

**For Immediate Release**

December 14, 2020

Contact: Jeremy Drucker (612) 670-9650

# SAVE THE BOUNDARY WATERS

**ICYMI:**

**[Star Tribune Looks at Twin Metals Water Claims](#)**

**ELY, MN--**Yesterday the Star Tribune published a deep look into Chilean mining giant Antofagasta's Twin Metals project and some of the mining company's claims about how it would prevent toxic pollution from flowing into the Boundary Waters. The answer is not reassuring. Twin Metals is essentially promising to do what has never been done before, with the fate of the Boundary Waters at risk. Multiple independent mining experts were quoted in the news story, and none of them were confident Twin Metals could accomplish what it is promising.

"A proposed Twin Metals mine next to the Boundary Waters is unacceptably risky," **said Tom Landwehr, Executive Director of the Campaign to Save the Boundary Waters.** "This is the wrong location for a sulfide-ore copper mine; any mine next to the Boundary Waters would cause the loss of the exceptional economic, ecological, and recreational benefits that the Wilderness provides. This news story highlights the deep flaws in the dangerous plan for a Twin Metals mine, and explains accurately the impossibility of a risk-free, toxic discharge-free sulfide-ore mine next to America's most significant lakeland Wilderness. We must protect this priceless Wilderness before it is too late."

The US Forest Service determined in 2016 that the Twin Metals project posed an unacceptable risk of irreparable harm to the Boundary Waters, and that finding has never been refuted.

Mining companies often promise one thing during the permitting process that fails to match the actual performance of the mines. As the story notes:

Twin Metals could have the best of intentions, Kuipers [a mining expert] said, but mining companies and regulators have a poor record of predicting water-quality impacts.

In 2006, Kuipers and colleagues [studied 25 U.S. mines](#), their environmental impact statements and their spill track records. Of the 15 mines predicted to have low impacts on surface water and groundwater, at least 70% wound up significantly violating water quality standards, accidentally releasing toxic metals.

A new [report](#) on Alaska's five major operating mines, released in March by the environmental group Earthworks, showed all five had major spills and other accidental releases.

Guy Archibald, a staff scientist on mining with the Southeast Alaska Conservation Council, said a large mine will have adverse effects on nearby waters no matter how responsible a company tries to be.

"If I had to sum up the history of the mining industry," Archibald said, "It would be, 'Whoops, we didn't see that happening.' "

You can read the entire piece [here](#).