performance of a multi-stage (constructed wetland/PSB/aeration pond) treatment system will depend on site-specific conditions and the actual water being treated. The site-specific design of a treatment system for West Pit overflow water must be pilot-tested to prove its performance before it could be installed and operated to replace mechanical treatment. A pilot-scale treatment system will be designed, installed and monitored after the water quality of the West Pit is comparable to that expected during long-term closure. Based on current modeling, water quality is estimated to stabilize at levels comparable to the long-term water quality that could be directed to the constructed wetland system after approximately Mine Year 50 (although concentrations for many constituents trend downward over the long-term). Monitoring of the actual West Pit overflow quality during operations and reclamation will be used to evaluate when the constructed wetland testing could be initiated.

The pilot-scale non-mechanical treatment system will be constructed at the Mine Site and use water from the West Pit as inflow. It is anticipated that several years of pilot-testing will be required to obtain the data needed to understand the effects of seasonal variations in temperature or other factors on the performance of the treatment system. After the pilot-testing has been completed and the results of the work have been accepted by the MDNR and MPCA, the design and installation of a full-scale treatment system can be initiated if the proven performance is sufficient to allow replacement of mechanical treatment.

Another important factor in consideration of non-mechanical treatment is the useful life of the system. This will depend on the design configuration as well as site-specific factors and will be evaluated during the pilot-testing program.

The design and timing of the pilot-testing program will be developed during PTM permitting and included in this document at that time.

6.3.4 Financial Assurance

The cost of the development of the West Pit Overflow Non-Mechanical Treatment System (Section 6.3.3) will be included in the Contingency Reclamation Estimate that will be the basis for financial assurance. The costs for installation, operation and maintenance of the non-mechanical system will not be included in the financial assurance estimate because these costs are assumed to be less than the costs for the mechanical treatment system that would be replaced. The cost estimate will be updated annually based on the liability at the end of the following year. See Section 7.4 of Reference (1) for details.

6.4 Flotation Tailings Basin (FTB) Non-Mechanical Treatment System

6.4.1 Purpose

The purpose of the FTB Non-Mechanical Treatment System is to replace mechanical treatment of the water draining through the FTB and collected in the FTB Containment System and the South Seepage Management System with a low-maintenance, low-energy non-mechanical treatment system during the long-term closure phase of the Project.

6.4.2 Conceptual Design

The FTB Non-Mechanical Treatment System is expected to be a multistage system consisting of the following:

- a constructed wetland for metal precipitation and solids removal
- permeable sorptive barriers (PSBs) for polishing.

For the FTB Non-Mechanical Treatment System, the total flow is expected to be approximately 1,500 gpm (Section 6 of Reference (4)) for the combined flows modeled at the north, northwest, west, and south toes. The conceptual plan includes re-building the natural wetlands between the FTB and the Containment System as a vertical, upflow constructed wetland system with PSB systems at the outer perimeter within the access road. Figure 6-4 shows a conceptual layout for the FTB Non-Mechanical Treatment System. Figure 6-5 shows a conceptual cross-section of the proposed system. Water collected by the FTB South Seepage Management System is expected to be pumped to the non-mechanical treatment system.



Figure 6-4 Conceptual Plan View: FTB Non-Mechanical Treatment System



Figure 6-5 Conceptual Cross-Section: FTB Non-Mechanical Treatment System

6.4.2.1 Constructed Wetland

The constructed wetland will be designed to remove metals and reduce the load of sulfate. The hydraulic retention time will be 5 days (Section 6.1.2.2) to provide for year-round operation at a wide range of temperatures. In addition, an extra foot of open water will be maintained above the volume required for the 5-day retention time, to allow for ice formation while maintaining an open water layer in winter months (Reference (66)).

Using the design flow rate of 1,500 gpm, a hydraulic retention time of 5 days, an average working treatment depth of approximately three feet, and an effective porosity of 30%, the minimum required area for a constructed wetland, calculated in **Equation 6-5**, is approximately 37 acres.

$$Area = \frac{1{,}500\ gal}{min} \times 5\ day \times \frac{1{,}440\ min}{day} \frac{1\ ft^3}{7.48\ gal} \times \frac{1}{0.3} \times \frac{1\ Acre}{43{,}560\ ft^2} \times \frac{1}{3\ ft} \quad \textbf{Equation 6-5}$$

Constructed wetlands will be implemented at various suitable locations (within existing wetland areas) between the toe of the FTB dams and the Containment System. They will discharge via outlet structures at multiple locations along the outer access road of the FTB Containment System as shown conceptually on Figure 6-4. Assuming that the treatment system can be

constructed outside the toe of the FTB, this represents a minimum width of approximately 66 feet around the north and west perimeter of the FTB. The actual distance between the FTB toe and the Containment System will be greater to provide adequate area for wetland construction based on groundwater modeling and the extent of existing wetlands.

6.4.2.2 Permeable Sorptive Barrier (PSB)

PSBs will be constructed to provide a contingency system for additional removal of metals if needed. Using an empty bed contact time of one hour, and a discharge rate of 1,500 gpm, the required minimum volume for the PSB at the outfall of the constructed wetland, calculated using Equation 6-6, is 12,000 cubic feet of sorptive media.

$$Volume = \frac{1{,}500\ gal}{min} \times 1\ hr \times \frac{60\ min}{hr} \times \frac{1\ ft^3}{7.48\ gal}$$ **Equation 6-6**

PSBs will be designed to be incorporated into the outlet structures from the constructed wetland at multiple locations along the outer access road of the FTB Containment System as shown in Figure 6-4. PSBs may be incorporated into the construction of the access road around the outer perimeter or into other outlet structures, sometimes referred to as cassettes that would be designed specifically to house these units and facilitate periodic removal and replacement.

6.4.3 Development Plan

The performance of a constructed wetland/PSB treatment system will depend on site-specific conditions and the actual water being treated. The site-specific design of a treatment system for FTB seepage must be pilot-tested to prove its performance before a treatment system could be installed and operated to replace mechanical treatment. A pilot-scale treatment system will be designed, installed and monitored after the water quality of the water collected by the Containment System is comparable to that expected during long-term closure. Based on current modeling, water quality is estimated to stabilize at levels comparable to the long-term water quality that could be directed to the constructed wetland system after approximately Year 45. Monitoring of the actual seepage quality during operations and reclamation will be used to evaluate when the constructed wetland testing could be initiated.

The pilot-scale non-mechanical treatment system will be constructed at the FTB and use a slipstream of water from the Containment System as inflow. It is anticipated that several years of pilot-testing will be required to obtain the data needed to understand the effects of seasonal variations in temperature and other factors on the performance of the treatment system. After the pilot-testing has been completed and the results of the work have been accepted by the MDNR and MPCA, the design and installation of a full-scale treatment system can be initiated if the proven performance is sufficient to allow replacement of mechanical treatment.

Another important factor in consideration of non-mechanical treatment is the useful life of the system. This will depend on the design configuration as well as site-specific factors and will be evaluated during the pilot-testing program.

The design and timing of the pilot-testing program will be developed during PTM permitting and included in this document at that time.

6.4.4 Financial Assurance

The cost of the development of the FTB Non-Mechanical Treatment System (Section 6.4.3) will be included in the Contingency Reclamation Estimate that will be the basis for financial assurance. The costs for installation, operation and maintenance of the full-scale non-mechanical treatment system will be not be included in the financial assurance estimate because these costs are assumed to be less than the costs for the mechanical treatment system that would be replaced. The cost estimate will be updated annually based on the liability at the end of the following year. See Section 7.4 of Reference (2) for details.

6.5 FTB Pond Overflow Post-Mechanical Treatment Options

6.5.1 Purpose

The ultimate goal is to allow overflow of the FTP Pond after demonstrating that water in the FTP Pond is stormwater and that it complies with applicable standards. Once this is demonstrated, pond water could be allowed to overflow. The transition from preventing pond overflow to allowing it will occur only after the pond water has been demonstrated to be stormwater meeting applicable standards, and after this demonstration has been approved by the appropriate regulatory agencies.

6.5.2 Conceptual Design

The FTB Closure Overflow (Attachment A Drawing FTB-024 of Reference (7)) will be embedded into bedrock of the hillside east of Cell 2E during reclamation (Section 7.4 of Reference (7). It is expected that this structure would be modified to serve as a stormwater overflow. Figure 6-4 shows the location of the FTB Closure Overflow. Water discharged via this overflow structure would enter the Mud Lake Creek watershed.

6.5.3 Development Plan

During the initial portion of the long-term closure period, while FTB pond water is pumped to the WWTP to prevent overflow, a monitoring program will document changes in pond water levels and water quality over time (Section 5.1 of Reference (2)). This data will be used to evaluate options for demonstrating that the pond water can be classified as stormwater. It will also be used to evaluate potential stormwater overflow outlet elevations.

6.5.4 Financial Assurance

The cost of the FTB Emergency Overflow will be included in the Contingency Reclamation Estimate for the FTB (Section 7.6 of Reference (7)). The cost of the FTP Pond monitoring program will be included in the Contingency Reclamation Estimate for Plant Site water

management (Section 7.4 of Reference (2)). The costs for modification of the overflow outlet will not be included in the financial assurance estimate because these costs are assumed to be less than the costs for the mechanical treatment system that would be replaced. These mechanical treatment system estimates will be the basis for financial assurance. The estimates will be updated annually based on the liability at the end of the following year.

