



September 19, 2007

Mining Company Lobbied Hard in U.P., Lansing Opponents say it influences permitting process, lawmakers say 'Not so'

By [Glenn Puit](#)

Great Lakes Bulletin News Service

As a large, Utah-based mining company's push for permission to [dig a sulfide mine directly beneath an unspoiled Upper Peninsula trout stream](#) heads for hearings in Lansing today, many opponents of the project wonder whether the state agency considering the company's application is actually listening to their concerns.



Riverwalker

The firm, Kennecott Minerals Company, claims that its proposal to extract nickel and copper embedded in sulfur 1,000 feet directly beneath the Upper Peninsula's Salmon Trout River will provide badly needed jobs for the region without harming the environment. But many green organizations that either helped write (see sidebar) or subsequently praised the state's new regulatory regime say that if officials are even considering the idea of mining sulfide beneath a river—where any accidental mixing water, oxygen, and sulfur would produce what the company calls "dilute" sulfuric acid—something is awry.

The Salmon Trout River winds through miles of untouched Upper Peninsula forests.

An investigation by the *Great Lakes Bulletin News Service* indicates that Kennecott has staged a well-crafted, pervasive, and entirely legal campaign to sell its project to the communities near the mine, and lobbied members of Michigan Governor Jennifer M. Granholm's administration and lawmakers whose districts are in the Upper Peninsula.

But the investigation also revealed another activity that, while legal, is shrouded in secrecy. Kennecott donated cash to non-profit organizations controlled by the state Democratic and Republican parties, but refuses to reveal the amount.

Unlike traditional campaign contributions, donations to these organizations—known as 501 (c) 3's, 501 (c) 4's, or 527's—are unregulated in Michigan; individuals and companies can

give to them, even when operated by political parties or elected officials, without disclosing them.

Richard Robinson, director of Michigan's Campaign Finance Network, said secrecy around donations to political non-profits—a practice recently investigated by the *Detroit Free Press*—is common in Michigan, and he takes a dim view of it.

"If they wanted to be transparent, they wouldn't skulk around to a non-profit," Mr. Robinson asserted. He described the type of donation that Kennecott and other companies and individuals now make to political non-profits as "truly an insidious development."

The information vacuum around the practice makes it difficult to discern how much influence, if any, such donations have on public policy. However, something else is easy to discern: Even in the face of widespread opposition to the project in communities near the proposed mine, only one U.P. lawmaker joined former Governor William Milliken—who called the project "a terrible idea for the Great Lakes"—in opposing it: U.S. Representative Bart Stupak.

All but one other official the *Great Lakes Bulletin News Service* interviewed for this article refused to take sides, saying that it's up to the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality to administer the new regulations and decide the issue. That official, Representative Tom Casperson, of Escanaba, unreservedly supports the project.

Engaging a Community

It is now clear that Kennecott knew that there might be stiff resistance to the mine, which the firm calls the Eagle Project. So the company, owned by Rio Tinto, a large, London-based mining company, set out to win the support of local residents and local and state leaders and lawmakers.

Kennecott established its Eagle Project Community Relations plan, which targeted local residents who would have a stake in the mine's success, including civic and political leaders. The company's goal, according to its own documents, is "to make meaningful, long-term contributions to the surrounding communities, which would in turn provide the company benefits in business and social standing."

Kennecott identified and engaged local political groups with legislative clout, regulatory government agencies, environmental groups, and business, labor, and charitable organizations. It placed large ads in Marquette's daily newspaper and ran a heavy schedule of well-produced TV commercials, some featuring two professors from nearby Michigan Technological University, which Kennecott has financially supported in the past. The company has also donated to local charitable groups and to Veterans Memorial Park, in Champion, which is near the proposed mine site.

"We partner with different entities," Mr. Cherry said. We do not want to be perceived as just writing checks."

But Dick Huey, co-founder of Save the Wild U.P., a citizen group leading opposition to the mine, said he believes Kennecott's public relations is aimed at convincing local residents that there is not much that can be done to stop the proposal.

"It's a constant drumbeat of spin," Mr. Huey said, "trying to say that sulfide mining is really no different than iron mining, and of course it is."

"I think it has had an impact," he added. "The mining company is trying to give the impression that this is a done deal: 'They've got too much money—you can't fight them.'"

