

**Commenter #1 - Larson**

We are very concerned about the proposed quarry in Waterford Township. Both the noise and additional truck traffic will be disruptive; however in addition to the noise and added truck traffic we are particularly concerned about the groundwater. Seems like they should be guaranteeing that nothing will happen to the wells in the township. If some wells run dry or get contaminated, it will be a hardship for the residents of the township and will significantly adversely affect our property values. At some point Bryan Rock Products will leave but we will still be here. Any long-term environmental problems will not affect their business at all—they can pick up and go whenever they please; however we as residents will have to live with the aftermath. We strongly oppose the quarry.

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Potential impacts related to groundwater, noise, and truck traffic will be addressed in the EIS as indicated in sections 5.1, 5.4, and 5.5 of the Scoping Decision Document (SDD).

**Commenter# 2 - Holthusen**

In addition to the verbal comments that I provided in the township meeting on 9/6/23, I wanted to provide some written comments as a part of the public commentary period running through 9/21/23. I am operating under the following assumption, as written in the scoping document: “comments should address the accuracy and completeness of information, potential impacts that warrant further investigation and the need for an EIS.”

My comments are as follows:

1. All studies detailed in the EIS should consider a timeframe inclusive of the 50-year anticipated project duration and should detail anticipated impacts at regular intervals along that 50-year timeframe.
2. All wells within the township should be analyzed to understand what aquifer or water source they draw from, as there are several assumptions made throughout the scoping document as to 1) current water sources for both residential and irrigation wells, 2) distance at which wells may be impacted from the project site, and 3) waterways that link to those water sources.
  - a. The results of this analysis (of wells within the township) should directly inform the scope of studies to be completed as a part of the EIS.
3. Well surveys should include both water quantity and water quality impacts to all wells within the township. The reality is that waterways are not restricted to the site of the project and the land immediately surrounding it. All Waterford residents have a right to know the anticipated impacts of this project.
4. Light pollution should be considered as a part of the EIS. There are residential properties that could be impacted—from a great distance to the project site.

5. Alongside the traffic impact study, analysis should be done around the financial impacts of increased traffic flow over the lifetime of the project. This should include a breakdown of financial impacts at the township, county, and state level at regular intervals over the 50-year proposed project duration.
6. Additional economic impacts of this project should be studied, including:
  - a. Anticipated impacts to property values, throughout the township, over the 50-year proposed project duration.
  - b. Anticipated impacts to jobs within the area.
  - c. Both positive and negative impacts to 1) the township, vs. 2) Bryan Rock at their various locations and the southern metropolitan area.
7. I recommend that studies conducted as a part of the EIS are extended to consider impacts to other neighboring townships—where water, traffic, or financial impacts will extend past Waterford township. While this proposed project is in Waterford township, we should act as good stewards of our natural resources and consider impacts to our neighbors.
8. In the township meeting on 9/6, a local farmer raised the issue of financial support that Bryan Rock has verbally promised to township residents and landowners; Bryan Rock has apparently promised to pay for the replacement or expansion of wells if they are negatively impacted by the project. There are also caveats to that promise, such as if the well equipment is considered “obsolete or outdated.” These promises and any caveats should be detailed and confirmed in writing to ensure that township residents and farmers are protected in the event of actual impact to wells—whether anticipated or not. These statements should be written and confirmed in a way that will not only protect current residents and landowners, but also any future residents who may purchase that property during the 50-year anticipated project duration.

Please let me know if you have any questions on my comments above! Also, please confirm that you have received my comments and included them as a part of the public commentary period.

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. The EIS studies are developed to analyze worst case conditions, irrespective of when they will occur within the life of the Project. However, because of the progressive nature of a quarry operation, where appropriate, the EIS studies will incorporate additional analysis at intermediate stages of development. This information will be useful in establishing if or when a mitigation may be appropriate. The SDD document Section 4.1 is revised to address this comment.

The EIS studies are designed to evaluate the area of potential environmental impact which is independent of municipal boundaries. The area of potential impact (the distance at which wells may be impacted from the dewatering) will be determined by groundwater modeling of the highest anticipated dewatering rate at full buildout (SDD Section 5.1.a.). Residential water supply wells and irrigation wells identified within the potential area of impact will be included in a well inventory (SDD Section 5.1. b) which will evaluate well construction information including the water source for the well to determine if the water supply could be impacted. An evaluation of potential impacts to wetlands and waterways,

which may include waterways upstream and downstream of the project, including outside of the Waterford Township boundary, is included in the SDD Sections 5.1.c.

Section 5.3 of the SDD is revised to include an evaluation of potential impacts from light pollution.