Revision History

Date	Version	Description
6/11/12	1	Initial release
7/10/12	2	Responses to comments on Version 1 Section 5 - eliminated expanded WWTF and added antimony and lead treatment Section 6 – added lead treatment Section 8 – moved enhanced bentonite for beach to contingency mitigation Section 9 – moved to contingency mitigation section
9/28/12	3	Significant changes in response to comments on Version 2 and because of long-term mechanical treatment
10/31/12	4	Numerous changes in response to comments on Version 3. Figure 2-4 was corrected to show Cat 1 cover construction sequence. A few instances of corrections were made to provide for internal consistency.
3/6/13	5	Major reorganization The Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Groundwater Containment System description (Section 3 of AWMP v4) has been moved to the NorthMet Project Rock and Overburden management Plan v5 The Flotation Tailings Basin Containment System (Section 7 of AWMP v4) has been moved to the NorthMet Project Flotation Tailings Management Plan v2 Section 2 - Mine Site Adaptive Water Management has been added. It combines the overview of Mine Site water managements (Section 1.4 of AWMP v4) with the Waste Water Treatment Facility design. Section 4 - Plant Site Adaptive Water Management has been added. It combines the overview of Plant Site water managements (Section 1.5 of AWMP v4) with the Waste Water Treatment Plant design. Non-mechanical treatment systems for the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile, the West Pit Overflow and the Flotation Tailings Basin (AWMP v4 Sections 4, 6, and 9 respectively) are consolidated in Section 6 of this document All information relating to the modeling of the Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile has been consolidated in Section 3.4.3 (Previously in Sections 2.1 and 2.4.3 of AWMP v4) Section 2.2.1.1 During operations WWTF effluent sent to the East Pit will bypass the WWTF neutralization unit in order to deliver high alkalinity water that will help maintain circumneutral pH in the East Pit In long-term closure, FTB pond water will be pumped to the WWTP and treated only to the extent necessary to prevent overflow of the FTP Pond. Reducing the constituent load in the FTB pond is no longer part of the WWTP plan in long-term closure. An ultimate goal of long-term closure is to allow overflow of the FTP Pond by demonstrating that water in the FTB pond can be directly discharged as stormwater.

References

1. **Poly Met Mining Inc.** NorthMet Project Water Management Plan - Mine Site (v2). January 2013.

2. —. NorthMet Project Water Management Plan - Plant (v2). January 2013.

3. —. NorthMet Project Water Modeling Data Package Volume 1 - Mine Site (v12). March 2013.

4. —. NorthMet Project Water Modeling Data Package Volume 2 - Plant Site (v9). March 2013.

5. —. NorthMet Project Mine Plan (v2). December 2012.

6. —. NorthMet Project Rock and Overburden Management Plan (v5). December 2012.

7. —. NorthMet Project Flotation Tailings Management Plan (v2). December 2012.

8. —. NorthMet Project Residue Management Plan (v2). December 2012.

9. —. NorthMet Project Project Description (v5). March 2013.

10. —. NorthMet Project Reclamation Plan (v3). January 2013.

11. **Poly Met Mining, Inc.** NorthMet Project Water Modeling Work Plan - Mine Site (v8). September 2012.

12. **Barr Engineering Company.** Final Pilot-Testing Report - Plant Site Wastewater Treatment Plant Pilot Testing Program. Prepared for Poly Met Mining Inc. January 2013.

13. **American Water Works Association.** Reverse Osmosis and Nanofiltration (Manual of Water Supply Practices M46). 2nd 2007.

14. **Eger, P. and Lapakko, K.** Heavy Metals Study: Progress Report on the Field Leaching and Reclamation Study, 1977-1983. [Minnesota Department of Natural Resources Report]. 1985.

15. **Poly Met Mining Inc.** NorthMet Project Geotechnical Data Package Vol 3 - Mine Site Stockpiles (v2). May 2012.

16. **Koerner, R.M.** Designing with Geosynthetics. 6th s.l., New Jersey : Prentice Hall, Inc., 2012.

17. **Qian, X., R.M. Koerner, and D.H. Gray.** Geotechnical Aspects of Landfill Design and Construction. s.l. : Prentice Hall, Inc, 2002.

18. **Daniel, D.E.** Geotechnical Practice for Waste Disposal. s.l., London, England : Chapman and Hall, 1993.

19. **Breitenbach, A.J. and Smith, M.E.** Overview of Geomembrane History in the Mining Industry, 8th Bi-Annual Meeting of the International Geosynthetics Society (8IGS). 2006.

20. **GSE Lining Technology, Inc.** Personal communication from Larry Lydick. August 2012.

21. —. Mine Waste Cover Project List. August 2012.

22. **Rowe, R.K.** Long-term performance of containment barrier systems. *Geotechnique.* 2005, Vol. 55, 9, pp. 631-678.

23. **Giroud, J.P.** Equations for calculating the rate of liquid migration through composite liners due to geomembrane defects. *Geosynthetics International.* 1997, Vol. 4, 3-4, pp. 335-348.

24. **GSE Lining Technology.** Technical Note: Permeability for GSE Geomembranes. [Online] TN006 PermeabilityGeomem R03/17/06, 2006. www.gseworld.com.

25. **Giroud, J.P. and R. Bonaparte.** Leakage through liners constructed with geomembranes - part I. Geomembrane liners. *Geotextiles and Geomembranes.* 1989, Vol. 8, 1, pp. 27-67.

26. —. Leakage through liners constructed with geomembranes - part II. Composite liners. *Geotextiles and Geomembranes.* 1989, Vol. 8, 2, pp. 71-111.

27. **Schroeder, P. R., N.M. Aziz, C.M. Lloyd and P.A. Zappi.** The Hydrologic Evaluation of Landfill Performance (HELP) Model: User's Guide for Version 3. s.l., Washington, DC : U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Research and Development, September 1994. EPA/600/R-94/168a.

28. *Lessons learned from 10 years of leak detection surveys on geomembranes.* **Forget, B., A.L. Rollin, and T. Jacquelin.** Sardinia : s.n., 2005.

29. **Nosko, V., N. Touze-Foltz.** Geomembrane liner failure: modelling of its influence on contaminant transfer. 2000.

30. **Needham, A., E. Gallagher, I. Peggs, G. Howe, and J. Norris.** Likely medium to long-term generation of defects in geomembranes. P1-500/1/TR *R&D Technical Report.* 2004.

31. **Holl, Karen D.** Roots of Chaparral Shrubs Fail to Penetrate a Geosynthetic Landfill Liner. *Ecological Restoration.* June 2002.

32. **U.S. Environmental Protection Agency - Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation (5102P).** Revegetating Landfills and Waste Containment Areas Fact Sheet. October 2006. EPA 542-F-06-001.

33. **Phifer, Mark A.** Portsmouth On-Site Disposal Cell (OSDC) High Density PolyEthylene (HDPE) Geomembrane Longevity. *Savannah River National Laboratory.* January 31, 2012.

34. **Crouse, Phillip and Montgomery Watson.** Liner and Final Cover Long Term Performance Evaluation and Final Cover Life Cycle Expectation. Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory. May 2002.

35. **Leon, Roberto M.** Post Closure Management of a Hazardous Landfill at the Massachusetts Military Reservation Main Base Landfill. *Massachusetts Institute of Technology.* June 1977.

36. **Khire, M., C. Benson, and P. Bosscher.** Water Balance Modeling of Earthen Final Covers. *J. Geotech. and Geoenvironmental Eng.* 1997, Vol. 123, 8, pp. 744-754.

37. **Albright, W., C. Benson, and P. Apiwantragoon.** Field Hydrology of Landfill Final Covers with Composite Barrier Layers. *J. Geotech. and Geoenvironmental Eng.* 2012 (in press).

38. **U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.** Chapter 7: Section B Designing and Installing Liners – Technical Considerations for New Surface Impoundments, Landfills, and Waste Pile. *http://www.epa.gov/epawaste/nonhaz/industrial/guide/pdf/chap7b.pdf.* [Online] September 25, 2008.

39. **Rowe, R., S. Rimal, and H. Sangam.** Ageing of HDPE Geomembrane Exposed to Air, Water, and Leachate at Different Temperatures. *Geotextiles and Geomembranes J.* 2009. 27, pp. 137-151.

40. **Koerner, Robert M., Y. Grace Hsuan and George R. Koerner.** Geomembrane Lifetime Prediction; Unexposed and Exposed Conditions. *Geosynthetic Institute - GRI White Paper #6.* February 8, 2011.

41. **Bonaparte, R., D. Daniel and R. Koerner.** Assessment and Recommendations for Improving the Performance of Waste Containment Systems. PA/600/R-02/099 December 2002.

42. **Benson, C., W. Albright, D. Fratta, J. Tinjum, E. Kucukkirca, S. Lee, J. Scalia, P. Schlicht, and X. Wang.** Engineered Covers for Waste Containment: Changes in Engineering Properties & Implications for Long-Term Performance Assessment. Washington : Office of Research, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NUREG/CR-7028), 2011.

43. **Ludwig, Ralph D., Rick G. McGregor, David W. Blowes, Shawn G. Benner, and Keith Mountjoy.** A Permeable Reactive Barrier for Treatment of Heavy Metals. *GROUND WATER.* January-February 2002, Vol. 40, 1, pp. 59-66.

44. **Poly Met Mining Inc.** NorthMet Project Water Modeling Work Plan - Plant Site (v6). July 2012.