Just how well that part of Kennecott's campaign is working is uncertain. Mr. Huey said that opposition to the sulfide mine is intense throughout the Upper Peninsula. He noted that, at last week's public on the mine in Marquette, citizens spoke against the project in "overwhelming" numbers. He added that 96 percent of residents of Big Bay, where the mine would be dug, signed a petition opposing it. This week, he added, 117 physicians from the Marquette area signed a document opposing the mine.

'Every Right to Move Forward'

Kennecott now appears on the verge of getting a permit from the DEQ under the auspices of Michigan's new sulfide mining law. DEQ officials say they pushed for establishing that law (the state had no sulfide mining regulations) soon after Kennecott discovered the large nickel and copper deposits in the west-central Upper Peninsula. In 2004 the agency convened, with the governor's blessing, a task force including mining representatives, environmental groups, trade unions, academics, and state legislators (see sidebar on right).

When their handiwork was done, task force members said the law could help grow Michigan's economy and protect its ecology. But even with the environmental groups who helped write the new rules up in arms over the Eagle Project, and opposition booming among local residents, local elected leaders are reluctant to favor or oppose it.

For example, state Senator Mike Lahti (D-Hancock) said he generally views the mine as a positive development if Kennecott can follow the state's new law, while state Senator Mike Prusi, (D-Ishpeming) said that the new law was a positive development for the state and noted that environmental groups fully supported the task force's endeavor.

Governor Granholm's spokesperson, Liz Boyd, said that her boss "has directed the DEQ to insure that Kennecott's application meets or exceeds all requirements" of the new law.

Similar refrains can be found throughout the Democratic Party. Freshman state Representative Steve Lindberg, (D-Marquette), who is clearly pained by the proposal and acknowledges feeling pressure at home to oppose it, said that he has to "depend on the process, which seems like it works."

Joe Agostinelli, a spokesman for state Senator Jason Allen (R-Traverse City), who represents part of the U.P., said his boss is deferring to the DEQ, adding that if Kennecott follows the rules "they have every right to move forward."

Lobbying in Lansing

Whether such caution is out of respect to the approval process embedded in the new sulfide mining law or is due to something else is unclear. Legislators quite often critique state agencies; for example, some state Republican lawmakers have frequently and sometimes bitterly attacked some state agencies' decisions since Democratic Governor Granholm took office and appointed new department directors.

What is certain is that Kennecott has complimented its U.P. campaign with extensive lobbying in Lansing. This is not unusual; environmental groups also engage in extensive lobbying there.

Kennecott is active in Michigan's federal and state politics. For example, at the federal level, the company donated approximately \$10,000 to Michigan U.S. Representative John Dingell over the past six years. Mr. Cherry said any campaign donations to Dingell were not related to the mine.

Virtually all of the Upper Peninsula's legislators, with the exception of Congressman Stupak and state Senator Lahti, have accepted free food and beverage from Kennecott's high-profile lobbyist, Governmental Consultant Services Inc., also known as GCSI. According to Secretary of State records, Kennecott spent \$53,997 on statewide lobbying expenses on behalf of Kennecott in recent years. The lobbying firm did not return a phone call seeking comment for this story.

State records filed by GCSI show it had steady access to Michigan's political leaders and executive office staff over the last four years. And, the *News Service* confirmed, when GCSI officials lobbied U.P. legislators, Kennecott's sulfide mine was a topic of conversation.

According to state records, Representative Casperson, and Senators Allen and Prusi accepted free food and beverage from GCSI while being lobbied. The value of those items ranged from \$731 to \$1,170 per legislator from 2003 to 2006. The legislators deny the lobbying had any influence on their public positions on the mine.

State Representative Lindberg, who apparently has not been in office long enough for lobbying recordings about him to show up in state records, portrayed Lansing as overrun with lobbyists, and said he has reservations about accepting freebies. But he is also adamant that a free dinner is not going to influence his position on an issue.

"I've talked to GCSI about the mine," the representative said. "I've talked to the Sierra Club about the mine as well. Have I gone out to dinner with lobbyists? Unfortunately, it is a way of life down here."

Many members of the Governor Granholm's staff have also met with GCSI on the issue. GCSI has spent about \$1,064 on food and beverages on that top circle of state government since 2003.

Save the Wild U.P.'s Mr. Huey said he's convinced lobbying and behind the scenes

politicking caused Michigan's political leaders to abandon their responsibility to protect the pristine area in Marquette County where the mine would be located from industrial encroachment.

"I do have the feeling it has influenced public policy," he said. "I think the governor has also somehow been influenced to go off in a different direction than what were her prior campaign positions."

