Mining in Maine: Characterization of Public Perceptions
Investigator Report

To

The Maine Water Resources Research Institute

By
Andrew Morgan
Dr. Sandra De Urioste-Stone

2017

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

List of Appendices

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge Dr. John Daigle, Dr. Jean MacRae, Dr. Amanda Olsen, Lydia Horne and students from the spring 2016 environmental attitudes and behaviors course for help with survey design and question development. This study is supported by the National Institutes for Water Resources administered through the Senator George J. Mitchell Center, the Center for Research on Sustainable Forests and the USDA NIFA, McIntire Stennis project ME041504.

About the Authors

Andrew Morgan is a Graduate Research Assistant in the School of Forest Resources at the University of Maine. Born and raised in Maine, he is currently pursuing a MS in ecology and environmental sciences where he focuses on the human dimensions of natural resources. He earned his B.S. in Parks, Recreation and Tourism from the University of Maine. Andrew has been responsible for much of the data collection, study design, analysis, and reporting for this study.

Dr. Sandra De Urioste-Stone is Assistant Professor of Nature-based Tourism in the School of Forest Resources, University of Maine, USA. She earned a BA in ecotourism, MS in resource recreation and tourism, and PhD in natural resources with emphasis on conservation social sciences. Dr. De Urioste-Stone has done extensive work on sustainable tourism, community-based tourism, human dimensions of biodiversity conservation, and sustainable development (including adaptation to global changes, food security, and community-based public health interventions). Her work has included research projects with Maya indigenous groups. Being a Guatemala native, most of her work has been in Latin America. She has had experience working for environmental NGOs and universities in Central America. She has focused extensively on promoting knowledge to action approaches to science.

SECTION A

1. Executive Summary

As new locations for mining activities are sought, some regions with limited recent metallic mineral mining (MMM) history and expertise find themselves grappling with the issues which surround mining activities. Since 2012, Maine found itself in this situation after renewed interest in one of the state's largest metal containing deposits spurred the legislature to revise its MMM laws. Now in 2017, the debate continues demonstrating the importance of a social license to operate. A social license refers to the acceptance or approval of mining operations by local communities and other stakeholders, who can affect the profitability of those operations. This public acceptance or social license to operate, is influenced by risk perceptions, trust in governance structures, and weighing of benefits over costs. With nine mining bills introduced during the 128th legislative session, gaining an understanding of the public's risk perceptions on MMM in the state is both timely and critical.

It is the aim of this study to determine Maine residents' perceptions of metallic mineral mining and the requirements needed for conflict resolution of this current policy debate. Researchers have sought to identify major debate themes utilizing publicly available secondary data including public hearing testimonies and newspaper articles between 2012 and 2017. With additional funding, a mail survey which was not part of the proposal was also implemented to gather opinions from a wider audience of Maine residents. A total of 501 residents from across the state responded to this survey. WRRI funding was used to conduct an online survey which, due to a small response rate, was utilized as a pilot to inform the development of the larger mail survey. This report presents results from the larger mail survey.

Preliminary analysis of the secondary data identified several topics that have been prominent concerns for stakeholders. These topics include: water quality, mining on public lands, human and wildlife health, financial assurance, site closure and reclamation, potential impacts to existing industries, mistrust in mining organizations and also the state government. Survey participants expressed similar concerns. The majority of survey participants believed that human health (53%), fish and wildlife health (69%), and water quality (67%) would decrease if a metallic mineral mine were developed near their community. Likewise, the majority of survey participants (64%) agreed that a metallic mineral mine would be harmful to the local natural environment and over half (54%) of participants believed nature based tourism would decrease as a result of a potential local mine..

Over three quarters (78%) believed employment opportunities would increase. However, the majority of survey participants (63%) agreed that the negative impacts of MMM outweighed the benefits. These results have recently been reported to the Joint Standing Committee on Environment and Natural Resources to aid in their deliberations on the many mining bills proposed during the current legislative session.

2. Problem and Research Objectives

The prospect of rising metal prices driven by growing world populations and affluence, and the existence of several rich deposits have renewed interest in mining in Maine and spurred revision of the strict regulations governing the establishment of mining operations. While there are currently no operational metal mines in the state, there were active mines in the late 1800s and the mid 1960-70s in coastal areas (Lepage, Foley, & Thompson, 2015). Volcanogenic massive sulfide deposits are distributed throughout the state (Figure 1) and are associated with volcanic belts stretching from the New Hampshire-Quebec border, through northern Maine and into New Brunswick, and along the coast. Geologically and chemically similar deposits have been successfully mined in both New Brunswick and Vermont. These deposits are attractive as mines because the hydrothermal processes involved in their formation concentrate valuable ore minerals including copper, zinc, lead, gold, and silver; however, they are also very high in sulfur and iron as well as heavy metals that can be damaging to the environment and human health.



Figure 1. Historic metals mines and metal deposits in Maine. Yellow stars denote massive sulfide deposits with mining potential and blue stars represent former metals mines (Maine Geologic Survey, 2013).

Mining uncovers and increases the reactive surface area of sulfide minerals and increases their exposure to water and oxygen. These conditions enable oxidation of sulfide minerals, which generates acidity and causes acid mine drainage (AMD). Microorganisms that generate energy for growth by catalyzing the oxidation reactions greatly increase the rate of acid production. The acid accelerates metal dissolution from the waste rock and tailings, producing a leachate that can be extremely high in dissolved metals and environmental toxicity. It has been estimated that 20,000 km of streams and rivers in the US have been degraded by AMD (Skousen, Sexstone, & Ziemkiewicz, 2000). Two former metal mining sites in Maine—the Callahan Superfund site on Cape Rosier, and the Kerramerican mine in Blue Hill—have both produced acid and high metal concentrations in surrounding surface waters and sediments (Marvinney & Berry, 2015) (Figure 1). While remediation has been undertaken at both sites, they still pose a risk, and thus require ongoing monitoring. Modern mining seeks to minimize the impact to surrounding environments by preventing the establishment of AMD-causing microbes through limitation of mineral exposure to water and/or oxygen. Treatment may also be required to contain or immobilize any

metal-contaminated acid leachate that is generated (Skousen et al., 2000); however these processes can continue for decades and even centuries requiring perpetual treatment and containment.

Maine has not had an active metal mining operation since the mid-1970s in part due to strict environmental regulations. Over the past several years, lawmakers have sought to rewrite Maine's mining legislation to allow for increased mining. Particular interest has focused on Bald Mountain, a massive sulfide deposit in Aroostook County, which has been explored as a possible mining deposit for nearly forty years. As the process moves forward, it is essential to consider place-based perceptions of residents, who are likely to be affected by the risks and opportunities resulting from mining activities.

With no mining for 40 years, there is little local expertise, public familiarity or interest in mining-related issues in the state. The issue is complicated by differences in relevant temporal and spatial scales: the benefits accrue to companies and workers at the mine in the shorter term. The risks to the aquatic and forest ecosystems, and the citizens who rely on these resources to support their livelihoods, health, and recreational activities, will extend over a greater distance and longer time. A lack of public engagement could lead to development and implementation of legislation that is drafted primarily with input from a small set of stakeholder groups—interested companies—and with limited input from citizens or place-based data on potential values and risks. Given the important ramifications of legislative changes, we believe place-specific information and expertise are needed. This study therefore sought to characterize residents' knowledge, attitudes, and potential behaviors towards mining.

2.1 Study purpose

It is the aim of this study to determine Maine residents' perceptions of metallic mineral mining and the requirements needed for conflict resolution of a current policy debate.

2.2 Study Objectives

The objectives of this study are to (1) Track the evolution of the mining policy debate since 2012, (2) Better understand the perceptions and acceptance levels of Maine residents, (3) Determine the barriers that have prevented approval of the rule revisions and the conditions required for approval, (4) Provide information to policy makers to aid in their deliberations concerning metallic mineral mining in Maine.