45. **Neculita, C.-M., Zagury, G.J., and Bussiere, B.** Passive Treatment of Acid Mine Drainage in Bioreactors using Sulfate Reducing Bacteria: Critical Review and Research Needs. *Journal of Environmental Quality.* 2007. 36, pp. 1-16.

46. **Li, L. and Benson, C.H.** Evaluation of Five Strategies to Limit the Impact of Fouling in Permeable Reactive Barriers. *Journal of Hazardous Materials.* 2010, 181, pp. 170-180.

47. **Interstate Technology and Regulatory Council (ITRC).** Permeable Reactive Barrier: Technology Update. June 2011.

48. **U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development.** Manual: Constructed Wetlands Treatment of Municipal Wastewaters. Cincinnate, OH : s.n., September 2000. EPA/625/R-99/010.

49. **U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water.** Subsurface Flow Constructed Wetlands for Waste Water Treatment, A Technology Assessment. July 1993. EPA 822-R-93-008.

50. **Sturman, Paul J., Otto R. Stein, Jan Vymazal, and Lenda Kropfelova.** Sulfur Cycling in Constructed Wetlands. *Wastewater Treatment, Plant Dynamics and Management in Constructed and Natural Wetlands.* New York, New York : Springer Science and Business Media, 2008.

51. **Benner, S.G., Blowes, D.W., Gould, W.D., Herbert, Jr., R.B., and Ptacek, C.J.** Geochemistry of a Permeable Reactive Barrier for Metals and Acid Mine Drainage. *Environmental Science Technology.* 1999. Vol. 33, pp. 2793-2799.

52. **Guo, Q. and Blowes, D.W.** Biogeochemistry of Two Types of Permeable Reactive Barriers, Organic Carbon and Iron-Bearing Organic Carbon for Mine Drainage Treatment: Column Experiments. *Journal of Contaminant Hydrology.* 2009. Vol. 107, pp. 128-139.

53. **U.S. Environmental Protection Agency - Office of Research and Development.** Partition Coefficients for Metals in Surface Water, Soil, and Waste. July 2005. EPA/600/R-05/074.

54. **Minnesota Department of Natural Resources.** Trace Metal Uptake by Peat: Interaction of a White Cedar Bog and Mining Stockpile Leachate. 1980.

55. **American Society of Civil Engineers.** ASCE-Manuals and Reports on Engineering Practice-No.69. *Sulfide in Wastewater Collection and Treatment Systems.* New York, New York : American Society of Civil Engineers, 1989.

56. **Lewis, Alison Emslie.** Review of metal sulphide precipitation. *Hydrometallurgy.* September 2010. Vol. 104, 2, pp. 222-234.

57. **Lindsay, M.B.J., Ptacek, C.J., Blowes, D.W., and Gould, W. Douglas.** Zero-Valent Iron and Organic Carbon Mixtures for the Remediation of Acid Mine Drainage: Batch Experiments. *Applied Geochemistry.* 2008, 23:2214-2225.

58. **Kadlec, Robert H., and Knight, Robert L.** Treatment Wetlands. Boca Raton, FL : CRC Press, LLC, 1996.

59. **Barr Engineering Company.** Results of Site-Specific Sorption Tests: Mine Site Technical Memorandum. July 2009.

60. **American Peat Technology, LLC.** Soudan mine large-scale APTSorb test with sand filter pretreatment. 2008.

61. **Metesh, J.J., Jarrell, T., and Oravetz, S.** Treating Acid Mine Drainage from Abandoned Mines in Remote Areas. *USDA Forest Service, Technology and Development Program.* Missoula, MT : s.n., 1998.

62. **Kuyucak, Nural, Chabot, Francois, and Martschuk, John.** Successful implementation of a passive treatment system in an extremely cold climate, northern Quebec, Canada. s.l. : 7th International Conference on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), 2006.

63. **Zipper, C., Skousen, J., and Jage, C.** Passive Treatment of Acid Mine Drainage. *Virginia Cooperative Extension Publication No. 460-133.* Blacksburg, VA : Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 2011.

64. **Fripp, J., Ziemkiewicz, P.F., and Charkavorki, H.** Acid Mine Drainage Treatment. *EMRRP Technical Notes Collection (ERDC-TN-EMRRP-SR-14).* Vicksburg, MS : US Army Engineer Research and Development Center, 2000.

65. **Murray-Gulde, Cynthia L., Bearr, Jonathan, and Rodgers, John H.** Evaluation of a constructed wetland treatment system specifically designed to decrease bioavailable copper in a wastestream. *Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety.* 2005. 61, pp. 60-73.

66. **Knox, Anna Sophia, Eric A. Nelson, Nancy V. Halverson, and John B. Gladden.** Long-term performance of a constructed wetland for metal removal. *Soil and Sediment Contamination.* 2010. 19: 667-685.

67. **Ye, Z.H., Whiting, S.N., Lin, Z.Q., Lytle, C.M., Qian, J.H., and Terry, N.** Removal and Distribution of Iron, Manganese, Cobalt, and Nickel within a Pennsylvania Constructed Wetland Treating Coal Combustion By-Product Leachate. *Journal of Environmental Quality.* 2001, 30:1464-1473.

68. **Ettner, David C.** Pilot Scale Constructed Wetland for removal of Nickel from Tainings Drainage, Southern Norway. [ed.] International Mine Water Association. Sevilla, Spain : s.n., 1999.

69. **Hawkins, W. Bradley, John H. Rodgers, Jr., W. B. Gillespie, Jr., A. W. Dunn, P. B. Dorn, M. L. Canot.** Design and Construction of Wetlands for Aqueous Transfers and Transformations of Selected Metals. *Ecotoxiology and Environmental Safety.* 1997, 36, pp. 238-248.

70. **Sartaj, Majid.** Treatment and Transport Modeling of Landfill Leachate Contaminants in an Engineered Wetland System, Ph.D. thesis, Civil Engineering Program Ottawa-Carlton Institute for Civil Engineering. November 2001.

71. **Barr Engineering Company.** Permeable Reactive Barrier Bench Test Report-Tailing Basin, NPDES/SDS Permit No. MN 0054089, prepared for Cliffs Erie L.L.C. and PolyMet Mining, Inc. September 2011.

List of Tables

Table 1-1 AWMP / Management Plan Cross Reference....4
Table 2-1 Mine Site Process Water Flows to the WWTF....17
Table 2-2 Seasonal Variations in Mine Site Process Water Flows....20
Table 2-3 WWTF Preliminary Water Quality Targets (PWQTs)....22
Table 3-1 GSE 2012 Mining Project Summary – Cover Systems....43
Table 3-2 Examples of Covers with Geomembrane Barriers for Waste Rock Stockpiles....44
Table 4-1 Water Flows to the WWTP....72
Table 4-2 Seasonal Variations in WWTP Flows....73
Table 4-3 WWTP Preliminary Water Quality Targets (PWQTs)....74

List of Figures

Figure 1-1 Definitions Illustrated 8
Figure 2-1 Mine Site Water Management Schematic - Initial Years of Operations (approximately Year 1 through Year 11)....11
Figure 2-2 Mine Site Water Management Schematic - Later Years of Operations (approximately Year 12 through Year 20)....12
Figure 2-3 Mine Site Water Management Schematic – Reclamation (approximately Year 21 through Year 40) 12
Figure 2-4 Mine Site Water Management Schematic - Long-term Mechanical Treatment 13
Figure 2-5 Mine Site Water Management Schematic - Long-term Non-mechanical Treatment 13
Figure 2-6 Mine Site Water Management Time Line with Mechanical Treatment 14
Figure 3-1 Conceptual Cross-Section: Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Cover System....36
Figure 3-2 Plan View: Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Interim Configuration – Mine Year 13 38
Figure 3-3 Plan View: Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Reclamation Configuration....39
Figure 3-4 Frequency and Distribution of Leak Size 46
Figure 3-5 Probability Density Function and Cumulative Distribution Function for Percolation Rate from Cover with Geomembrane....56
Figure 3-6 Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Percolation and Non-Mechanical Treatment Mitigation – Sulfate, Cobalt and Nickel....58
Figure 3-7 Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Percolation and Non-Mechanical Treatment Mitigation – Copper 59
Figure 3-8 Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Cover Construction Sequencing 62
Figure 4-1 Plant Site Water Management Schematic – Operations (Year 1 through Year 20) 64
Figure 4-2 Plant Site Water Management Schematic – Reclamation: West Pit Flooding (approximately Year 21 through Year 30) 65
Figure 4-3 Plant Site Water Management Schematic – Reclamation: Pond Closure (approximately Year 31 through Year 40)....66
Figure 4-4 Plant Site Water Management Schematic - Long-term Mechanical Treatment 67
Figure 4-5 Plant Site Water Management Schematic - Long-term Non-mechanical Treatment 68
Figure 4-6 Plant Site Water Management Timeline with Mechanical Treatment....69
Figure 5-1 Bentonite Broadcasting....85

Figure 5-2 Bentonite Injection....86
Figure 5-3 Geosynthetic Clay Liner....87
Figure 5-4 Relationship between FTB Pond percolation and required size of non-mechanical treatment....91
Figure 6-1 Conceptual Plan View: Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile Non-Mechanical Treatment System....102
Figure 6-2 Conceptual Plan View: West Pit Overflow Non-Mechanical Treatment System....105
Figure 6-3 Conceptual Cross-Section: West Pit Overflow Non-Mechanical Treatment System....106
Figure 6-4 Conceptual Plan View: FTB Non-Mechanical Treatment System....110
Figure 6-5 Conceptual Cross-Section: FTB Non-Mechanical Treatment System....111