Insuring the Process

Spokesperson Cherry said his company has been evenhanded and bipartisan in donating to political non-profits, in what he said was "the interest of insuring good legislative process, so the process is understood and explained to everyone fairly."

But Kennecott refuses to say how much it gave to either party through that unregulated route. Meanwhile, a spokesman for the Michigan Democratic Party confirmed that Kennecott gave the party \$1,000 for administration expenses, but was unable to answer whether or not the money arrived via the party's non-profit fund.

A spokesman for the Michigan Republican Party did not return two phone calls for this story.

A spokesman for Ms. Granholm said the governor has not accepted any money from Kennecott, while Senator Lindberg said he didn't even know Kennecott had given to his party until he was asked about it for this article.

Mr. Cherry said Kennecott lobbies because it wants its voice heard in the political process.

"We're very conscientious of making sure that it is done on an equal basis," Mr. Cherry said. "We are not interested in influencing one side or the other."

(Veteran investigative journalist Glenn Puit is the Michigan Land Use Institute's Emmet County policy specialist. Reach him at glenn@mlui.org)

www.mlui.org



September 14, 2007

Will State Allow Sulfide Mining Under U.P. River? Green groups fear DEQ may ignore law they helped write

By [Glenn Puit](#)

Great Lakes Bulletin News Service

MARQUETTE—When a Utah mining company first proposed [digging a sulfide mine directly underneath the Salmon Trout River](#) in Michigan's Upper Peninsula five years ago, Michigan had no rules that could guide a decision about whether to allow such a thing.



Bill Kinjorski

So, encouraged by Governor Jennifer M. Granholm's administration, a group of union officials, environmentalists, Upper Peninsula politicians, state environmental officials, and representatives of the mining company, Kennecott Minerals, together crafted rules for sulfide mining in Michigan. When they finished and the rules became law in 2004, the parties claimed it would protect Michigan's environment, allow the revival of the Upper Peninsula's once-mighty mining industry, and boost the state's faltering economy.

Kennecott Minerals wants to mine sulfide under the Salmon Trout River, which is home to the endangered coaster brook trout.

But now that Kennecott appears close to getting what it wanted in the first place—permission to dig a sulfide mine beneath a world-class trout stream—opposition to the proposal has exploded in this Lake Superior city, which is roughly 30 miles from the mine site. A local citizen group, Save the Wild U.P., and a coalition of environmental groups, including the National Wildlife Federation, Sierra Club, and the Michigan Environmental Council, are fighting hard to stop it.

These groups, which supported the new law when it was written, say that they are now very frustrated with the state for indicating that it intends to approve the new application despite the fact that sulfur forms dangerous sulfuric acid if it is mixed with water and oxygen.

They maintain that the major reason the company has been allowed to proceed with its plans so far is that the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, which enforces the law, seems unwilling to use it to say no to Kennecott.

"For the most part it's a good law, but a law is only as good as its implementation, and that is where Michigan is failing miserably," said Michelle Halley, an attorney for the National Wildlife Federation who helped construct the law.

The DEQ has promised an independent, thorough review of Kennecott's application. The department, which has issued a preliminary decision that Kennecott's application appears to meet the requirements for a mining permit, disputes assertions that it is not properly implementing the law.

"We will make the best decision possible," DEQ spokesman Robert McCann promised. "Our team was put together for that sole purpose, to make as thorough a recommendation as possible, and what is technically the most right decision isn't always the most popular."

The DEQ is expected to make a final decision on the permit later this fall. Opponents, meanwhile, are encouraging people to attend either of next Wednesday's DEQ public hearings in Lansing on Kennecott's mining permit. The hearings, at the Lansing Center, are from 1 to 4:30 p.m. and 6 to 9:30 p.m. The agency is also accepting written comments from the public through October 17.

'A Terrible Place'

The proposed mine would be dug very near to Big Bay, a sleepy, rural, and charming town west of here, near the Superior shoreline. The area is known as the Yellow Dog Plains—a largely untouched wilderness on the edge of 576,000 acres of undeveloped timberlands. Kennecott wants to dig the mine to a point nearly 1,000 feet directly below the Salmon Trout River, where the company found significant deposits of valuable nickel and copper embedded in sulfide. Although the firm will not say how much the ore deposit is worth, many estimates of its value run into the billions of dollars. ([See Page 2 of this article for much more background.](#))

Mine opponents argue that the river itself is literally priceless. They point out that the river is a spawning ground for the endangered coaster brook trout and that the mine is just a few miles upstream from Lake Superior. So, they argue, a sulfuric acid release, known as acid mine drainage, could erase the trout population and significantly harm Lake Superior's ecosystem. They say that these are just a few of the many reasons why, according to a petition opponents circulated, 96 percent of Big Bay's residents oppose the project, even though Marquette County, where both Marquette and Big Bay are located, has an unemployment rate of about 6 percent.