In order to achieve these objectives we analyzed secondary data and conducted a survey to measure Maine residents' perceptions of likely environmental, socio-cultural, and economic risks and opportunities that could result from increasing mining activities, how those may impact their quality of place, and potential behaviors.

Results of the survey have been provided to the legislature to inform decision making. These results together will also form the basis for additional grant proposals to fund a larger-scale project, which will lead to development of local expertise in both faculty and students.

3. Methodology

3.1 Study Design

Data has been collected between January 2016 and March 2017 using a mixed methods approach, with both qualitative and quantitative research components.

Component 1—Content Analysis of Secondary Data: Throughout the research qualitative data was collected which included public hearing testimonies and newspaper articles. Testimonies were acquired through the Maine legislature and Board of Environmental Protection websites. News articles are predominantly from the Bangor Daily News and the Portland Press Herald. A qualitative content analysis was conducted on these testimonies and news articles using NVivo 11, a software that assists in such qualitative analysis.

Component 2—Resident mail-survey: Survey instruments were mailed to Maine residents beginning in July 2016. Up to two replacement questionnaires were sent and up to one postcard reminder to those who did not respond by set dates. Responses were recorded and analyzed in IBM's Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

3.1.1. Survey Sampling

Resident mailing addresses were obtained through InfoUSA and were selected using a stratified random sampling design. Based upon the 10 known significant metallic deposits in Maine, four strata were created for mailing the questionnaire (Fig. 1). The sample consisted of 2,573 valid addresses. Similar to Zhang and Moffat (2015) this study oversampled strata 1 and 2 with 830 and 839 addresses respectively to insure adequate number of responses from areas which have the greatest potential to be directly influenced by mining activities.



Figure 2. Map of sampling strata for mail survey of Maine residents.

Stratum one consists of those communities that are in closest proximity to the deposits or that have the potential to be most directly influenced if a mine were developed. Potential negative impacts from groundwater, air, and noise pollution as well as positive economic impacts could affect communities in any direction. Potential surface water pollution can be transported farther distances by rivers and streams. A deposit's proximity to waterways and the size of those waterways determine the distance of the direct impact.

Similarly, stratum two also revolves around the deposits but with fewer direct impacts. The largest determinants were both potential surface water pollution on larger waterways and being within a commutable distance (~1 hour) from the potential mine site. Stratum three is based upon the largest metropolitan communities in the state. Stratum four is the rest of Maine.

3.1.2. Questionnaire Design and Implementation

The mail questionnaire was designed using an adapted version of van der Linden's (2015) socio-cultural risk perceptions model. Our questionnaire utilizes knowledge, experience, socio-cultural, trust and socio-demographic constructs to determine risk perceptions which in turn influences acceptance levels. For more information on the theoretical framework please see Appendix A. The surveying period began July 2016 and ended in March 2017. The questionnaires were sent to the addresses determined in the sampling design with a cover letter and a prepaid return envelope. One adult (whoever had the most recent birthday) from each address was asked in the cover letter if they would be willing to participate and instructions on how to do so.

3.2. Quality Control

3.2.1. Pre-Testing

Funding from WRRI was originally used for an online survey developed and implemented as part of an environmental attitudes and behaviors course in the School of Forest Resources during the spring 2016 semester. Due to the very small response rate we utilized the online survey as a pilot to inform the implementation of a mail survey. Based upon the results of this pilot survey changes were made to make questions easier to understand and ensure we received an adequate response rate before implementing the mail survey.

3.2.2. Response Rate

The response rate for the mail survey was 19.5% (501 out of 2,573). We do not have phone contact information of participants so we are unable to follow up with any of those who did not respond to our survey. However, responses from those who responded after the final contact have been shown to be similar to non-respondents (Armstrong & Overton, 1977). Therefore, we will be comparing responses between those who responded to the mail survey after the first mailing with those who responded after the final contact.

4. Results

4.1. Qualitative Data

Over the past five years only introduced bills (LD 1302, LD 1324, LD 1059, and the original version of LD 750) that sought to strengthen the 2012 Metallic Mineral Mining Law received more support than opposition (Fig. 2). In Figure 3, the positions of all the testimonies and written comments given to the Board of Environmental Protection on the most recent proposed Chapter 200 rules are displayed. The opposition was overwhelmingly dominant with 486 opposed while only three supported and two testified neither for nor against the rules. No testimonies from the most recent public hearing held on March 20, 2017 have been analyzed.



Figure 3. Positions of testimonies for several bills related to metallic mineral mining.



Figure 4. Position of testimonies and written comments on proposed Chapter 200 rules submitted to BEP during Fall 2016.

Figure 4 displays the most frequent words within all the testimonies and news articles. The size of the word indicates its prevalence. Several major areas have been dominant and most consistent over time as barriers to rule approval. These barriers are displayed in Table 1.

Figure 5. Word cloud showing the most frequently used words in testimonies and news articles from 2012 through 2016.

Table 1. Topics identified as major barriers that have prevented approval of past mining rules.

Major Barrier Topics
▪ Water quality
▪ Mining on public lands
▪ Human & wildlife health
▪ Financial assurances
▪ Site closure & reclamation
▪ Potential impacts to existing industries
▪ Mistrust in mining organizations
▪ Mistrust in state governement

It appears much of the opposition came from views that the mining risks are too high and the rules are inadequate to reduce that risk. Many believe the policy makers have pushed for weaker rules while the testimonies have been disproportionally calling for stronger ones (see Table 2). However, some, especially DEP have argued that the rules can't be any stronger because they have to fit within the framework of the 2012 statute. This has displayed the problem caused by the rapid passage of a law

concerning an unfamiliar topic and without a lot of public input. During the public hearing held by BEP on the proposed rules in September 2016, Melanie Loyzim, deputy commissioner of DEP, stated:

> What we're hearing today is a great deal of opposition to the law. Unfortunately, we do not have the power to change the law. What we have to do is change the rule.

The DEP communications director has added these comments:

> [The DEP] cannot exceed or act contrary to its rulemaking authority and other state laws... department does not have the ability to fully address these concerns without statutory changes by the Legislature."

In addition to the misgivings about the adequacy of the mining rules, many who have testified express high risk because of their experience with living near Maine's two superfund sites.

> I live in the Blue Hill Peninsula area, the site of 2 Super Fund sites, one in Blue Hill, the Kerramerican Mine and the other, the Callahan Mine, in Brooksville... These two sites illustrate the devastating history of mineral mining (Female, LD1772, 2014).

But supporters say that this is not a reasonable comparison because of the age of these sites.

> This reputation stems for the most part from unregulated mining which pre-dated the EPA or the DEP but the legacy of fear about mining persists and in the present case, is being exaggerated by those individuals and groups who clearly are anti-mining, at least for Maine (Male, LD1772, 2014).

Frustration has mounted as the interval lengthens between the passage of the 2012 law and the approval of the rules. It is not just opponents but companies with mining interests also share the frustration.

> The fact that the State has passed a new metallic mining law, however failed to adopt pertinent rules in essence creates a moratorium, or at the least the basis for a lengthy litigation battle if someone were to apply for a permit (Aroostook Resources, LD 750, 2015).

Table 2. The number of references on perceptions of inadequacy of the mining rules.