List of Large Tables

Large Table 1 Mine Site Process Water Quality - Operations
Large Table 2 Mine Site Process Water Quality - Reclamation
Large Table 3 Mine Site Process Water Quality - Long-Term Closure
Large Table 4 WWTF Ranges of Blended Influent Water Quantity and Quality
Large Table 5 WWTF Effluent – GoldSim Effluent Concentrations and Potential Water Quality Standards
Large Table 6 HELP Model Input Layer Summary (Preliminary)
Large Table 7 HELP Model Input and Output Summary (Water Quality Impacts Modeling)
Large Table 8 Examples of Containment Systems at Other Sites
Large Table 9 WWTP Ranges of Blended Influent Water Quantity and Quality
Large Table 10 WWTP Effluent – GoldSim Effluent Concentrations and Potential Water Quality Standards

List of Large Figures

Large Figure 1 Water Treatment Overall Flow Sheet - Operations
Large Figure 2 Water Treatment Overall Flow Sheet - Reclamation
Large Figure 3 Water Treatment Overall Flow Sheet - Long-Term Closure
Large Figure 4 WWTF Location
Large Figure 5 WWTP Location

Large Tables

Large Table 1 Mine Site Process Water Quality - Operations

EQ Basin	Source	Percentile	Ag	Al	Alkalinity	As	B	Ba	Be	Ca	Cd	Cl	Co	Cr	Cu	F	Fe	K	Mg	Mn	Na	Ni	Pb	Sb	Se	SO4	Tl	V	Zn
East EQ Basin	East Pit	10	2.00E-04	1.41E-04	9.56E+00	1.00E-01	1.00E-01	9.65E-03	4.00E-04	5.69E+02	1.61E-03	2.48E+01	2.63E-01	1.00E-02	1.97E-01	1.32E+00	4.92E-02	4.43E+01	3.89E+01	1.05E+00	1.62E+02	2.92E+00	2.00E-03	1.75E-02	3.36E-02	2.06E+03	2.00E-04	1.00E-02	1.84E-01
		90	2.00E-04	1.74E-03	4.54E+01	1.00E-01	1.00E-01	1.17E-02	4.00E-04	7.39E+02	4.37E-02	7.12E+01	2.79E+00	1.00E-02	1.28E+01	1.50E+00	2.09E-01	5.85E+01	3.98E+02	3.70E+00	3.71E+02	5.80E+01	2.00E-03	9.08E-02	1.23E-01	3.80E+03	2.00E-04	1.00E-02	1.96E+00
	Central Pit	10	1.94E-04	1.40E-04	9.02E+00	8.98E-03	2.84E-02	2.07E-02	3.94E-04	1.41E+01	1.04E-03	3.65E-01	6.78E-02	5.49E-04	1.72E-01	1.01E-01	4.97E-02	2.10E+00	6.31E+00	2.38E-01	4.05E+00	5.19E-01	2.00E-03	4.41E-03	7.44E-04	4.78E+01	8.96E-05	7.53E-03	1.64E-01
		90	2.00E-04	1.74E-03	3.13E+01	7.30E-02	6.18E-02	3.61E-02	4.00E-04	4.76E+01	1.12E-02	5.10E-01	3.29E-01	1.14E-03	4.15E+00	3.05E-01	2.11E-01	7.71E+00	1.81E+01	5.29E-01	1.09E+01	2.30E+00	2.00E-03	1.68E-02	2.51E-03	1.77E+02	1.13E-04	9.69E-03	1.23E+00
	West Pit	10	1.68E-04	9.30E-04	2.56E+01	2.45E-02	5.55E-02	1.91E-02	2.64E-04	1.11E+02	1.04E-03	4.25E+00	5.66E-02	1.89E-03	1.17E-01	3.93E-01	4.58E-02	1.07E+01	1.99E+01	1.55E-01	3.02E+01	1.12E+00	2.56E-03	9.16E-03	2.35E-04	2.32E+02	8.37E-05	8.59E-03	8.02E-02
		90	1.84E-04	2.15E-03	4.32E+01	5.74E-02	8.76E-02	2.56E-02	3.52E-04	2.51E+02	5.28E-03	8.94E+01	2.32E-01	3.59E-03	6.13E-01	9.59E-01	1.98E-01	2.74E+01	7.40E+01	3.65E-01	7.37E+01	4.38E+00	5.42E-03	2.99E-02	1.24E-02	5.70E+02	1.16E-04	9.37E-03	2.88E-01
	Haul Roads	10	3.98E-08	9.28E-04	3.48E+01	9.98E-03	5.65E-02	2.60E-02	1.21E-05	1.45E+02	7.96E-04	0.00E+00	5.92E-02	2.08E-03	1.14E-01	1.81E+00	4.48E-02	2.16E+01	2.58E+01	1.40E-01	2.38E+01	9.75E-01	3.66E-05	1.10E-02	1.50E-05	1.40E+02	3.55E-07	5.49E-03	4.47E-02
		90	9.57E-05	2.15E-03	5.08E+01	7.39E-02	1.00E-01	3.04E-02	4.00E-04	3.39E+02	3.54E-03	0.00E+00	2.38E-01	1.00E-02	6.41E-01	3.29E+00	1.76E-01	4.82E+01	1.25E+02	3.28E-01	1.55E+02	2.48E+00	2.27E-03	7.53E-02	4.20E-03	2.26E+02	1.50E-04	1.00E-02	1.60E-01
	Rail Transfer Hopper	10	2.00E-04	1.40E-04	9.53E+00	1.00E-01	1.00E-01	1.28E-02	4.00E-04	2.92E+02	1.22E-03	0.00E+00	2.36E-01	8.99E-03	1.92E-01	1.61E+00	4.97E-02	3.30E+01	2.75E+01	8.58E-01	4.73E+01	2.93E+00	2.00E-03	1.74E-02	3.34E-02	1.17E+03	2.00E-04	1.00E-02	1.76E-01
		90	2.00E-04	1.74E-03	4.31E+01	1.00E-01	1.00E-01	1.50E-02	4.00E-04	4.34E+02	1.46E-02	0.00E+00	2.45E+00	1.00E-02	1.30E+01	2.15E+00	2.11E-01	4.80E+01	1.43E+02	3.64E+00	2.23E+02	5.70E+01	2.00E-03	8.61E-02	7.81E-02	1.92E+03	2.00E-04	1.00E-02	1.55E+00
	Category 1 Stockpile	10	3.40E-07	9.30E-04	3.48E+01	6.67E-02	1.00E-01	1.09E-02	1.12E-04	6.34E+02	1.68E-03	2.23E-02	6.17E-02	1.00E-02	1.19E-01	1.34E+00	4.58E-02	4.35E+01	7.58E+01	1.91E-01	1.15E+02	1.29E+00	2.77E-04	1.72E-02	1.13E-04	5.63E+02	2.50E-06	1.00E-02	9.18E-02
		90	2.00E-04	2.15E-03	5.11E+01	1.00E-01	1.00E-01	1.97E-02	4.00E-04	7.23E+02	7.67E-03	7.27E-01	3.19E-01	1.00E-02	6.57E-01	1.43E+00	1.99E-01	5.38E+01	3.73E+02	4.97E-01	2.97E+02	6.61E+00	2.20E-02	9.05E-02	3.31E-02	2.72E+03	2.00E-04	1.00E-02	3.83E-01
	Cumulative	**10**	1.13E-04	7.42E-04	2.37E+01	6.67E-02	8.18E-02	1.47E-02	2.82E-04	4.54E+02	2.11E-03	1.08E+01	1.71E-01	7.09E-03	1.95E-01	1.09E+00	5.30E-02	3.45E+01	6.12E+01	4.59E-01	1.25E+02	2.22E+00	1.44E-03	2.19E-02	1.35E-02	1.09E+03	9.05E-05	9.23E-03	1.40E-01
		90	1.89E-04	1.73E-03	4.22E+01	8.25E-02	9.31E-02	1.93E-02	3.83E-04	5.31E+02	1.82E-02	4.66E+01	1.13E+00	7.94E-03	4.86E+00	1.28E+00	1.90E-01	4.23E+01	2.25E+02	1.53E+00	2.29E+02	2.17E+01	6.53E-03	5.90E-02	6.11E-02	2.07E+03	1.66E-04	9.73E-03	8.69E-01
West EQ Basin	Category 2/3 Stockpile	10	2.13E-02	8.26E+01	3.42E+00	9.97E-02	1.05E-01	8.49E-03	5.66E-03	4.02E+02	1.49E-02	5.40E-22	1.63E+00	1.29E-02	7.72E+01	1.54E+00	1.79E+01	3.05E+01	1.35E+02	2.63E+00	5.31E+01	2.23E+01	1.02E-01	4.01E-01	5.27E-02	1.90E+03	1.19E-03	3.36E-02	1.63E+00
		90	3.00E-02	4.77E+02	1.82E+01	9.98E-02	2.51E-01	1.34E-02	1.30E-02	5.58E+02	1.47E-01	4.68E-21	1.89E+01	1.41E-02	1.02E+02	1.87E+00	1.02E+02	4.64E+01	9.60E+02	3.64E+01	2.28E+02	3.59E+02	3.32E-01	1.60E+00	1.13E-01	8.43E+03	7.56E-03	3.98E-02	1.64E+01
	Ore Surge Pile	10	3.53E-02	1.31E+02	1.22E-20	9.96E-02	1.08E-01	6.52E-03	8.27E-03	3.44E+02	2.20E-02	3.26E-21	6.88E+00	1.51E-02	1.30E+02	1.66E+00	3.04E+01	1.81E+01	2.21E+02	1.31E+01	2.99E+01	1.26E+02	1.72E-01	3.26E-01	9.89E-02	2.47E+03	1.98E-03	5.05E-02	3.39E+00
		90	4.78E-02	8.17E+02	5.02E-01	9.97E-02	3.55E-01	1.18E-02	2.11E-02	4.60E+02	1.95E-01	2.07E-20	3.96E+01	1.67E-02	1.65E+02	1.92E+00	1.72E+02	4.19E+01	1.38E+03	7.98E+01	1.69E+02	8.16E+02	5.48E-01	2.56E+00	9.99E-02	1.29E+04	9.88E-03	5.85E-02	2.28E+01
	Category 4 Stockpile (inactive)	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
		90	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Cumulative	**10**	2.34E-02	8.99E+01	2.95E+00	9.97E-02	1.06E-01	8.27E-03	6.21E-03	3.96E+02	1.78E-02	8.85E-22	2.59E+00	1.33E-02	8.50E+01	1.56E+00	1.97E+01	2.92E+01	1.58E+02	4.48E+00	5.17E+01	3.95E+01	1.11E-01	4.08E-01	5.85E-02	1.99E+03	1.29E-03	3.62E-02	2.05E+00
		90	3.25E-02	5.27E+02	1.57E+01	9.98E-02	2.64E-01	1.31E-02	1.41E-02	5.43E+02	1.49E-01	7.67E-21	2.07E+01	1.45E-02	1.10E+02	1.88E+00	1.13E+02	4.58E+01	1.00E+03	3.96E+01	2.18E+02	4.05E+02	3.61E-01	1.73E+00	1.11E-01	9.03E+03	7.96E-03	4.23E-02	1.68E+01
Other	Plant Site WWTP Concentrate	10	2.07E-04	3.35E-03	7.57E+01	4.60E-01	1.59E-01	3.62E-01	3.77E-04	2.00E+03	9.57E-04	4.90E+02	2.36E-01	6.84E-03	6.05E+00	3.57E+01	3.57E+01	5.87E+02	2.49E+03	1.13E+01	1.69E+03	3.66E+00	6.92E-01	1.03E-02	2.69E-03	1.03E+04	2.27E-04	8.97E-03	6.43E-01
		90	2.33E-04	5.14E-03	9.63E+01	7.29E-01	1.97E-01	4.14E-01	4.03E-04	3.02E+03	2.11E-03	6.11E+02	7.16E-01	7.45E-03	1.18E+01	4.40E+01	6.02E+01	7.02E+02	3.03E+03	1.76E+01	1.95E+03	9.90E+00	9.72E-01	1.37E-02	3.42E-03	1.23E+04	2.52E-04	9.32E-03	1.45E+00