Those against the mine also object on broader grounds as well; they say that Kennecott's mining operation would, among other things, transform one of the state's most remote and unspoiled areas into a heavily industrialized site and generate a great deal of heavy truck traffic.

What most baffles opponents, however, is what they see as a lack of basic common sense about where and where not to put a sulfide mine. Or, as one of the mine's most prominent

opponents, former Governor William G. Milliken, puts it: "What a terrible place for a mine."

The opponents' biggest fear is that the mine could collapse. If it did, they argue, it would drastically change the Salmon Trout River's geography forever.

That fear may not be far fetched: Last year, persistent inquiries by mining opponents revealed that the DEQ had failed to release a scientific analysis, one that it contracted, that said such a collapse was indeed possible. The DEQ insisted that it did not intentionally withhold the study, which is public information. Kennecott disputes the findings, which said that the mine's crown pillar, which supports the mine's ceiling, could be vulnerable.

Kennecott's project manager for the mine, [Jonathan Cherry, said the project has been meticulously designed to protect the environment](#). When asked if there was any chance the river could collapse into a mine dug directly beneath it, Mr. Cherry insisted there was little, if any chance such a catastrophe could happen.

"What I can say is that with the modeling we have done and the samples we have collected and engineering designs that we've put together," he said, "we are as confident as we can be that the river will not collapse into the mine."

Fear of 'Takings'

According to the National Wildlife Federation's Ms. Halley, the group of representatives that she worked with to write the new sulfide mining regulations did discuss a ban on sulfide mining in sensitive areas. But, she said, industry representatives convinced state officials that the law could not restrict the location of a mine without opening the state up to litigation.

The industry argued that, if the state forbid a company to mine in a specific location that it owned or had a financial interest in, that firm could sue the state in what is known as "takings" litigation—suits that seek compensation for a landowner prevented from using their property in the way that they wish. Ms. Halley said that, when told this, state officials were not willing to put restrictions on the actual siting of any mine.

"The industry made comments about 'takings' litigation, that it felt it would get the state into trouble," she said. "I think the state became intimidated by that."

The DEQ's own Web site essentially confirms Ms. Halley's theory.

"Some people have advocated for 'siting criteria,' which would prohibit issuance of a permit for mining in certain categories of environmentally sensitive lands," a question-and-answer feature about the new sulfide mining regulations says. "However, such a categorical denial on private land would almost certainly subject the State of Michigan to a claim for a taking of property. Under the U.S. and Michigan Constitutions, the State cannot take private property without compensation—in other words, the State would have

to pay full market value for the property, plus legal costs."

Yet Mr. McCann, the DEQ's spokesman, said that the mine's location is considered in the permitting process in other ways.

"The location does play a role in issues such as, can the water quality be protected," he said.

But Jim Olson, a Traverse City-based lawyer noted for his environmental litigation, particularly around water issues, believes the state is giving way too much legal consideration to the threat of a takings lawsuit. He said that Michigan laws, in addition to protecting private property rights, also strongly emphasizes the public's interest in protecting state lands as well—which would include the river, the public land it flows through, and Lake Superior.

"It is affecting public policy and good judgment," Mr. Olson said of the takings threat.

Mr. Olson added that, if the DEQ and state leaders stopped worrying about being sued and instead stood up to protect such vulnerable places like the Salmon Trout River, it would eventually prevail, even if Kennecott is a very large company with tremendous financial resources.

"The DEQ is not standing up for the sovereign rights of water in the state's most critical time," Mr. Olson said. "If the state would assert its sovereign interest, it would have broader powers."

Wisconsin's Challenge

One state that is considered a model for strict regulations on sulfide mining is Wisconsin, which many say has effectively instituted a moratorium on sulfide mining by requiring a mining company to demonstrate that prior sulfide mines have not polluted.

But Ms. Halley and another mine opponent, Cynthia Pryor of the Yellow Dog Watershed Preserve, said that when the law was being written, the DEQ and the mining industry made clear that there was not going to be a law in Michigan that mirrored the Wisconsin law.