The state adopted EAW form is used for the Scoping EAW and does not include analysis of financial impacts. However, socioeconomic impacts are a required component of the EIS and therefore not typically included as an item to be scoped. None the less, Table 4-1 and Section 5.7 of the SDD have been revised to clarify that socioeconomic impacts will be evaluated in the EIS. The socioeconomic impact analysis will include information on financial impacts to the township, property values, the local economy, and jobs.

Analysis of potential impacts to be evaluated in the EIS is not limited to the municipality in which the project occurs. The studies and analyses to be included in the EIS will extend to the area of potential environmental impact associated with each topic.

The EIS will include an evaluation of appropriate mitigation options to address potential well interference issues identified in the EIS. In addition to identifying wells with potential well interference through the well inventory and evaluation, mitigation measures may include groundwater level monitoring to verify how water levels change over time as the quarry footprint expands and dewatering rates increase which may allow avoidance of a well interference issue before it affects a water supply, offering well interference agreements which describe what a well owner should do if they experience a water supply issue, establish the financial responsibilities (for example quarry operator pays for a water well contractor or the residents choice to investigate the issue and determine if it is result of the dewatering activity), and identify measures to restore the water supply, which might be lowering the pump or drilling a new well. Well interference agreements are a way to efficiently resolve a water supply issue that is caused by the quarry operator in a timely manner, without having to go through the formal process established by the DNR which is effective, but lengthy. [Actual execution of written well interference agreements are outside of the scope of an EIS and are more appropriately addressed as part of permitting]

### **Commenter #3 – Lundstrom**

We have lived along the banks of Chub Creek in Waterford Township for over 27 years. The land is beautiful and fertile and provides for its people in many ways. We think Waterford Township is not an ideal place for a limestone quarry for many reasons. Of main concern is the dewatering aspect of the project. Certainly there must be limestone available in an area where they would not have to throw away water as waste or a byproduct. The Prairie du Chein aquifer is an important resource to many in our area.

All one needs to do is tune into the news to hear the plight of those residents in the SW United States to know how important an abundance of clean water can be. Rerouting the aquifer will lead to flooding downstream and a back-up of water upstream in Chub Creek.

We will expect the water table to be lowered for a substantial area around the mine. We will expect wells, springs and streams to dry up as the water table is lowered. Unfortunately this same water table is important to an area of agricultural importance in the state. Within our township, many people earn their livings from working the soil. We have traditional farming, sod farming, organic SAs, truck (sweet

corn) farming and tree farming. Not too far away we also have fruit farms.

The past 2 years of drought have shown us how important our ground water really is. Personally our apple trees are showing stress and reduced production and our pastures had to be taken out of grazing more than a month earlier than usual (August instead of October) due to extremely dry conditions.

The proposed mine is located in a Karst area. Water flowing through Karst systems are very susceptible to pollution and contamination.

The EAW said that the quarry would not pollute the area but the ground water will be migrating to the site like a drain, pulling pollutant towards the site through neighboring land, drawing pollutants along with it. Mining in an area changes the water flow patterns.

Page 22 of the EAW states: There is one mapped karst feature- a sink hole 3/4 mile NE of the site. As water is drawn towards the mining site we fear that we would see development of more sink holes forming in nearby land.

For many years, Ann collected stream data from Chub Creek for the Minnesota Pollution control and Cannon Valley watershed project. Any time we had a sizable rain of just a few inches, the creek came up many inches and often flooded. This creek is very susceptible to flooding due to the large area it drains. When it is constantly full due to waste water from the quarry what happens when it rains? What happens when the winter snow melts? How will those of us along the creek deal with the extra water? Does Bryan Rock help us with newly wet basements? Will we need flood insurance now? Do we expect the flood zones to change?

The proposed number of gravel truck trips on nearby roadways will increase the traffic substantially. One of the intersections they plan to use (Hwys 3 and 86) is a very dangerous intersection-even after the new improvements. Will Bryan Rock be responsible for the truck drivers to make sure they follow the proposed routes and do not take short cuts across small township gravel roads that are not adequate for a heavy vehicle?

We ask that the township supervisors to please vote against allowing a limestone quarry to mine in Waterford Township.

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Potential impacts related to water resources, aesthetics, and truck traffic, will be addressed in the EIS as indicated in Sections 5.1, 5.3, and 5.5 of the SDD.

**Commenter #4 - Gale on behalf of Quinnell Farms**

The Quinnell Farms have a number of concerns about the impact on their operation by this mine project.

The Quinnells own the adjacent 200 acres immediately south of the project and the 80 acres immediately east of the project (across Arkansas Avenue).

The Access Road. The biggest concern of the Quinnells is about the shared access road that is partially on the Devney farm property and partially on the Quinnell farm property. This access road has been in use by the Quinnells for some 80 years and its continued use is critical to the farming of the Quinnell 200

acres located immediately south of the proposed mine. There is also a question that is raised by the fact that on some Dakota County maps the access road is treated as an extension of 290th Street.