1. All concentrations shown are mg/L
2. All concentrations are shown for the peak year of Operations, Year 14
3. Percentiles are the 10th and 90th percentiles of the annual average concentrations
4. Category 4 stockpile has been moved to the East Pit by Year 14, therefore no concentrations are shown
5. Source: GoldSim Model Version 5.0

Reference (2)

Large Table 2 Mine Site Process Water Quality - Reclamation

	Source	Percentile	Ag	Al	Alkalinity	As	B	Ba	Be	Ca	Cd	Cl	Co	Cr	Cu	F	Fe	K	Mg	Mn	Na	Ni	Pb	Sb	Se	SO4	Tl	V	Zn
East EQ Basin	Combined	10	2.00E-04	1.41E-04	9.56E+00	1.00E-01	1.00E-01	1.06E-02	4.00E-04	2.49E+02	1.61E-03	6.96E+01	2.63E-01	1.00E-02	1.97E-01	1.33E+00	4.92E-02	4.43E+01	3.84E+01	6.63E-01	1.71E+02	2.89E+00	2.00E-03	1.75E-02	1.41E-02	8.26E+02	2.00E-04	1.00E-02	1.84E-01
	East/Central Pit	90	2.00E-04	1.74E-03	4.54E+01	1.00E-01	1.00E-01	1.57E-02	4.00E-04	7.30E+02	4.33E-02	1.06E+02	2.25E+00	1.00E-02	1.28E+01	2.26E+00	2.09E-01	5.85E+01	3.37E+02	3.44E+00	4.59E+02	2.18E+01	2.00E-03	9.08E-02	1.08E-01	2.82E+03	2.00E-04	1.00E-02	1.96E+00
	Category 1	10	2.61E-05	9.30E-04	3.48E+01	9.76E-02	1.00E-01	9.96E-03	3.72E-04	6.35E+02	1.70E-03	1.38E-15	6.17E-02	1.00E-02	1.19E-01	1.34E+00	4.58E-02	4.35E+01	7.60E+01	1.91E-01	1.75E+02	1.29E+00	2.08E-02	1.75E-02	2.08E-04	1.95E+03	1.22E-04	1.00E-02	9.22E-02
	Stockpile	90	2.00E-04	2.15E-03	5.11E+01	1.00E-01	1.00E-01	1.34E-02	4.00E-04	7.23E+02	7.89E-03	3.25E-04	3.19E-01	1.00E-02	6.57E-01	1.43E+00	1.99E-01	5.38E+01	3.76E+02	4.97E-01	3.02E+02	6.61E+00	9.98E-02	9.07E-02	6.59E-02	3.63E+03	2.00E-04	1.00E-02	3.90E-01
	Cumulative	**10**	2.00E-04	1.42E-04	9.57E+00	1.00E-01	1.00E-01	1.06E-02	4.00E-04	2.50E+02	1.61E-03	6.95E+01	2.63E-01	1.00E-02	1.97E-01	1.33E+00	4.92E-02	4.43E+01	3.84E+01	6.63E-01	1.71E+02	2.89E+00	2.01E-03	1.75E-02	1.40E-02	8.27E+02	2.00E-04	1.00E-02	1.84E-01
		90	2.00E-04	1.74E-03	4.54E+01	1.00E-01	1.00E-01	1.56E-02	4.00E-04	7.30E+02	4.31E-02	1.06E+02	2.24E+00	1.00E-02	1.28E+01	2.25E+00	2.09E-01	5.85E+01	3.37E+02	3.42E+00	4.58E+02	2.18E+01	2.46E-03	9.08E-02	1.08E-01	2.83E+03	2.00E-04	1.00E-02	1.95E+00
Other	Plant Site WWTP	10	1.58E-04	2.81E-03	6.87E+01	6.36E-01	1.39E-01	2.88E-01	3.37E-04	3.70E+03	8.34E-04	4.64E+02	3.03E-01	5.64E-03	4.98E+00	2.11E+01	7.88E+00	6.05E+02	2.63E+03	1.01E+01	1.65E+03	4.97E+00	7.86E-01	1.10E-02	3.74E-03	9.41E+03	1.68E-04	7.42E-03	1.91E-01
	Concentrate	90	1.83E-04	5.14E-03	9.20E+01	8.44E-01	1.78E-01	3.18E-01	3.63E-04	6.06E+03	1.91E-03	5.77E+02	9.55E-01	6.67E-03	1.11E+01	2.67E+01	1.65E+01	6.81E+02	3.15E+03	1.74E+01	1.94E+03	1.39E+01	9.90E-01	1.66E-02	5.64E-03	1.11E+04	1.93E-04	8.58E-03	9.86E-01
Inactive Sources	West Pit	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
		90	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Haul Roads	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
		90	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Rail Transfer Hopper	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
		90	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Category 2/3 Stockpile	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
		90	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Ore Surge Pile	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
		90	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Category 4 Stockpile	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
		90	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

1. All concentrations shown are mg/L
2. All concentrations are shown for Year 25
3. Percentiles are the 10th and 90th percentiles of the annual average concentrations
4. Source: GoldSim Model Version 5.0

Reference (2)