"What Wisconsin did was put in place a permit law that basically says, 'If you want to mine for sulfides in Wisconsin you have to find other mines anywhere that either ran for 10 years or were reclaimed for 10 years that did not have acid mine drainage or heavy metals discharge,'" Ms. Pryor said. "'Prove it. If you find three, you can start the process here.'

"We tried to implement kind of a 'prove it first' philosophy here," she recalled, "and we were told at the very first meeting when we went to talk about the statute that, if you are here to talk about a Wisconsin-like moratorium, forget it."

She added that a DEQ deputy director essentially said, "We are here to do legislation for underground mining. We are not here to do a moratorium."

Environmental groups have since written a letter to the DEQ urging it to allow an independent investigation to determine whether there is an underlying "corporate culture in the (DEQ's) Office of Geological Survey" that is undermining "state policy governing metallic mining as set out by the new law." So far, the DEQ has refused to do so.

(Click [here](#) to read more background on the mine proposal, the area where it would be built, and problems associated with sulfide mining. On Tuesday the Great Lakes Bulletin News Service will report on how Kennecott's lobbying efforts may have affected officials' views on their proposal. Glenn Puit, a veteran investigative reporter, is the Michigan Land Use Institute's Emmet County policy specialist. Reach him at glenn@mlui.org

www.mlui.org



September 14, 2007

Industrializing the Wild U.P.

By [Glenn Puit](#)

Great Lakes Bulletin News Service

The Salmon Trout River is a place of natural peace.

If you visit the river, which is on the Yellow Dog Plains, near Marquette, you will likely hear nothing but the wind, the sounds of water, or maybe, in the distance, thunder rumbling over the vast wilderness. The plains are part of 576,000 acres of undeveloped timberlands, and are near the edge of the McCormick Wilderness—a remarkable stretch of 17,280 acres of untouched, natural landscape.

But if state officials allow a Utah mining company, Kennecott Minerals, to bore a sulfide mine directly underneath the river there, environmentalists say it will transform a portion of the area's natural beauty into a heavily industrialized site.

"We don't believe this is an appropriate spot for a large-scale industrial development," said Marvin Roberson Jr., a forestry specialist with the Sierra Club. "We would be opposed to a Holiday Inn at this location, or anything else that would cause the level of traffic and development that is proposed with this."

Kennecott, a subsidiary of mining industry international giant Rio Tinto, of London, is planning to build the mine on a 90-to-100 acre site on the Yellow Dog that is accessible by gravel roads from Big Bay. The mine, known as the Eagle Project, would involve both state and private land.

Jonathan Cherry, project manager for Kennecott, said the mining can be done safely. In an interview with the *Great Lakes Bulletin News Service*, he claimed that every aspect of the mine has been designed to protect the environment.

"We believe it can absolutely be done safely both from a human health perspective and also with the environment," Mr. Cherry said. "One of the things that I think (has been) lost in the debate is that we are very sensitive and aware of the environmental



MLUI

Leakage from sulfide or "acid" mining is highly toxic and fatal to wildlife

implications, but at the same time you have to remember that we are going to have people underground there. It has to be safe for the people."

Kennecott gained access to the lands through the leasing and purchasing of more than 500,000 acres of mineral rights from private entities and the state. The private purchase of the mineral rights was made from Ford Minerals. The state lease of mineral rights unfolded through the Department of Natural Resources under the administration of former Michigan Governor John Engler.

Noted environmental lawyer James Olson said the decision by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources to lease out the land in the first place was not wise, and triggered the proposal for the mine.

"Those are the decisions, the flaw that underlies all of this," Mr. Olson said. "What is going on with the State of Michigan is that they don't have the sense of what they have in the Upper and Lower Peninsula—that this could even be leased for mining to begin with. They could have simply said no, and they don't have to give any reason for it. It's a violation of the public trust of Michigan."

Once the mineral rights were secured, Kennecott performed an extensive search and found an extremely valuable chunk of nickel and copper stretching underneath the Salmon Trout.

"We have been looking for metallic mineral deposits in this area for quite some time, over a decade," Mr. Cherry said. "It was in 2002, through some geophysical techniques and through an actual hole in the ground, that we discovered an ore body up here."

The chunk of rock the company wants to extract is about 85 percent nickel and 15 percent copper. Kennecott won't say how much the nickel and copper are worth, but most believe the ore body, if retrieved, is worth a staggering amount of money.

"I've heard estimates from \$1.5 billion as of four years ago to \$13 billion," said the Sierra Club's Mr. Roberson. "It's clearly a significant, gigantic ore body. They (Kennecott) are the only ones who have the data."