Category	Codes	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Inadequate Rules	Weak mining rules	0	2	4	33	517
			"2,000 people signed a petition submitted by Maine Conservation Voters expressing opposition to weak mining rules" (BDN, 2013).	"Despite overwhelming public comment in favor of stronger and more protective rules...the overall direction of these changes is to make the rules substantially less protective" (TU, LD1772, 2014).	"To risk our precious natural resources with weak mining rules is unacceptable" (Female, LD 146, 2015).	"I urge you to reject the latest version of DEP's weak mining rules. I am very concerned that these weak rules would allow mining corporations to pollute our water and harm our woods and wildlife for centuries" (111 written comments used this phrase).
	Need protective rules	0	1	8	17	6
			"a region where economic development, whether industrial or recreational must be subject to stringent rules" (Male, LD 1059, 2013).	"I am not opposed to the extraction of metallic minerals in Maine, but am committed to rigorous oversight, with tough, clear and effective rules that are vigorously enforced" (Male, LD1772, 2014).	"We need very protective and clear rules that will help prevent the type of problems that have plagued communities, taxpayers and the environment near mines across the country. These rules are neither protective nor clear" (NRCM, LD 146, 2015).	"I hope you will do everything in your power to establish strong mining rules that will protect Maine's amazing water resources. The proposed rules are not strong enough" (Female, Ch 200, 2016)..
	Lack of experts	1	0	1	0	1
		"the task of designing rules now that really will be adequate for the future will take more expertise and time than this committee has available in these few weeks" (Rep Chapman, LD 1853, 2012).		"the current language has no scientific basis and provides no clear guidance for how a mining company might be expected to develop and defend its monitoring plan" (Male, LD 1772, 2014).		"demand that the statute be fixed under expert guidance of a multi disicplinary expert panel free of all political, agency and mining lobby influences" (Bowker Associates, Ch 200, 2016).

Others have expressed opposition partly due to the mistrust they have in the state government (see Table 3). This mistrust has stemmed from the involvement of J.D. Irving in the initial push for a new mining law and their relationship with the state legislator who sponsored the bill.

> These rules are the result of JD Irving's stated desire to mine at Bald Mountain. The sense of urgency that has surrounded this rulemaking over the course of the past two years — the sense that Maine needs new mining rules is also a JD Irving creation (NRCM, LD 1772, 2014).

Additional sources of mistrust include the rapidity of the passage of the 2012 law, little initial public input, suspected non-compliance with Maine's Administrative Procedures Act, resubmitting rules that were alleged to be the same as the rules that were rejected the year before, and the appearance of weakening rules while public input was calling for stronger ones.

Table 3. References about mistrust in the state government.

Category	Codes	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Mistrust in State Gov't	Irresponsible mining rules	0	2	0	4	114
			"Maine Legislature in 2012 rushed through a law requiring the DEP to write new, less-stringent mining rules for the whole state" (The Boston Phoenix, 2013).		"It is clear that the overall intent of these metallic mining rules is to relax regulations on the metallic minerals mining industry" (Male, LD146, 2015).	"The past two years, thousands of citizens and many local organizations said "NO" ...and defeated these irresponsible mining rules" (111 written comments used this phrase).
	LePage admin	1	0	0	0	114
		"LePage and his cronies want to say 'screw clean water, we need ten jobs for ten years'" (Online comment, 2012).				"For the third year in a row, the LePage Administration is pushing weak mining rules that attack on our clean water and land" (111 written comments used this phrase).
	MAPA non-compliance	0	1	9	13	2
			"In light of the improprieties on the part of Maine DEP, and considering the devastating damage that would be allowed under the permissive rules proposed by the agency, I contend that the mining law enacted in 2012 must be repealed" (BDN, 2013).	"The Department of Environmental Protection... did not follow administrative procedural rules that require a ten-day public comment period" (Rep Chapman, LD1772, 2014).	"I understand that LD 750 ...demands that the rejected metallic mining rules comply with Maine's Administrative Procedures Act" (Resident, LD 750, 2015).	"MAPA specifically requires that DEP affirmatively seek best knowledge and science applicable to all rulemaking, even routine technical rules. DEP has not satisfied that standard for many many years now. It is not meeting this standard in this reckless rule" (Bowker Associates, Ch 200, 2016).
	Resubmitting rejected rules	0	0	0	12	4
					I speak in opposition to L.D. I46, a bill that contains verbatim the same mining rules that were rejected by the legislature last year (Female, LD 146, 2015).	I am totally confounded by your recent attempts to resurrect rule making (Male, Ch 200, 2016).

4.2. Resident Mail Survey

A total of 501 individuals responded to the mail survey. The mail survey was voluntary therefore participants could skip questions if they desired. Non-responses for each question were not calculated in percentage totals. The following results give the exact number of responses (N) for each question. These results reflect descriptive results only.

4.2.1. Demographics (residence, place of origin, gender, age, education)

General demographic characteristics from respondents are presented in Table 2 along with comparisons with census data and Maine 2016 voter registration data. Just over half of the respondents were female (51.9%) which is nearly identical to 2010 Census data. The mean age of all participants was 58.3 (as a requirement, all participants were 18 years or older). A higher percentage (52.9%) of participants have a Bachelor's degree or higher than the overall Maine population (28.4%). Participants' political affiliation mirrored very closely to that of the Maine population with 29.9% Democrat, 26.7% Republican, 37% Independent, and 6.4% other.

Table 4. Demographic characteristics of residents who responded to the mail survey. N=501.

Demographic Characteristics	N	%	Census Data[1]	ME 2016 Voter Registration[2]
Gender				
Male	235	48.1	49	
Female	254	51.9	51	
Age in years				
Mean	58.3 yrs			
Education				
Less than high school	9	1.8	8.7	
High school	75	15.3	33.6	
Some college	90	18.4	20.1	
2-year degree	57	11.7	9.3	
Bachelor's degree	147	30.1	18.3	
Master's degree or higher	111	22.8	10.1	
Political Affiliation				
Democrat	140	29.9		32%
Republican	125	26.7		27%
Independent	173	37		36%
Other	30	6.4		5%

Note 1. Gender data from 2010 Census. Education data from 2014 Census estimates. No average age was found for Maine population 18 years and older. All census data obtained from https://www.census.gov/quickfacts.

Note 2. Data obtained from Statewide Registered and Enrolled Data File from http://www.maine.gov/sos/cec/elec/data/. Unenrolled was used to calculate independents. Green and Libertarian were used to calculate other category.

As a result of oversampling strata 1 and 2, over 30% of respondents were residents in Aroostook (18%) or Hancock (15%) counties (Fig. 5). Cumberland County was third with 13% while Oxford and Sagadahoc counties only comprised 1% each.



Figure 6. Percentage of respondents from each Maine county. N=501.

4.2.2. Profile (Experience, Knowledge, and Community)

The questionnaire asked questions related to a participants experience with any type of mining, knowledge about metallic mineral mining in Maine, and questions about their own community. Table 3 displays the results from a few experience and knowledge questions. The vast majority (83%) had no personal or family experience with any type of mining. Approximately 40% incorrectly thought that there were currently active metal mines in the state while nearly two thirds (63.5%) had not heard about the MMM discussion occurring in the state prior to participating in the survey. Of those that did have prior knowledge, three quarters (74%) got their information from newspapers and over two thirds (68%) from local TV/radio news outlets.

Table 5. Answers to experience and knowledge related questions.

Experience & Knowledge Survey Questions	N	%
Q1. Experience with any type of mining?	477	Yes = 17 No = 83
Q2. Currently active MMM in ME?	403	Yes = 39.2 No = 52.1 I Don't Know = 8.7
Q4. Prior knowledge of MMM discussion?	485	Yes = 36.5 No = 63.5

Figue 6 shows results for the question that asked a participant's level of agreement to the statement "I am concerned about my community's ability to attract young people." A quarter (26%) strongly agreed with this statement. In all, 75% had some level of agreement to this statement. Nearly identical results are displayed in Figure 7 with 76% expressing some level of agreement to the statement "limited job opportunities have caused the departure of people who lived in my community."



Figure 7. Respondents' level of agreement with the statement "I am concerned about my community's ability to attract young people." N=489.



Figure 8. Respondents' level of agreement with the statement "Limited job opportunities have caused the departure of people who live in my community." N=488.

For the statement " people in my community are typically supportive of resource extraction jobs", 7% strongly agreed, 48% either agreed or somewhat agreed (Fig. 8). Even more had some form of agreement (87%) that 'people in my community are typically supportive of jobs in the tourism industry (Fig. 9).