Large Table 3 Mine Site Process Water Quality - Long-Term Closure

	Source	Percentile	Ag	Al	Alkalinity	As	B	Ba	Be	Ca	Cd	Cl	Co	Cr	Cu	F	Fe	K	Mg	Mn	Na	Ni	Pb	Sb	Se	SO4	Tl	V	Zn
Active Sources	West Pit	10	2.00E-04	9.30E-04	3.48E+01	8.36E-03	1.00E-01	2.55E-02	3.00E-04	3.52E+01	9.48E-04	1.03E+01	1.24E-02	3.26E-03	1.19E-01	2.04E-01	4.58E-02	7.85E+00	1.93E+01	1.72E-01	2.62E+01	1.79E-01	4.50E-03	8.51E-03	2.35E-04	5.54E+01	1.12E-04	1.00E-02	7.30E-02
		90	2.00E-04	2.15E-03	5.11E+01	1.83E-02	1.00E-01	3.68E-02	4.00E-04	4.75E+01	3.60E-03	1.46E+01	5.95E-02	3.65E-03	6.51E-01	2.58E-01	1.99E-01	1.31E+01	2.30E+01	2.25E-01	4.48E+01	5.97E-01	8.83E-03	1.17E-02	2.85E-03	6.97E+01	1.23E-04	1.00E-02	2.15E-01
	Category 1 Stockpile	10	2.89E-05	9.30E-04	3.48E+01	1.00E-01	1.00E-01	9.49E-03	4.00E-04	6.35E+02	1.70E-03	1.59E-21	6.17E-02	1.00E-02	1.19E-01	1.34E+00	4.58E-02	4.35E+01	7.61E+01	1.91E-01	1.80E+02	1.29E+00	2.09E-02	1.75E-02	2.35E-04	2.26E+03	2.00E-04	1.00E-02	9.22E-02
		90	2.00E-04	2.15E-03	5.11E+01	1.00E-01	1.00E-01	1.14E-02	4.00E-04	7.23E+02	7.97E-03	2.50E-09	3.19E-01	1.00E-02	6.57E-01	1.42E+00	1.99E-01	5.38E+01	3.76E+02	4.97E-01	3.05E+02	6.61E+00	1.00E-01	9.08E-02	7.03E-02	4.01E+03	2.00E-04	1.00E-02	3.90E-01
	Cumulative	**10**	1.98E-04	9.30E-04	3.48E+01	9.13E-03	1.00E-01	2.54E-02	3.01E-04	3.79E+01	9.75E-04	1.02E+01	1.38E-02	3.30E-03	1.19E-01	2.11E-01	4.58E-02	8.13E+00	2.01E+01	1.73E-01	2.77E+01	2.04E-01	5.04E-03	8.78E-03	2.35E-04	6.47E+01	1.12E-04	1.00E-02	7.49E-02
		90	2.00E-04	2.15E-03	5.11E+01	1.95E-02	1.00E-01	3.66E-02	4.00E-04	6.15E+01	3.61E-03	1.45E+01	6.09E-02	3.75E-03	6.51E-01	2.79E-01	1.99E-01	1.36E+01	2.72E+01	2.27E-01	4.86E+01	6.53E-01	9.68E-03	1.26E-02	3.49E-03	1.38E+02	1.25E-04	1.00E-02	2.15E-01
Inactive Sources	Combined East/Central Pit	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
		90	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Plant Site Concentrate	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
		90	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Haul Roads	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
		90	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Rail Transfer Hopper	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
		90	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Category 2/3 Stockpile	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
		90	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Ore Surge Pile	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
		90	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Category 4 Stockpile	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
		90	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

1. All concentrations shown are mg/L
2. All concentrations are shown for Year 75
3. Percentiles are the 10th and 90th percentiles of the annual average concentrations
4. Source: GoldSim Model Version 5.0

Reference (2)

Large Table 4 WWTF Ranges of Blended Influent Water Quantity and Quality

WWTF Ranges of Blended Influent Water Quantity and Quality (µg/L unless otherwise specified)	Operations[2]						Reclamation[3]				Long-Term Closure[4]	
	East EQ Basin		West EQ Basin		WWTP Reject Concentrate		East EQ Basin		WWTP Reject Concentrate			
	10%	90%	10%	90%	10%	90%	10%	90%	10%	90%	10%	90%
Flow (gpm) [1]	880	1280	115	170	50	150	1750	1750	175	175	300	375
Ag (Silver)	0.0001	0.0002	0.0234	0.0325	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002
Al (Aluminum)	0.0007	0.0017	89.9428	526.6742	0.0034	0.0051	0.0001	0.0017	0.0028	0.0051	0.0009	0.0021
Alk (Alkalinity)	23.70	42.19	2.95	15.67	75.73	96.25	9.57	45.40	68.67	92.05	34.82	51.12
As (Arsenic)	0.067	0.082	0.100	0.100	0.460	0.729	0.100	0.100	0.636	0.844	0.009	0.020
B (Boron)	0.082	0.093	0.106	0.264	0.159	0.197	0.100	0.100	0.139	0.178	0.100	0.100
Ba (Barium)	0.015	0.019	0.008	0.013	0.362	0.414	0.011	0.016	0.288	0.318	0.025	0.037
Be (Beryllium)	0.0003	0.0004	0.0062	0.0141	0.0004	0.0004	0.0004	0.0004	0.0003	0.0004	0.0003	0.0004
Ca (Calcium)	454.2	531.2	395.7	543.1	2004.4	3019.5	249.6	729.6	3700.7	6057.8	37.9	61.5
Cd (Cadmium)	0.002	0.018	0.018	0.149	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.043	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.004
Cl (Chloride)	10.777	46.612	< 0.0000	< 0.0000	489.750	610.670	69.537	105.962	464.320	576.837	10.187	14.495
Co (Cobalt)	0.171	1.134	2.588	20.709	0.236	0.716	0.263	2.240	0.303	0.955	0.014	0.061
Cr (Chromium)	0.007	0.008	0.013	0.014	0.007	0.007	0.010	0.010	0.006	0.007	0.003	0.004
Cu (Copper)	0.20	4.86	84.95	110.41	6.05	11.81	0.20	12.76	4.98	11.06	0.12	0.65
F (Fluoride)	1.09	1.28	1.56	1.88	35.74	44.01	1.33	2.25	21.09	26.74	0.21	0.28
Fe (Iron)	0.05	0.19	19.68	112.73	35.66	60.16	0.05	0.21	7.88	16.53	0.05	0.20
K (Potassium)	34.46	42.33	29.16	45.80	586.85	701.78	44.30	58.47	605.49	680.95	8.13	13.61
Mg (Magnesium)	61.25	224.88	158.32	1004.17	2489.80	3028.25	38.43	336.87	2630.10	3152.05	20.10	27.19
Mn (Manganese)	0.46	1.53	4.48	39.57	11.33	17.60	0.66	3.42	10.09	17.43	0.17	0.23
Na (Sodium)	125.48	228.91	51.72	217.65	1685.28	1953.01	170.95	457.79	1645.72	1935.33	27.69	48.61
Ni (Nickel)	2.22	21.67	39.49	405.00	3.66	9.90	2.89	21.76	4.97	13.93	0.20	0.65
Pb (Lead)	0.001	0.007	0.111	0.361	0.692	0.972	0.002	0.002	0.786	0.990	0.005	0.010
Sb (Antimony)	0.022	0.059	0.408	1.727	0.010	0.014	0.017	0.091	0.011	0.017	0.009	0.013
Se (Selenium)	0.014	0.061	0.059	0.111	0.003	0.003	0.014	0.108	0.004	0.006	0.000	0.003
SO4 (Sulfate)	1092.62	2068.23	1993.42	9034.62	10290.25	12336.67	826.52	2827.36	9405.66	11119.33	64.66	138.31
Tl (Thallium)	0.0001	0.0002	0.0013	0.0080	0.0002	0.0003	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0001	0.0001
V (Vanadium)	0.009	0.010	0.036	0.042	0.009	0.009	0.010	0.010	0.007	0.009	0.010	0.010
Zn (Zinc)	0.140	0.869	2.052	16.773	0.643	1.447	0.184	1.953	0.191	0.986	0.075	0.215
TDS (Total Dissolved Solids mg/L)	1910.00	3010.00	2830.00	10400.00	18500.00	20800.00	1520.00	3920.00	19500.00	22500.00	197.00	274.00

(1) Flows are shown as annual average flows (gpm), rounded to the nearest 5 gpm.

(2) Estimates based on Reference (3) non-charged balanced water for Year 14

(3) Estimates based on Reference (3) non-charged balanced water for Year 25.

(4) Estimates based on Reference (3) non-charged balanced water for Year 75.

Large Table 5 WWTF Effluent – GoldSim Effluent Concentrations and Potentially Applicable Water Quality Standards

Parameter (µg/L unless otherwise noted)	GoldSim Effluent Concentration			Surface Water						Groundwater	Drinking Water	
				M.R. 7052.0100 Class 2B (chronic standard)			M.R. 7050.0222 Class 2B (chronic standard)		M.R. 7050.0224 Class 4A (chronic standard)	Minn. Groundwater (HRL, HBV, or RAA)	Federal Standard, (Primary MCLs)	Federal Standard, (Secondary MCLs)
Metals/Inorganics												
Aluminum	125						**125**					50-200
Antimony	31						**31**			6	6.0	
Arsenic	10			53			(3)				**10.0**	
Barium	2,000									**2,000**	2,000	
Beryllium	4									0.08	**4.0**	
Boron	500								**500**	1,000		
Cadmium (1) (2)	4	4	2	**5.1**	**4.2**	**2.5**	(3)			4	5.0	
Chromium (+3)				86			(3)			20,000	100 (total)	
Chromium (+6)	11			**11**			(3)			100	100 (total)	
Cobalt	5						**5.0**					
Copper (1) (2)	30	16	9	**20**	**17**	**9.3**	(3)				1,300	1,000
Iron	300											**300**
Lead (1) (2)	19	7	3				**10.2**	**7.7**	**3.2**		15	
Manganese	50									100		**50**
Mercury				0.0013			(3)				2.0	
Nickel (1) (2)	100	90	50	**113**	**94**	**52**	(3)			100		
Selenium	5			**5.0**			(3)			30	50	
Silver	1						**1.0**			30		100
Thallium	0.56						**0.56**			0.6	2.0	
Zinc (1) (2)	388	200	100	**260**	**216**	**120**	(3)			2,000		5,000
General Parameters												
Ammonia (un-ionized)							40					
Bicarbonate (meq/L)									5			
Chloride (mg/L)	230						**230**					250
Cyanide (free)				5.2			(3)			100	200	
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)							>5.0					
Fluoride (mg/L)	2										4.0	**2.0**
Hardness (mg/L) (2)	250	200	100	**250**	**200**	**100**	250	200	100			
Nitrate (mg/L)										10	10	
Oil							500					
pH (su)							6.5-9.0		6.0-8.5			6.5-8.5
Sodium (% of cations)									**60**			
Specific Conductance (uhmos/cm)									1,000			
Sulfate (mg/L) (2)	250	150	9						**10**			**250**
Total Dissolved Salts (mg/L)									700			500 (total dissolved solids)
Turbidity (NTU)							25					

Values in **bold** font indicate value used for Preliminary Water Quality Target.
(1) Surface water standard based on Hardness.
(2) GoldSim modeled concentration for Operations, Reclamation, and Long-Term Closure.
(3) Standard superseded by M.Rules 7052.0100, Class 2B standard.

