Jeff

While the DEP and BEP have worked on this issue, it is still full of holes that cause great concern. You have the unenviable task of making a week set of rules, to strengthen a broken statute. During the past four years I have watched as this all unfolded. I have testified each time to try to advance the State Of Maine in protecting the environment with concerns to the Water, Air, Habitat, Public Safety and pollution of off site contaminant's from Metallic Mining.

The DEP has made an attempt to appease the some 400 plus comments on the dangers of the week rules and poor statute, yet it fails to protect the waters of Maine and protect the public with your changes. I would like to see a list of all the suggested changes and those that you have adopted and taken to heart from LD 1853 to present day. Many who have commented as I have and testified have extensively researched this subject and have contributed to our awareness of the dangers associated with Metallic Mining in Maine.

Not only have you Stream lined the permitting process as John Martin so elegantly phrased it but you have caved into all the request of the Mining industry and ignored Best Science, Best Management, Best Practices available.

I have read the Chapter 200 revision and find it inadequate to protect the waters of Maine and the public health let alone the economy of Maine. Glossed over by words of promise and vague unrealistic expectations of obtaining sufficient financial compensation for a worst case scenario. How can we predict the cost of Maine's waters when they are contaminated from upstream waste storage. How can we compensate the families who will loose their children from contamination and families washed away due to Tailings dam breaches. Once the cat is out of the bag there is no reclamation, sedimentation will endure long after we are gone and our children's children, will eat the arsenic and mercury that will be our legacy.

Our 1991 rules didn't allow the contamination of the streams and rivers, lakes and ponds it was Prohibited. Our class A and AA waters were not allowed to be degraded. Furthermore drinking water standards are not good enough for the Biota of the river that feed the invertebrates and our Salmon and Trout. Copper at drinking water standard may also be a limiting factor for trout and Salmon that spawn in the streams of Maine.

Commenting only on those revisions would be giving credence to those not mentioned. I will not condone the allowance of denigration of waters in a mining site. The poorly researched use of wet cover to protect reactive materials will ultimately contaminate our neighbors down stream. Financial requirements are insufficient and don't address the underlying problem of leaving the public on the hook for Millions and a destroyed economic future of Maine.

The DEP continues to erode the protection of our waters of Maine. The direct refusal of the will of the people of Maine will not go unnoticed. To address these rules gives a twice rejected industries' designed Rules/Statue which fails to protect the waters of Maine credence and does nothing to protect the environment.

Please revise these rules using the advise of Dr. Chambers who has already predicted major mining design faults around the world including Maine's own Bald Mt. One thing I have learned from a safety aspect is, if you can fill out the accident form and show the cause of the accident you can work towards its prevention. I have read the reports that were made available to you I advise you do the same.

https://www.earthworksaction.org/files/pubs-others/BowkerChambers-RiskPublicLiability_EconomicsOfTailingsStorageFacility%20Failures-23Jul15.pdf

I will suggest that you address the problem of the loss of public confidence in providing good direction for a Statue that is at fault for these rules, that are not addressing the problem. Please allow comments not on point as they are relevant to the pursuit of environmental protection.

Craig Terrell Affected Area cterrell51@yahoo.com T13 R8 c/o Portage lake ME 04768