Figure 9. Respondents' level of agreement with the statement "People in my community are typically supportive of resource extraction jobs." N=485.



Figure 10. Respondents' level of agreement with the statement "People in my community are typically supportive of jobs in the tourism industry." N=488.

4.2.3. Trust in Information Sources and Strategies

This section displays the results of questions that asked about how much participants trusted different sources for more information on MMM and how much they believed certain strategies would reduce negative environmental impacts of MMM. Trust in newspapers and local news outlets were nearly identical with 52% and 50% having some level of trust (Fig. 10 & 11).



Figure 11. Respondents' level of trust for receiving further information on MMM from newspapers. N=457.



Figure 12. Respondents' level of trust for receiving further information on MMM from local TV/radio news. N=464.

The large majority (84%) had some level of trust in scientists/researchers as information sources (Fig 12). Conversely, 23% somewhat trusted or trusted mining organizations and only 3% expressed strong trust (Fig. 13).



Figure 13. Respondents' level of trust for receiving further information on MMM from scientists/researchers. N=467.



Figure 14. Respondents' level of trust for receiving further information on MMM from mining organizations. N=463.



Figure 15. Respondents' level of trust for receiving further information on MMM from economic development organizations. N=466.



Figure 16. Respondents' level of trust for receiving further information on MMM from conservation organizations. N=467.

Economic development organizations were trusted slightly more than mining organizations (Fig. 14) with 27% trusting or somewhat trusting, and only 3% strongly trusting them as future information sources on MMM. Figure 15 shows that 43% somewhat trusted or trusted conservation organizations while just 7% strongly trusted them.

Both the state government and federal government (Fig. 16 & 17) only had a quarter of participants have some level of trust in them as information sources on MMM.



Figure 17. Respondents' level of trust for receiving further information on MMM from the state government. N=464.



Figure 18. Respondents' level of trust for receiving further information on MMM from the federal government. N=467.

Yet, 86% and 85% believed that water quality regulations and oversight by Maine Department of Environmental Protection would reduce negative environmental impacts of MMM in Maine respectively (Fig. 18 & 19).



Figure 19. How much respondents' thought water quality regulations would reduce environmental impacts of MMM in Maine. N=462.



Figure 20. How much respondents' thought DEP oversight would reduce environmental impacts of MMM in Maine. N464.

Conversely, in Figures 20 & 21 over one-third (39% and 36%) believed that environmental monitoring and upfront financial assurances by private mining companies would not reduce negative environmental impacts.



Figure 21. How much respondents' thought environmental monitoring by private mining companies would reduce environmental impacts of MMM in Maine. N=462.



Figure 22. How much respondents' thought upfront financial assurances from private mining companies would reduce environmental impacts of MMM in Maine. N=459.

4.2.4. Risk Assessment

This section displays results of questions that assessed participants' perception of the risks of MMM if mines were developed near their community and in Maine overall. Over half (59%) expressed concern if a metallic mineral mine were developed near their community (Fig. 22) and 64% expressed agreement that such a mine would be harmful to the local natural environment (Fig. 23).



Figure 23. Respondents' level of agreement to the statement "I would be concerned about a metallic mineral mine developed near my community." N=487.



Figure 24. Respondents' level of agreement to the statement "A metallic mineral mine would be harmful to the local natural environment." N=486.

In Figure 24, a third (34%) agreed or somewhat agreed that a metallic mineral mine would be beneficial to their community. Only 6% strongly agreed with this statement.



Figure 25. Respondents' level of agreement to the statement "A metallic mineral mine would be beneficial to my community." N=488.

In asking about mine development in Maine overall, 63% had some level of agreement that the negative impacts of MMM outweigh the benefits (Fig. 25). Only 17% expressed any disagreement to this

statement. In Figure 26, 41% had some level of agreement to the statement that “metallic mineral mining would be harmful to Maine’s natural environment” while a third (32%) were neutral towards the statement.



Figure 26. Respondents' level of agreement to the statement "the negative impacts of metallic mineral mining outweigh the benefits." N=480.



Figure 27. Respondents' level of agreement to the statement "metallic mineral mining would be harmful to Maine's natural environment." N=479.

Participants were also asked if they believed certain things would increase, decrease, or remain constant if a mine was developed near their community. In Figure 27, over half (53%) believed human health would decrease and 43% believed it would remain constant. Over two-thirds (69%) believed that fish and wildlife health would decrease (Fig. 28).



Figure 28. Perceived impact to human health of a potential mine near respondents’ community. N=462.



Figure 29. Perceived impact to fish and wildlife health of a potential mine near respondents’ community. N=467.

Similarly, over two-thirds (67%) believed that water quality would decrease (Fig. 29). In Figure 30, over half (54%) believed that nature based tourism would decrease.



Figure 30. Perceived impact to water quality of a potential mine near respondents' community. N=467.



Figure 31. Perceived impact to nature based tourism of a potential mine near respondents' community. N=468.

In Figure 31 78% believed employment opportunities would increase. Yet, 44% believed that house/property values would decrease (Fig. 32).



Figure 32. Perceived impact to employment opportunities of a potential mine near respondents' community. N=465.



Figure 33. Perceived impact to house/property value of a potential mine near respondents' community. N=467.

5. Principle Findings and Significance

Study Limitations and Considerations for Survey Results:

Though a 19.5% response rate is adequate in social sciences, it is small enough that certain groups in the population may not be adequately represented. In determining the representativeness of the survey, the participants' demographics for gender and political party are nearly identical to that of the Maine population while average age, income, and education are higher, as is often the case with surveys. The distribution of the counties in which participants resided also is different than Maine as a result of the deliberate sampling design to capture more residents within close proximity to deposits.

Key Findings and Recommendations:

- The qualitative results show that, counter intuitively, pushing to get a bill passed can actually hinder the fulfillment of the bill's purpose. Vague language and unclear regulations also have been displayed to pose a barrier for all involved. Those from each side of the discussion desire clear standards. Unclear rules have left the public with misgivings and interested investors with uncertainty about pursuing mining in this state. There are some who are just opposed to mining and are likely to remain so. Yet most just want strong mining rules that protect residents' values and the resources that exist here already.
- Survey participants expressed similar concerns to those expressed in testimony. These concerns include negative impacts to water quality, local environment, human health, and existing industries.
- A large number of survey participants lacked of awareness or information. Approximately 40% incorrectly thought that there were currently active metal mines in the state while nearly two thirds (63.5%) had not heard about the MMM discussion occurring in the state prior to participating in the survey. Of those that did have prior knowledge, three quarters (74%) got their information from newspapers and over two thirds (68%) from local TV/radio news outlets.
  - In order to have more constructive public input on this and other policy topics, increased information may need to be given. Since newspapers and local news outlets were the most prominent sources of information, state government entities should utilize these channels for dispersion of information.
  - Scientists and researchers were the most trusted for future information on MMM (84% had some level of trust). In addition, trust in state government for future information on MMM was low (25% had some level of trust). Therefore, scientists may be able to play as intermediary on controversial issues by providing information to which a wary public may be receptive.
- Survey participants did, however, express that they believed that water quality regulations (86%) and oversight by Maine Department of Environmental Protection (85%) would reduce negative environmental impacts of MMM in Maine.
  - Ensuring water quality regulations and DEP oversight are adequate to reduce negative environmental impacts will play a critical role since nearly 40% of survey participants believed that environmental monitoring by private mining companies would not reduce these impacts.
- It has been expressed both in testimony and by survey participants that negative impacts on the environment from MMM could potentially affect existing industries like tourism. While 55% of

participants agreed that " people in my community are typically supportive of resource extraction jobs", even more (87%) had some form of agreement that 'people in my community are typically supportive of jobs in the tourism industry." Over half (54%) of participants believed nature based tourism would decrease as a result of a potential local mine.