Large Table 6 HELP Model Input Layer Summary (Preliminary)

	Vertical Percolation Layer 1	Lateral Drainage Layer 1	Geomembrane Barrier Layer	Vertical Percolation Layer 2	Selection and/or Verification Method
Material Texture Number	8	5	36	22	Selected by HELP Model User
Unified Soil Classification (Typical Description)	ML (inorganic silts, very fine sands, rock flour, silty or clayey fine sands)	SM (silty sands, sand-silt mixtures)	N/A	ML (inorganic silts, very fine sands, rock flour, silty or clayey fine sands)	Help Model Default Based on Material Texture Number - Construction Specification and Construction QA/QC
Thickness (inches)	18	12	N/A	6	Construction Specification and Construction QA/QC
Porosity (Vol/Vol)	0.463	0.457	N/A	0.419	HELP Model Default Based on Material Texture Number
Field Capacity (Vol/Vol)	0.232	0.131	N/A	0.307	HELP Model Default Based on Material Texture Number
Wilting Point (Vol/Vol)	0.116	0.058	N/A	0.180	HELP Model Default Based on Material Texture Number
Initial Soil Water Content (Vol/Vol)	Calculated by HELP Model	Calculated by HELP Model	N/A	Calculated by HELP Model	HELP Model Default Based on Material Texture Number
Saturated Hydraulic Conductivity (cm/sec)[(1),(3)]	3.7×10^{-4}	1.0×10^{-3}	4.0×10^{-13}	1.9×10^{-5}	HELP Model Default Based on Material Texture Number -- Construction Specification and Construction QA/QC for Lateral Drainage Layer
Root Channels[(2)]	Approx. 4.2	N/A	N/A	N/A	HELP Model Default Based on Vegetation Quality
Surface Slope	1% Top; 27% Side	1% Top; 27% Side	N/A	N/A	Construction Specification and Construction QA/QC
SCS Runoff Curve Number	Calculated by HELP Model	N/A	N/A	N/A	HELP Model Default Based on Surface Material Texture Number, Vegetation Quality and Surface Slope
Uninterrupted Slope Length (feet)	150’ on Side Slopes; 75’ on Top Slopes	150’ on Side Slopes; 75’ on Top Slopes	N/A	N/A	Construction Specification and Construction QA/QC
Vegetation Quality	Good Stand of Grass	N/A	N/A	N/A	Specified by HELP Model User
Fraction of Area Allowing Runoff	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	Specified by HELP Model User on Basis of Site Geometry
Evaporative Zone Depth (inches)	12	N/A	N/A	N/A	Specified by HELP Model User
Geomembrane Installation Quality	N/A	N/A	Good	N/A	Specified by HELP Model User
Defects Frequency	N/A	N/A	Input range supported by 2.4.1.1	N/A	Specified by HELP Model User
Defect Size	N/A	N/A	$1.0\ cm^2$	N/A	HELP Model Default

(1) Saturated Hydraulic Conductivity – for cover construction projects it is standard practice to specify the saturated hydraulic conductivity of only the Lateral Drainage Layer. While default saturated hydraulic conductivity values for Vertical Percolation Layers are used to facilitate HELP Modeling; carry-over of these values to Construction Specifications and Construction QA/QC is not typical and is not proposed.
(2) Root Channels – an empirical factor utilized by the HELP Model to increase the hydraulic conductivity of the top soil layer (Vertical Percolation Layer 1) to account for the effects of root channels on soil hydraulic conductivity.
(3) Per agreement with MPCA participants in stockpile cover design review, the construction specifications will require a hydraulic conductivity of 1.0 x 10-2 cm/sec for Lateral Drainage Layer 1 on stockpile side slopes and a hydraulic conductivity of 1.0 x 10-3 cm/sec for Lateral Drainage Layer 1 on the top and benches of the stockpile. The Saturated Hydraulic Conductivity of 1.0 x 10-3 cm/sec is used for HELP modeling of the entire Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile to yield a slightly higher estimate of percolation rate through geomembrane defects for purposes of water quality impacts modeling; Material Texture Number 5 for Lateral Drainage Layer 1 has been selected to provide the 1.0 x 10-3 cm/sec hydraulic conductivity HELP model input for Lateral Drainage Layer 1. Actual (construction specification) Lateral Drainage Layer 1 will be more reflective of the characteristics of HELP Model Default Material Texture 1 – SP (poorly graded sands and gravelly sands, little or no fines).

Large Table 7 HELP Model Input and Output Summary (Water Quality Impacts Modeling)

HELP Model - Primary Inputs and Model Outcomes	Scenario 1: Lower Defect Frequency (2 holes/acre)[1],[3]						Scenario 2: Higher Defect Frequency (10 holes/acre)[3]					
	Stockpile Top and Benches		Stockpile Sides		Stockpile Weighted Average[2]		Stockpile Top and Benches		Stockpile Sides		Stockpile Weighted Average[2]	
Slope Angle, %	1%		27%		18.3%		1%		27%		18.3%	
Drainage Length, ft.	75		150		N/A		75		150		N/A	
Hydraulic Conductivity of Granular Drainage Layer, cm/sec	1×10^{-3}		1×10^{-3}		1×10^{-3}		1×10^{-3}		1×10^{-3}		1×10^{-3}	
Average Annual Precipitation, in/yr and as % of Precipitation	27.68	100.00%	27.68	100.00%	27.68	100.00%	27.68	100.00%	27.68	100.00%	27.68	100.00%
Surface Water Runoff, in/yr and as % of Precipitation	3.21	11.60%	2.96	10.68%	3.04	10.98%	3.12	11.27%	2.96	10.68%	3.01	10.88%
Evapotranspiration, in/yr and as % of Precipitation	18.90	68.28%	18.80	67.93%	18.84	68.05%	18.86	68.14%	18.80	67.93%	18.82	68.00%
Lateral Drainage off Geomembrane, in/yr and as % of Precipitation	5.31	19.18%	5.88	21.24%	5.69	20.56%	4.67	16.87%	5.76	20.81%	5.40	19.50%
Percolation through Geomembrane, in/yr and as % of Precipitation	0.22	0.79%	0.030	0.11%	0.09	0.34%	1.01	3.65%	0.16	0.58%	0.44	1.60%

(1) Geomebrane barrier layer installation quality is "Good" per HELP Model User's Manual definition
(2) Area of Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile - Top (acres): 175
(2) Area of Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile - Sides (acres): 351
(2) Total Area of Category 1 Waste Rock Stockpile (acres): 526
(3) All values rounded to nearest hundreth; some rounding errors will be reflected in column totals

Large Table 8 **Examples of Containment Systems at Other Sites**

Location	Ref	Project Setting	Barrier Wall	Trench Dimensions	Seepage Collection	Seepage Collection Pipe	Cap
Carlsbad, NM	8	Potash Process Disposal	slurry wall	10 ft deep	Y	Y	-
Duncan, Oklahoma	9	Landfill Remediation	80 mil HDPE panels	35 ft deep	Y	-	native
Tacoma, Washington	9	Wood Process Waste Landfill	bentonite	30 ft deep	Y	-	GCL
Dallas, TX	9	Landfill Remediation	2X40 mil HDPE panels	35 ft deep	Y	6 in PVC	-
Bogalusa, LA	10	Papermill Landfill	soil-bentonite	40 ft deep, 2.5 ft wide	Y	Y	-
Oak Ridge, TN	11	DOE Landfill	soil-bentonite	22 ft deep	Y	-	-
San Antonio, TX	11	USAF Landfill	slurry	40 ft deep, 3 ft wide	PRB	-	-
Taunton, MA	9	Pharmaceutical Mfr Remediation	bentonite	55 ft deep, 12 ft wide	Y	4 in PVC	multi-composite liner
Toledo, OH	9	MGP Mfr Remediation	bentonite	Y	Y	-	native
Salt Lake City, UT	10	Watkins Dam Restoration	cement- bentonite	70 ft deep, 2.5 ft wide	18 ft deep, 3 ft wide	-	-
Burbank, CA	9	Brownfield Remediation	soil-bentonite	60 ft deep	-	-	-
Coahoma, TX	9	Oil Field Remediation	-	12 ft deep, 3 ft wide	Y	-	HDPE
Beaumont, TX	9	Creosoting Facility Remediation	soil-bentonite	50 ft deep	Y	-	-
Greely, CO	10	Former Gravel Quarry	soil-cement-bentonite	65 ft deep, 3 ft wide	-	-	-
Alberta, CA	10	Mine Tailings Pond	soil-bentonite	100 ft deep, 3 ft wide	-	-	-