Mr. Cherry said any amount of minerals mined from the state-owned portion of the mine site would earn royalties for the state's natural resources fund, but would not say how much the company expects to profit.

"As a company policy we don't disclose the profit that would come from it," Cherry said. "Obviously, if it didn't make money, we wouldn't be doing it."

"When the ore body is put into production, those minerals that come from the half that are leased from the state, we actually have to pay a royalty to the state," Cherry said. "It could be anywhere from \$25 to \$50 million."

Kennecott said the mine will generate about 120 fulltime jobs that will last for about a decade.

"Our goal is to have at least 75 percent local hire," Mr. Cherry said. "A combination of hourly jobs to management jobs everything from mechanics to underground miners to truck drivers to engineers and scientists."

The jobs will offer an average salary of \$40,000 not including benefits. This is a fine wage in Marquette, but critics say the short life span of the mine will perpetuate another boom-to-bust mining cycle in the Upper Peninsula.

Complicating the issue is the fact that the nickel and copper are encased in sulfur. This means that when the minerals are removed from the ground, the process can result in the production of a dilute form of sulfuric acid.

Mr. Cherry contends the mining can be done safely even if it involves sulfur. He said the industrial site would include environmental control facilities and "liner" systems to contain any possible acid leakage. The site would also include a 10-million gallon water treatment plant. A sloped tunnel will lead to the ore.

"It will be brought to the surface, it will be put into trucks and shipped off site to a railhead, and at that point it will go to a processing facility," Mr. Cherry said. "There is no processing of ore material on site. This is essentially an underground rock quarry."

But opponents say their concerns are significant. The biggest one seems to be the feeling that the operation would threaten the plains' beauty and peace: Besides the mine head instillation, Kennecott's plans calls for massive trucks coming and going from the rural site approximately 40 times per day.

Another fear is that the mine could cause the river to collapse, a possibility that one scientific analysis of the area said should be taken seriously. The DEQ, which will decide as early as next month whether to issue a permit for the mine, originally failed to release documents concerning that possible collapse. The agency said the withholding was an accident.

In addition, the river is home to the coaster brook trout, a fish species that has seen dramatic declines in its population.

"There is a very high potential for contamination of groundwater," said Michelle Halley, an attorney fighting the mine on behalf of the National Wildlife Federation. "The concerns about the water are very important. The potential for drawdown (of pollution) in the wetlands and the river are very real. So far, that's something the company hasn't event acknowledged."

A map of Kennecott's acquired mineral rights shows it owns or leases mineral rights to vast amounts of the Upper Peninsula—more than 500,000 acres. Ms. Halley believes that

if the mine in Big Bay is approved by the DEQ, then more are likely come.

"It's very clear this is the first of many prospects they would like to develop," Ms. Halley said. "We are looking at a big change in the quality of life in the U.P. if this occurs, and a big change in how the U.P. views ourselves and how the rest of the world views us."

and more here.

[The Michigan Department of Environmental Quality Web site has much more information on the sulfide mine proposal, known as the Kennecott Eagle Project.](#)

Traverse City-area opponents of Kennecott's proposed sulfide mine beneath the Salmon Trout River are will gather at the Hagerty Center, 715 E. Front Street in Traverse City, on Friday, Sept. 28, at 5:30 p.m. Music will be provided by Joshua Davis of the band Steppin' In It

[Save the Wild U.P., a group opposed to the Salmon Trout River mining proposal, has posted a form letter asking the DEQ to deny Kennecott Minerals' Permit Application here.](#)

The Michigan Department of Environmental Quality is accepting written comments about the proposal through Oct. 17. Send them to:

DEQ/DNR Kennecott Comments
Office of Geological Survey
P.O. Box 30256
Lansing, Michigan 48909-7756
Comments can also be sent by e-mail to DEQ-Kennecott-comments@michigan.gov

For more information contact:

Michelle Halley
National Wildlife Federation
Attorney and Lake Superior Project Manager
P.O. Box 914
Marquette, MI, 49855
michelle.halley@sbcglobal.net

Jonathan Cherry
Project Manager
Kennecott Minerals' Eagle Project
Phone: 906-475-9732 or 801-238-2495

James Olson
Attorney
Olson, Bzdok and Howard
Phone: 231-946-0044

Cynthia Pryor
Executive Director
Yellow Dog Watershed Preserve
P.O. Box 5
Big Bay, MI, 49808
Phone: 906-345-9223
cpryor@isp.com

www.mlui.org