

Joy Brewer

From: Nancy Warren <nwarren1@earthlink.net>
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2017 12:50 PM
To: Joy Brewer
Subject: SB 129

Please share with committee members

For more than 2 weeks I have been trying to clarify provisions of SB 129 to no avail. Although SB 129 passed the Senate with amendments, my concerns still have not been addressed.

Senator Casperson has been quoted in the local newspapers that within Ontonagon County, *"investors are preparing to site the first mine permitted by this legislation"*

As a resident of Ontonagon County, I would like to know where this will be. What impact will the copper mine have on nearby property values? What about noise / truck traffic / light pollution? Would any legislator who supports this bill want a "small" mine that produces up to 75,000 tons of waste in their backyard?

Amendment offered by Sen. Rebekah Warren (D) on March 9, 2017 To require that mining permit applicants must describe characteristics of the waste rock and mine tailings removed in the mining process.

Amendment offered by Sen. Rebekah Warren (D) on March 9, 2017 To require a public hearing on a proposed mining operation.

Both amendments failed.

The bill as written excludes small copper mines from the requirements of Part 632 and therefore:

- Removes local government from regulating, controlling the mining activities
- Eliminates the requirement for an Environmental Impact Statement
- Eliminates Public Meetings
- Eliminates any plan that will minimize actual/potential adverse impacts on natural resources
- Removes the requirement that companies disclose materials, methods and techniques that will be used
- Removes the provision for prevention, control & monitoring of acid-forming waste products that could leach into groundwater
- Removes the requirement for a contingency plan which includes an assessment of the risk to the environment or public health

Also, the bill specifically states that 10 acres or less can be mined in a calendar year as long as they stay below 75,000 tons of waste rock in a year. I would like clarification that if a company has mineral rights for a large tract of land, will that company be permitted to mine 10 acres one year, then 10 acres next year (providing they pay the necessary permitting fees) and still be considered a small mine under SB 129?

For these reasons, I cannot support SB 129 as written.

Nancy Warren
PO Box 102

Ewen, MI 49925
906 988 2892