Large Table 9 WWTP Ranges of Blended Influent Water Quantity and Quality

Parameter (µg/L, unless otherwise specified)	Operations[1]		Reclamation[2]		Long-Term Closure[3]	
	10%	90%	10%	90%	10%	90%
Ag (Silver)	0.2095	0.2483	0.1628	0.1820	0.0666	0.1282
Al (Aluminum)	3.455	5.998	2.877	6.007	6.576	16.910
Alk (Alkalinity)	76380	116500	67730	93640	117400	179600
As (Arsenic)	36.36	48.83	41.31	51.75	12.14	17.39
B (Boron)	159.60	233.00	140.20	179.80	213.80	311.20
Ba (Barium)	23.23	27.80	19.11	20.67	15.65	20.72
Be (Beryllium)	0.3770	0.4099	0.3328	0.3634	0.1744	0.2326
Ca (Calcium)	139200	207800	208500	338000	73450	114100
Cd (Cadmium)	0.992	3.008	0.850	3.070	0.193	0.717
Cl (Chloride)	21750	27570	24640	31210	10630	15180
Co (Cobalt)	16.19	51.95	20.49	86.21	6.13	18.38
Cr (Chromium)	6.65	7.41	5.58	6.65	1.38	1.96
Cu (Copper)	289.3	615.7	255.4	545.8	69.7	154.0
F (Fluoride)	1410.0	1742.0	1096.0	1384.0	201.2	319.2
Fe (Iron)	2157	4543	680	1186	1590	3132
K (Potassium)	28930	34580	30720	34690	9943	14060
Mg (Magnesium)	125300	155000	133000	160400	72330	134200
Mn (Manganese)	632	1033	549	922	589	1100
Na (Sodium)	75330	91750	84130	100500	24120	44120
Ni (Nickel)	232.3	629.2	301.0	1036.0	78.5	209.0
Pb (Lead)	40.29	52.78	41.80	52.43	6.54	10.00
Sb (Antimony)	9.698	13.760	11.100	17.010	2.837	5.877
Se (Selenium)	2.696	3.895	3.762	6.244	0.639	1.162
SO4 (Sulfate)	490600	670300	480800	585900	158800	282500
Tl (Thallium)	0.2239	0.2903	0.1689	0.1958	0.0646	0.1754
V (Vanadium)	8.995	9.446	7.126	8.573	2.105	3.054
Zn (Zinc)	117.40	219.60	81.12	198.70	15.63	43.27
TDS (Total Dissolved Solids, mg/L)	951.8	1230.0	1037.0	1271.0	456.5	682.8

(1) Estimate based on Reference (4) non-charged balanced water for Year 15

(2) Estimate based on Reference (4) non-charged balanced water for Year 25

(3) Estimate based on Reference (4) non-charged balanced water for Year 60

Large Table 10 WWTP Effluent – GoldSim Modeled Concentrations and Potential Water Quality Standards

Parameter (µg/L unless otherwise noted)	GoldSim Effluent Concentration	Surface Water			Groundwater	Drinking Water	
		M.R. 7052.0100 Class 2B (chronic standard)	M.R. 7050.0222 Class 2B (chronic standard)	M.R. 7050.0224 Class 4A (chronic standard)	Minn. Groundwater (HRL, HBV, or RAA)	Federal Standard, (Primary MCLs)	Federal Standard, (Secondary MCLs)
Metals/Inorganics							
Aluminum	125		**125**				50-200
Antimony	31		**31**		6	6.0	
Arsenic	10	53	(3)			**10.0**	
Barium	5				**2,000**	2,000	
Beryllium	4				0.08	**4.0**	
Boron	400			**500**	1,000		
Cadmium (1) (2)	2	**2.5**	(3)		4	5.0	
Chromium (+3)		86	(3)		20,000	100 (total)	
Chromium (+6)	11	**11**	(3)		100	100 (total)	
Cobalt	5		**5.0**				
Copper (1) (2)	9	**9.3**	(3)			1,300	1,000
Iron	300						**300**
Lead (1) (2)	3		**3.2**			15	
Manganese	50				100		**50**
Mercury		0.0013	(3)			2.0	
Nickel (1) (2)	50	**52**	(3)		100		
Selenium	5	**5.0**	(3)		30	50	
Silver	1		**1.0**		30		100
Thallium	0.56		**0.56**		0.6	2.0	
Zinc (1) (2)	100	**120**	(3)		2,000		5,000
General Parameters							
Ammonia (un-ionized)			40				
Bicarbonate (meq/L)				5			
Chloride (mg/L)	1.3		**230**				250
Cyanide (free)		5.2	(3)		100	200	
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)			>5.0				
Fluoride (mg/L)	0.05					4.0	**2.0**
Hardness (mg/L) (2)	100	**100**	100				
Nitrate (mg/L)					10	10	
Oil			500				
pH (su)			6.5-9.0	6.0-8.5			6.5-8.5
Sodium (% of cations)	2 (mg/L)			**60**			
Specific Conductance (uhmos/cm)				1,000			
Sulfate (mg/L) (2)	9			**10**			250
Total Dissolved Salts (mg/L)				700			500 (total dissolved solids)
Turbidity (NTU)			25				

Values in **bold** font indicate value used for Preliminary Water Quality Target.
(1) Surface water standard based on Hardness.
(2) GoldSim modeled concentration for Operations, Reclamation, and Long-Term Closure.
(3) Standard superseded by M.Rules 7052.0100, Class 2B standard.

Large Figures



Large Figure 1
Water Treatment
Overall Flow Sheet-Operations
NorthMet Project
Poly Met Mining, Inc.
Hoyt Lakes, MN

\\barr.com\projects\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C08 NorthMet WWTF\WorkFiles\Wastewater Mngmnt Plans\Mine Site\Figures\Figure-1-Operations.vsd
3/5/2013



\\barr.com\projects\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C08 NorthMet WWTF\WorkFiles\Wastewater Mngmnt Plans\Mine Site\Figures\Figure-2-Reclamation.vsd
3/5/2013

Large Figure 2
Water Treatment
Overall Flow Sheet-Reclamation
NorthMet Project
Poly Met Mining, Inc.
Hoyt Lakes, MN



Large Figure 3
Water Treatment
Overall Flow Sheet- Long-Term Closure
NorthMet Project
Poly Met Mining, Inc.
Hoyt Lakes, MN

\\barr.com\projects\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C08 NorthMet WWTF\WorkFiles\Wastewater Mngmnt Plans\Mine Site\Figures\Figure-3-Long Term Closure.vsd
3/5/2013

PETER MITCHELL OPEN PIT TACONITE MINE

T60 R13 Sec. 32
T60 R13 Sec. 33
T60 R13 Sec. 34
T60 R13 Sec. 35
T60 R13 Sec. 36
T59 R13 Sec. 5
T59 R13 Sec. 4
T59 R13 Sec. 3
T59 R13 Sec. 2
T59 R13 Sec. 1
T59 R12 Sec. 6
T59 R13 Sec. 8
T59 R13 Sec. 9
T59 R13 Sec. 10
T59 R13 Sec. 11
T59 R13 Sec. 12
T59 R12 Sec. 7
T59 R13 Sec. 17
T59 R13 Sec. 16
T59 R13 Sec. 15
T59 R13 Sec. 14
T59 R13 Sec. 13
T59 R12 Sec. 18

Yelp Creek
Partridge River
Partridge River
Stubble Creek

EAST PIT
CENTRAL PIT
CATEGORY 4 - REMOVED
CATEGORY 2/3 - REMOVED AND RECLAIMED
CATEGORY 1
WEST PIT
ORE SURGE PILE
CPS POND
MINE SITE FUELING & MAINTENANCE FACILITY
RAIL TRANSFER HOPPER
WWTF PONDS
WASTE WATER TREATMENT FACILITY
CENTRAL PUMPING STATION
OVERBURDEN STORAGE & LAYDOWN AREA
TREATED WATER PIPELINE
DUNKA ROAD

Mine Site
Open Stockpile
Covered Stockpile
Active Stockpile
Removed and Reclaimed Stockpile
Removed Stockpile
Mine Pits
Existing Private Railroad
Proposed Railroad Track

N

0 750 1,500 3,000
Feet

Large Figure 4
WWTF LOCATION
NorthMet Project
Poly Met Mining Inc.
Hoyt Lakes, MN

Barr Footer: ArcGIS 10.1, 2013-02-01 10:13 File: I:\Client\PolyMet_Mining\Work_Orders\Mine_Engineering_Assistance\Maps\Reports\Wastewater_Management_Plan\Large Figure 4 WWTF Location.mxd User: amr2



Barr Footer: ArcGIS 10.1, 2013-01-29 16:20 File: I:\Client\PolyMet_Mining\Work_Orders\Mine_Engineering_Assistance\Maps\Reports\Wastewater_Management_Plan\Large Figure 5 WWTP Location.mxd User: arm2

Containment System
Treated Water Discharge Pipe
Seepage Water Pipe
Flotation Tailings Pipeline
Hydrometallurgical Residue Pipeline
Drainage Flow Direction
*The drainage swale drains stormwater away from the toe of the dam.

0 2,000 4,000
Feet

Large Figure 5
WWTP LOCATION
NorthMet Project
Poly Met Mining Inc.
Hoyt Lakes, MN