- A fair number of survey respondents (40%) thought that a metallic mineral mine would be beneficial to their community and over three quarters (78%) believed employment opportunities would increase. However, the majority of survey participants agreed that the negative impacts of MMM outweighed the benefits (63%).
- The majority of survey participants (64%) agreed that a metallic mineral mine would be harmful to the local natural environment.
- The majority of survey participants believed that human health (53%), fish and wildlife health (69%), and water quality (67%) would decrease if a metallic mineral mine were developed near their community.

Significance:

This research addressed the social perceptions of metallic mining development in Maine. These included perceptions on the negative and/or positive impacts to local communities and their ability to be economically and environmentally sustainable. Results from this study have been reported to the Maine legislature to help them determine the sustainability of metallic mining in regards to Maine's communities, economies, and natural resources, particularly water resources. We have attempted to gather these perceptions from the widest number of stakeholders, from those who have actively participated in the policy debate to those who had limited knowledge on the topic.

SECTION C.

Student Support:

The project allowed for involvement of one undergraduate student and two graduate students. It also provided the opportunity for undergraduate students (40) and graduate students (9) to participate in a service learning project associated with the project in SFR479 (Environmental Attitudes and Behaviors, taught by Dr. John Daigle). Students enrolled in the course supported instrument development, conducted descriptive data analysis for the pilot online survey results, and gave an oral presentation of preliminary findings.

Presentations:

Environmental Attitudes and Behaviors Course. (2016, May). *Perceptions of metallic mineral mining in Maine.* Class presentation at University of Maine's service learning class presentations, Orono, Maine.

Morgan, A. (2016, September). *Testimony of Andrew Morgan before the Board of Environmental Protection, Neither for nor against the proposed chapter 200: Metallic mineral exploration, advanced exploration and mining.* Testimony presented at the Maine Board of Environmental Protection Public Hearing, Augusta, Maine.

Morgan, A. (2016, December). *Risk perceptions of metallic mineral mining in Maine.* Thesis project proposal presented at the School of Forest Resources, Orono, Maine.

Morgan, A. (2017, January). *Public risk perceptions of metallic mineral mining in Maine: A mixed methods study.* Abstract to present at the International Symposium on Society and Resource Management in Umeå, Sweden on June 19, 2017. Accepted.

Morgan, A. (2017, March). *Public perceptions of metallic mineral mining in Maine.* Poster session presented at the Maine Sustainability and Water Conference, Augusta, Maine.

Proposal Submissions:

De Urioste-Stone, S. (Lead PI), Morgan, A. (Proposal Author). *Travel to present grant proposal.* University of Maine Graduate Student Government. February 9, 2017. Requested, $850; awarded partial funding, $425.

De Urioste-Stone, S. (Lead PI), Morgan, A. (Proposal Author). *2017 Lee & Sunny Allen international experience travel scholarship.* The School of Forest Resources, University of Maine. April 13, 2017. Requested, $700; awarded full funding.

Olsen, A. MacRae, J. & De Urioste-Stone, S.M. 2017. "Attitudes and impacts of mining in Maine: A comparative study". Requested $36,314; proposal submitted to Water Resources Research Institute. (Unfunded).

Publications:

Shepherd, M. 2017. *Why legislating mining in Maine is so hard, in one survey*. News article from the Bangor Daily News. URL: http://stateandcapitol.bangordailynews.com /2017/04/25/ why-legislating-mining-in-maine-is-so-hard-in-one-survey/

Simms, D. (2017, March). *Mitchell Center mining project data to be submitted for legislative consideration.* Press release from the Senator George J. Mitchell Center for Sustainability Solutions. URL: https://umaine.edu/mitchellcenter/category/news/

Morgan, A., De Urioste-Stone, S. (2017, April). *Public perceptions of metallic mineral mining in Maine: Research summary report of preliminary results.* Report to the Maine Legislature's Joint Standing Committee on Environment and Natural Resources, 29 pages.

6. Literature Cited

Armstrong, J. S., & Overton, T. S. (1977). Estimating nonresponse bias in mail surveys. *Journal of Marketing Research, 14*(3), 396-402.

Campbell, G., Roberts, M. (2010). Permitting a new mine: Insights from the community debate. *Resources Policy*, 35, 210-217.

Furr, R. M. & Bacharach, V. R. (2014). *Psychometrics: An introduction.* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Heberlein, T. (2012). *Navigating environmental attitudes.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Joffe, H. (2003). Risk: From perception to social representation. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 42(1), 55-73.

Kaiser, F. G., & Fuhrer, U. (2003). Ecological behavior's dependency on different forms of knowledge. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 52*(4), 598-613.

Kasperson, R. E., Renn, O., Slovic, P., Brown, H. S., Emel, J., & Goble, R. (1988). The social amplification of risk: A conceptual framework. *Risk Analysis.* 8(2), 177-187.

Kelly, J. (2011). NIMBY. In: Mulvaney, D. & Robbins, P. (Eds). *Green Politics: An A-to-Z Guide.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Lepage, C. A., Foley, M. E., & Thompson, W. B. (2015). Mining in Maine: Past, present and future. Maine: Maine Geological Survey.

Mase, A.S., Cho, H., & Prokopy, L.S. (2015). Enhancing the Social Amplification of Risk Framework (SARF) by Exploring Trust, the Availability Heuristic, and Agricultural Advisors' Belief in Climate Change. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 41*, 166-176.

Marvinney, R. G., & Berry, H. N. (2015). Legacy mines in Maine. Maine: Maine Geological Survey.

Riesch, H. (2013). Levels of uncertainty. In: Roeser, S., Hillerbrand, R., Sandin, P., & Peterson, M. (Eds) *The Essentials of Risk Theory.* Dordrecht: Springer.

Slovic, P., Fischhoff, B., & Lichtenstein, S. (1982). Why study risk perceptions? *Risk Analysis,* 2(2).

Skousen, J. G., Sexstone, A., & Ziemkiewicz, P. F. (2000). *Acid mine drainage control and treatment* (Vol. Agronomy No. 41): American Society of Agronomy and American Society for Surface Mining and Reclamation.

van der Linden, S. (2015). The social-psychological determinants of climate change risk perceptions: Towards a comprehensive model. *Journal of Environmental Psychology 41*,112-124.

Vaske, J. (2008). *Survey research and analysis: Applications in parks, recreation and human dimensions.* State College, PA: Venture Publishing, Inc.

Zhang, A., Moffat, K. (2015). A balancing act: The role of benefits, impacts, and confidence in governance in predicting acceptance of mining in Australia. *Resources Policy*, 44, 25-34.

Appendix A. Theoretical Framework

"Psychometrics is the study of the operations and procedures used to measure variability in behavior and to connect those measurements to psychological phenomena" (Furr & Bacharach, 2014). Based largely on this theory of psychological measurement, van der Linden's (2015) framework focuses on linking attitudes to behavioral actions. Likewise, the metallic mineral mining risk perception model (MRPM) (Fig. 33) links attitudes with "behavioral action" which in this study's context is acceptance level of metallic mining.

Risk Perceptions

Risk is uncertainty about an event or activity coupled with the possible severity of outcomes (Riesch, 2013). In addition, there are differences between an individual's personal and societal risk perceptions. Van der Linden (2015) found that knowledge was a significant predictor only for societal risk whereas personal experience and egoistic value orientations were only significant predictors of personal risk. Other concepts (e.g., gender, social norms) predicted both types of risk. Societal risk in this context is associated with the state of Maine overall.



Figure 34. Metallic mineral mining risk perception model. (Adapted from van der Linden, 2015).

Community risk is an added component to the model. This type of risk is important to distinguish from personal and societal because mining costs tend to be disproportionately borne by the local communities whereas the benefits are dispersed throughout society (Campbell & Roberts, 2010). Community risk is also unique because of the "not in my backyard" (NIMBY) phenomena. NIMBY is the "opposition to the siting of locally undesirable land uses…which present unusually high risks" to the local community or natural environment (Kelly, 2011). NIMBYists are not necessarily opposed to land uses like mining they just don't want them near their home (Kelly, 2011). Thus by including community risk along with personal and societal risk variability can be measured. For example, if community risk is high while personal and societal risk is low then the NIMBY phenomena may be present.

