Anne Uehling

As someone who wrote an article almost ten years ago, published in MINPost, about the relationship between mercury, sulfate and wild rice, I find it incomprehensible that MPCA is still trying to get around the 10ppm standard. Politicians and industry were trying to overturn the standard then, pushing to allow as high as 50 ppm. The legislature funded a University of Minnesota study, which to their disappointment affirmed the 10 ppm standard.

At that time, too, a survey of babies born along the north shore showed a worrisome percentage of infants with unacceptable levels of mercury in their bodies, a condition threatening normal brain development.

The newly MPCA proposed "Site-Specific Standards" offers one more back door to sulfate pollution.

The proposed permitting plan does not provide a credible definition of criteria. How large a body of water with rice growing in it would be automatically excluded from a site specific permit being issued? What would be the criteria for which rice areas could be sacrificed?

What would be the standard for run off or connecting link to another body of water or stream?

The claim iron is a sufficient ameliorator has been disproven. (See research, S. LaFond-Hudson, Iron sulfide formation on root surfaces controlled by the life cycle of wild rice, Biogeochem. (2018))

I urge the MPCA to act in accordance with the words "pollution control" that are part of the agency name rather than act to expand the perimeters of allowable pollution.
Anne Stewart Uehling
Ely, MN