Cognitive Factors

In order for the role of knowledge in risk perceptions to be detected, different forms of knowledge should be utilized (Kaiser & Fuhrer, 2003; van der Linden, 2015). This study will measure five interrelated cognitive factors: prior, actual, cause, response, and impact knowledge about metallic mining in Maine. These differ slightly from the original model which distinguished between three types of knowledge: cause, impacts, and response.

The following is an example of how knowledge can influence risk perceptions. When people lack prior knowledge their attitudes can shift with any new information received (Slovic et al., 1982). Heberlein (2012) calls these weak attitudes opinions because they lack cognitive structure. Given the novelty of the MMM topic in Maine, measures of prior knowledge have been added to ascertain if respondents have heard of the topic prior to taking the survey and if so, what sources did this information come from. If a respondent has not heard of the topic before then the survey is their first encounter with MMM. This should be able to explain any inconsistencies with their responses throughout the survey.

Experiential Processing

"Attitudes based on direct experience are better developed. They have more beliefs, they're more stable, and they have stronger affect" (Heberlein, 2012, p26). Personal experience is also connected with heuristics which are mental shortcuts. People often process information about complex risk issues by linking them with past experiences or vivid examples from specific events (Mase et al., 2015). Therefore, if someone has prior experience with mining activities they will associate and evaluate the current MMM issue through those experiences and tend to have stronger attitudes associated with the topic.

Socio-Cultural Influences

Van der Linden's model utilizes broad value orientations to explain risk perceptions. Vaske (2008) distinguishes between value orientations and values which "transcend situations, issues and objects" (e.g., honesty) (p.24). Value orientations, though guided by values, are "patterns of direction and intensity among basic beliefs" which "reflect our thoughts about specific objects or issues" (Vaske, 2008, p. 25). According to van der Linden (2015) three broad value orientations are relevant for environmental issues. These are egoistic, socio-altruistic, and biospheric value orientations (van der Linden, 2015).

Risk perceptions are influenced by interaction with other people and social structures (Joffe, 2003; Kasperson et al., 1988). Norms are one of the most useful and powerful concepts in social psychology (Heberlein, 2012). A key distinction between norms and attitudes is that norms come with sanctions or punishments (Vaske, 2008; Heberlein, 2012). Descriptive norms are behavioral regularities (Heberlein, 2012); they are "what most people are doing" (Vaske, 2008, p. 27). Injunctive norms are "what people should or ought to do in a given situation" (Vaske, 2008, p. 27). These two norms are categorized as social norms where the punishments are administered by others. Personal norms represent an individual's belief system, carry an individual sense of obligation, and have internal sanctions (Heberlein, 2012).

Trust

Though not originally a component of his model van der Linden (2015) suggests that trust factors would be useful additions. This study thus incorporates a trust in information sources component similar to what Mase, et al. (2015) added to the Social Amplification of Risk Framework. When a person feels that an information source shares similar values, is consistent with initial beliefs, and has the public's best interest in mind that source is trusted more; while conversely, information from sources that they feel do not meet those standards are rejected (Mase et al., 2015; Slovic et al., 1982).

Trust is connected to confidence in governance structures which manage risks associated with activities like mining (Mase et al., 2015, Zhang & Moffat, 2015). "Loss of trust can increase risk perceptions, make a risk more unacceptable, and intensify the public response" (Mase et al., 2015, p. 168). Zhang and Moffat (2015) found that environmental concerns were offset and level of acceptance increased if residents perceived that there were strong regulations and the government had the ability to hold the mining industry accountable. Conversely, when governance was perceived to be weak, acceptance level significantly decreased even for those residents with low environmental concerns (Zhang & Moffat, 2015). Therefore a component to measure respondents' perceptions on the ability of different governance structures to reduce negative environmental impacts is also added to the model.

Socio-demographics

Gender and political affiliation were the only socio-demographic factors that influenced risk perceptions with van der Linden's model. Other factors such as income, education, and age had no significant effect on risk perceptions (van der Linden, 2015). This lower explanatory property is reflected in Figure 33 with a dotted outline on the socio-demographics arrow. These socio-demographics are still important because they act as control factors and allow evaluation of how well the sample reflects the population.

Appendix B. IRB Approval Application

3. Participant Recruitment:

Due to the low response rate from the online survey, a mail survey will be used. The same strata will be used to send the survey to Maine residents only. This population will include 3500 individuals, randomly selected; participants will be sent invitations to take the survey via mail and can voluntarily choose to take the survey by responding to a mail-questionnaire. The ages of individuals in this population will include individuals only 18 years and older.

4. Informed Consent:

All potential survey respondents will be provided with consent information before choosing to participate in the survey. At the beginning of the actual survey, participants will be given written details that will describe what they would be asked to do in the survey, the risks they would be undertaking by participating, the benefits they might receive by participating, the procedures for maintaining their confidentiality, and the contact information of the PI of the research team. Participation in surveys will then imply consent to participate. Informed consent is included as part of the questionnaire.

5. Confidentiality:

The following precautions will be addressed to ensure privacy of participants and confidentiality of data collected in this study:

- Responses to the mail survey instrument will not have study participants mails attached to their responses. Only response data will be collected.
- Reports, presentations, and manuscripts will NOT include names of survey respondents, or other identifiable data, in order to preserve privacy of participants.
- Mail addresses will not be linked to data so responses will be anonymous and all data will be kept in a password-protected computer.
- Survey responses will be destroyed after seven years.

6. Risks to Participants:

In the judgment of the Principal Investigator, there are no possible physical, psychological, social, legal, economic, or other risks to the subjects, either immediate or long range. The risk to human subjects is no greater than that of everyday living.

7. Benefits:

Individuals participating in the survey will not gain any direct benefit from participating in the study. Individuals may feel satisfied that their contribution to this survey may be helping express Maine residents' attitudes and level of acceptance of possible metallic mineral mining in the state.

This survey study will greatly assist a funded Water Resources Research Institute (WRRI) research grant and interdisciplinary team of University of Maine faculty that will utilize a mixed methods approach. This approach will gain measures of the social, economic, and ecological benefits and costs potentially derived from future metallic mineral mining in Maine. (LOOK AT Current proposal)

8. Compensation:

At the end of the survey period winners will be chosen to win one of three $50 Hannaford gift cards. Winners will be chosen by randomly selecting three mailing addresses from all participants that returned a survey. The gift cards will be mailed to these three addresses.

Appendix C. Mail Questionnaire

Public Perceptions of Metallic Mineral Mining in Maine



Funding provided by:

Dear Maine Resident,

You are invited to participate in a research project being conducted by Dr. Sandra De Urioste-Stone, a faculty member in the School of Forest Resources at the University of Maine. Maine is currently exploring changes to metallic mineral mining legislation. The purpose of this research is to better understand your views toward metallic mineral mining and the associated benefits and risks. You must be at least 18 years of age to participate.

What you will be asked to do
If you decide to participate, you will be asked to fill out the following questionnaire, which will take approximately 15-20 minutes. You must be at least 18 years of age to participate.

Risks
Except for your time, there are no risks to participate in this study.

Benefits
While this study may have no direct benefit to you, this research will help us better understand resident views toward metallic mineral mining in Maine.

Compensation
By completing and returning this survey, you will be entered into a raffle to win one of three $50 Hannaford gift cards. Winners will be randomly chosen at the end of the survey period and the gift cards will be sent to the same mailing address used to send the survey.

Confidentiality
The survey responses will be confidential. Please do not write your name anywhere on the survey. The survey has an identification number for mailing and raffle purposes– your responses will be held in the strictest confidence; the key will be stored in a locked office for two years. The survey responses will only be published in summarized form, so your individual responses will never be revealed. All data will be kept in a password protected computer. Hard copy surveys will be destroyed after seven years.

Voluntary
Participation is voluntary. You may stop at any time or skip questions that you do not wish to answer. Returning the survey implies consent to participate.

Contact Information

If you have any questions about this study, please contact:

Dr. Sandra De Urioste-Stone
Assistant Professor
University of Maine
(207) 581-2885
sandra.de@maine.edu

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact:

Gayle Jones, Assistant
Protection of Human Subjects Review Board
University of Maine
(207) 581-1498
gayle.jones@umit.maine.edu

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!

PART A. ***Mining involves the extraction and processing of raw materials from the earth. Given a long history of mining in Maine and across the country, we would like to know about any firsthand experience you may have with mining activities.***

1. Do you have any family history or personal experience with any type of mining?
(e.g., coal, gems, granite, gravel, metals, peat, etc.)

☐ Yes *(Please answer 1a & 1b)* ☐ No *(Skip to Part B, in page 4)*

1a. Your family history or personal experience with mining includes...

(Please check all that apply)	In Maine	In another U.S. State	In a foreign country
Having been employed at a mine	☐	☐	☐
Having a family member employed at a mine	☐	☐	☐
Living near an active mine	☐	☐	☐
Visiting near an active mine	☐	☐	☐
Participating in a mining advocacy program	☐	☐	☐
Participating in a group opposing mining	☐	☐	☐
Other (*Please specify*)	☐	☐	☐

1b. What type of mining was associated with your family history or personal experience?

(Please check all that apply)	In Maine	In another U.S. State	In a foreign country
Agricultural minerals *(e.g., peat, potash, etc.)*	☐	☐	☐
Coal	☐	☐	☐
Construction minerals *(e.g., gypsum, mica, etc.)*	☐	☐	☐
Industrial minerals *(e.g., salt, lime, boron, etc.)*	☐	☐	☐
Precious gemstones *(e.g., diamonds, etc.)*	☐	☐	☐
Semi-precious gemstones *(e.g., tourmaline, garnets, etc.)*	☐	☐	☐
Precious metals *(e.g., gold, silver, etc.)*	☐	☐	☐
Non-precious metals *(e.g., iron, copper, zinc, etc.)*	☐	☐	☐
Oil extraction	☐	☐	☐
Sand/Gravel	☐	☐	☐
Stone *(e.g., granite, dimension, etc.)*	☐	☐	☐
Other (*Please specify*)	☐	☐	☐

PART B. ***This part of the survey focuses exclusively on metallic mineral mining in Maine.***

- Metallic mineral mining involves the extraction of metal ore (e.g., copper, gold, iron, zinc, etc.) from the earth and the processing needed to concentrate those metals into usable commodities.
- Modern metallic mineral mines can create job opportunities by employing people to operate large facilities, equipment, and also building new infrastructure.
- As a by-product of the metal extraction process, large amounts of often toxic waste material is generated, which requires careful planning and treatment to prevent polluting the surrounding area. Any non-toxic waste material may be reused for other purposes such as building roads.
- Over the past few years the state government has sought to revise the laws and regulations that govern metallic mineral mining in Maine. Your responses are greatly appreciated and will help us understand Maine residents' opinions concerning this important subject.

2. Are there currently active metallic mineral mines in the state of Maine?

□ Yes □ No

3. Please indicate, to the best of your knowledge, how much you believe that each of the following items contributes to the demand for products derived from metallic mineral mining…

Items	*Please circle one response for each item below.*			
Cell phones, computers, etc.	Major contributor	Minor contributor	No contribution at all	Decreases demand
Construction	Major contributor	Minor contributor	No contribution at all	Decreases demand
Economic growth	Major contributor	Minor contributor	No contribution at all	Decreases demand
Improved recycling for electronics	Major contributor	Minor contributor	No contribution at all	Decreases demand
Jewelry	Major contributor	Minor contributor	No contribution at all	Decreases demand
Owning a car	Major contributor	Minor contributor	No contribution at all	Decreases demand
Recycling	Major contributor	Minor contributor	No contribution at all	Decreases demand

4. Prior to this survey, were you aware of the current discussion concerning metallic mineral mining in Maine?

□ Yes (*Please answer question 4a*) □ No *(Skip to question 5)*

4a. If yes, where did you gain your information? *(Please check all that apply)*

□ Newspaper *(paper or online)*
□ Local TV/Radio news
□ Family member
□ Friend
□ Scientists/researchers
□ Maine state government
□ Mining organizations *(e.g., Aroostook Resources)*
□ Economic development organizations *(e.g., Chambers of Commerce)*
□ Conservation organizations *(e.g., Natural Resource Council of Maine)*
□ Other *(Please specify)* _____

5. If you were to receive further information about metallic mineral mining in Maine, how much would you trust or distrust the following agencies, organizations, and groups?

Information Source	*Please circle one response for each source of information below.*						
Newspaper *(paper or online)*	Strongly Distrust	Distrust	Somewhat Distrust	Neutral	Somewhat Trust	Trust	Strongly Trust
Local TV/Radio news	Strongly Distrust	Distrust	Somewhat Distrust	Neutral	Somewhat Trust	Trust	Strongly Trust
Family members	Strongly Distrust	Distrust	Somewhat Distrust	Neutral	Somewhat Trust	Trust	Strongly Trust
Friends	Strongly Distrust	Distrust	Somewhat Distrust	Neutral	Somewhat Trust	Trust	Strongly Trust
Scientists/researchers	Strongly Distrust	Distrust	Somewhat Distrust	Neutral	Somewhat Trust	Trust	Strongly Trust
Mining organizations	Strongly Distrust	Distrust	Somewhat Distrust	Neutral	Somewhat Trust	Trust	Strongly Trust
Economic development organizations	Strongly Distrust	Distrust	Somewhat Distrust	Neutral	Somewhat Trust	Trust	Strongly Trust
Conservation organizations	Strongly Distrust	Distrust	Somewhat Distrust	Neutral	Somewhat Trust	Trust	Strongly Trust
Local government	Strongly Distrust	Distrust	Somewhat Distrust	Neutral	Somewhat Trust	Trust	Strongly Trust
State government	Strongly Distrust	Distrust	Somewhat Distrust	Neutral	Somewhat Trust	Trust	Strongly Trust
Federal government	Strongly Distrust	Distrust	Somewhat Distrust	Neutral	Somewhat Trust	Trust	Strongly Trust
Other *(Please specify)*	Strongly Distrust	Distrust	Somewhat Distrust	Neutral	Somewhat Trust	Trust	Strongly Trust

6. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements about <u>your community and the people close to you…</u>

Statement	*Please circle one response for each statement below.*						
Good job opportunities are available to people who live in my community	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I am concerned about people leaving my town to live elsewhere	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
People in my community are typically supportive of resource extraction jobs *(e.g., forest products, fishing, mining)*	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I am concerned about my community's ability to attract young people	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Limited job opportunities have caused the departure of people who lived in my community	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
People in my community are typically supportive of jobs in the tourism industry *(e.g., guides, hotels, restaurants)*	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
People who are important to me would think highly of me for getting a job at a metallic mineral mine in Maine	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
People whose opinion I value think that metallic mineral mining may have positive impacts in Maine	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
People whose opinion I value think that metallic mineral mining may have negative impacts in Maine	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Metallic mineral mining would fit with my perception of the Maine identity	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

7. <u>If</u> a metallic mineral mine was developed <u>near your community</u>, please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements about <u>yourself and your community</u>…

Statement	*Please circle one response for each statement below.*						
A metallic mineral mine would improve my current employment situation	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A metallic mineral mine would be harmful to me	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I would be concerned about a metallic mineral mine developed near my community	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A metallic mineral mine would be beneficial to my community	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I would support the development of a metallic mineral mine near my community	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A metallic mineral mine would only have short-term economic benefits for my community	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A metallic mineral mine would have long-term economic benefits for my community	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A metallic mineral mine would be harmful to the local natural environment	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

8. <u>If</u> more metallic mineral mines were developed <u>in Maine</u>, please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements...

Statement	*Please circle one response for each statement below.*						
The benefits of metallic mineral mining outweigh the negative impacts	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Metallic mineral mining would be harmful to Maine's natural environment	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Metallic mineral mining should occur in Maine	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Metallic mineral mining would only have short-term economic benefits in Maine	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Metallic mineral mining would have long-term economic benefits in Maine	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The negative impacts of metallic mineral mining outweigh the benefits	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

9. How much do you think that each of the following strategies, <u>if implemented</u>, would reduce negative environmental impacts of metallic mineral mining in Maine?

_____ is likely to reduce negative environmental impacts…	*Please circle one response for each strategy below.*		
Water quality regulations	A lot	A little	Not at all
Pre-site planning	A lot	A little	Not at all
ME Dept. of Environmental Protection oversight	A lot	A little	Not at all
Closure and site reclamation plan	A lot	A little	Not at all
New technologies for metallic mineral mining	A lot	A little	Not at all
Environmental monitoring by private mining companies	A lot	A little	Not at all
Upfront financial assurances from private mining companies	A lot	A little	Not at all
Other *(Please specify)*	A lot	A little	Not at all

10. <u>If</u> a metallic mineral mine was developed <u>near your community</u>, please indicate whether you believe that the following items would be likely to increase, remain constant, or decrease...

_____ is likely to…	*Please circle one response for each item below.*				
Nature based tourism	Increase a lot	Increase a little	Remain Constant	Decrease a little	Decrease a lot
Outdoor recreation	Increase a lot	Increase a little	Remain Constant	Decrease a little	Decrease a lot
Human health	Increase a lot	Increase a little	Remain Constant	Decrease a little	Decrease a lot
Fish and wildlife health	Increase a lot	Increase a little	Remain Constant	Decrease a little	Decrease a lot
Water quality	Increase a lot	Increase a little	Remain Constant	Decrease a little	Decrease a lot
Land pollution	Increase a lot	Increase a little	Remain Constant	Decrease a little	Decrease a lot
Noise pollution	Increase a lot	Increase a little	Remain Constant	Decrease a little	Decrease a lot
Human population	Increase a lot	Increase a little	Remain Constant	Decrease a little	Decrease a lot
Employment opportunities	Increase a lot	Increase a little	Remain Constant	Decrease a little	Decrease a lot
Rural development	Increase a lot	Increase a little	Remain Constant	Decrease a little	Decrease a lot
House/Property value	Increase a lot	Increase a little	Remain Constant	Decrease a little	Decrease a lot
Infrastructure improvement	Increase a lot	Increase a little	Remain Constant	Decrease a little	Decrease a lot
Traffic	Increase a lot	Increase a little	Remain Constant	Decrease a little	Decrease a lot
Local tax revenue	Increase a lot	Increase a little	Remain Constant	Decrease a little	Decrease a lot
State tax revenue	Increase a lot	Increase a little	Remain Constant	Decrease a little	Decrease a lot
Influence of state government	Increase a lot	Increase a little	Remain Constant	Decrease a little	Decrease a lot
Other *(Please specify)*	Increase a lot	Increase a little	Remain Constant	Decrease a little	Decrease a lot

PART C. ***This part asks you about your general values to life. This will give us a framework for studying Maine residents' attitudes and opinions related to metallic mineral mining.***

11. For each value listed below, please rate the extent to which you consider it to be a 'GUIDING PRINCIPLE IN YOUR LIFE':

Value	*(Please circle one response for each statement)*								
Wealth *(possessions, financial success)*	Opposed to my values	Not important	Of little importance	Somewhat important	Important	Slightly more than important	Quite important	Very important	Of Supreme importance
Preventing Pollution **(***protecting natural resources)*	Opposed to my values	Not important	Of little importance	Somewhat important	Important	Slightly more than important	Quite important	Very important	Of Supreme importance
Peace *(a world free of war and conflict)*	Opposed to my values	Not important	Of little importance	Somewhat important	Important	Slightly more than important	Quite important	Very important	Of Supreme importance
Protecting the Environment *(preserving nature)*	Opposed to my values	Not important	Of little importance	Somewhat important	Important	Slightly more than important	Quite important	Very important	Of Supreme importance
Social Power **(***control over others, dominance)*	Opposed to my values	Not important	Of little importance	Somewhat important	Important	Slightly more than important	Quite important	Very important	Of Supreme importance
Helpful *(working for the welfare of others)*	Opposed to my values	Not important	Of little importance	Somewhat important	Important	Slightly more than important	Quite important	Very important	Of Supreme importance
Authority *(the right to lead or command)*	Opposed to my values	Not important	Of little importance	Somewhat important	Important	Slightly more than important	Quite important	Very important	Of Supreme importance
Social Justice *(correcting injustice, care for the weak)*	Opposed to my values	Not important	Of little importance	Somewhat important	Important	Slightly more than important	Quite important	Very important	Of Supreme importance
Respecting the Earth *(harmony with other species)*	Opposed to my values	Not important	Of little importance	Somewhat important	Important	Slightly more than important	Quite important	Very important	Of Supreme importance
Influential *(having an impact on people and events)*	Opposed to my values	Not important	Of little importance	Somewhat important	Important	Slightly more than important	Quite important	Very important	Of Supreme importance
Unity with Nature *(fitting into nature)*	Opposed to my values	Not important	Of little importance	Somewhat important	Important	Slightly more than important	Quite important	Very important	Of Supreme importance
Equality *(equal opportunity for all)*	Opposed to my values	Not important	Of little importance	Somewhat important	Important	Slightly more than important	Quite important	Very important	Of Supreme importance

PART D. ***This final section of the survey asks some background information about you. Your answers, as with all of the answers you provide, will remain confidential.***

12. Which Maine County do you currently reside in?

□ Androscoggin	□ Hancock	□ Oxford	□ Somerset
□ Aroostook	□ Kennebec	□ Penobscot	□ Waldo
□ Cumberland	□ Knox	□ Piscataquis	□ Washington
□ Franklin	□ Lincoln	□ Sagadahoc	□ York

13. How many years have you lived in the state of Maine?_____ years

14. What is your gender? □ Male □ Female

15. What is your ethnic background? *(you may select more than one)*

□ African-American	□ Native American
□ Asian-Pacific Islander	□ White
□ Hispanic	□ Other *(Please specify)*_____

16. What is your age? _____ years

17. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

□ Less than High school	□ 4-year college degree (BA, BS)
□ High school or GED	□ Master's degree
□ Some college	□ Doctoral degree (PhD)
□ 2-yr college degree (AA, AS)	□ Professional degree (MD, JD, etc.)

18. What is your current employment status? *(Please check all that apply)*

□ Part-time	□ Retired
□ Full-time	□ Unemployed, seeking employment
□ Self-employed	□ Unemployed, not seeking employment
□ Student	□ Unable to work

19. What is your current annual household income in US dollars before taxes?

□ Less than $10,000	□ $35,000 - $49,999
□ $10,000 - $14,999	□ $50,000 - $74,999
□ $15,000 - $24,999	□ $75,000 - $99,999
□ $25,000 - $34,999	□ $100,000 or more

20. What is your political affiliation?

□ Democrat	□ Independent
□ Republican	□ Other *(Please specify)* _____

21. Do you belong to any organizations related to conservation, tourism, recreation, or economic development?

□ Yes (*Please answer question 21a*) □ No (*Please skip to question 22*)

21a. If yes, for each category please list the organizations to which you belong.

- □ Conservation _____
- □ Tourism or Recreation _____
- □ Economic Development _____

22. Please feel free to add any additional comments regarding the topic of metallic mineral mining in Maine.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for participating in our survey!
Your responses are greatly appreciated