The EIS should clearly state how this access road will be impacted by the mine, including the location of the mine berms, and how much mine traffic this access road will bear during the different life stages of the mine. And if there is significant additional mine traffic on the access road then two additional concerns are raised; one, how much additional dust will be created and how will that dust impact the Quinnell crops, and, two, if a chloride solution is applied to the access road as a dust suppressor, how much impact will the chloride solution have on the Quinnell crops adjacent to the road.

Irrigation by Dewatering. Free irrigation has its benefits which may include decreasing the amount of fertilizer due to the nitrate concentration of the dewatering diverted to irrigation. However, the questions for the Quinnell Farms are threefold; one, how much fertilizer equivalent nitrate and Ag lime will the diverted irrigation result in so the Quinnells can accurately calculate the amount of applied fertilizer and Ag lime to buy without causing burnout, two, how would irrigation be handled if the dewatering was slowed or even completely interrupted, and three, is the irrigation going to be considered part of the fugitive dust mitigation.

The EIS should clearly state what the fertilizer and lime effect is of the water diverted to irrigation from dewatering, included the design of how the diverted water would be delivered to the Quinnell 200 acres to the south and 80 acres to the east, and answer the questions of how reliable that irrigation water source will be and what happens when there is a slow down or stoppage of supply.

Asphalt Recycling. The Quinnells are concerned that asphalt recycling, as compared to limestone mining and concrete recycling, may be a significant source of volatile chemical contamination of the dewatering irrigation water supply with a resulting negative effect on crops.

The EIS should address the impact of volatile chemical contamination in the dewatering irrigation water supply due to asphalt recycling.

Homesteads. The Quinnell Farms contains a homestead located at 29120 Arkansas Ave. W., and the Dakota County property card indicates that the home on that site was originally built in 1870. The Quinnell 280 acres could bear six additional homesteads under the one for forty rule. In 50 or so years if the restoration goes through as planned these 280 acres could be prime lakeside real estate, but presently with the mine next door or across the street it is unlikely that anyone is going to want to build their hobby-farm home next to a limestone mine, or buy a home within spitting distance of the mine.

The EIS should address the cumulative potential effects of the mine on neighboring property values.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Section 5.5 b. of the SDD is revised to include additional information in the EIS related to the shared access road between the Devney and Quinell Properties.

Section 3.7 and 5.1.c of the SDD is revised to include additional clarity regarding the evaluation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures will be evaluated with the specifics of the evaluation to be determined by the potential environmental effect that they are intended to address. Since the studies have not yet been conducted, the specifics of the mitigation evaluation are not outlined in the SDD.

Development and evaluation of mitigation measures will be performed with sufficient detail to allow informed decision as to feasibility and effectiveness. In the case of supplying irrigation water from the dewatering operation, this would include addressing the questions raised in your comment letter.

Table 4.1 and Section 4.1 of the SDD is revised to include additional information in the EIS regarding recycled concrete and asphalt with focus on storage, management, processing, beneficial use, potential impacts to groundwater contamination (which would include water diverted for irrigation), and pollution prevention will be included in the EIS.

The SDD is revised to add Section 5.7 which includes an evaluation of socioeconomic impacts. The socioeconomic impact analysis will include information on financial impacts to the township, property values, the local economy, and jobs.

#### **Commenter #5 - Allister**

I wanted to write and express concerns about the proposed mine in Waterford. I read through the EAW document, one thing that stood out is the statement that "rates of dewatering are expected to slowly increase over time as the footprint of the mine expands both horizontally and vertically." With aquifers being drained, that is concerning to us as farmers. Even though we are supposed to get "wetter" in climate projection models, the trend for this increased rainfall is occasional big storms, not regular steady rains, which leaves us with in-between periods of drought (as we've experienced the past few years)...this drought has made farming more difficult, and the water supply piece is concerning.

But beyond how this would impact us and our farm specifically, I'm more concerned about how it would impact all of us citizens of Waterford Township and also all the wildlife, the excellent soil, and the watershed...and all of those who come after us, including our kids, who could be the next generation here! The unknowns and potential risks of this project feel bigger than the rewards.

As farmers, we are painfully aware of the growing impacts of climate change year to year. I feel pretty strongly that at this moment we need to preserve our natural resources, not destroy them. Something I have always loved so much about folks here in Waterford Township, and why we chose to buy land here, is the shared value around preservation...of farmland, of history (like the bridge, and the town hall being moved instead of destroyed), of our beautiful land that includes woods, wetlands, and the river and Chub Creek. I think that it aligns with our township's values to preserve all the land in our small township rather than extract its resources.

Thanks for taking the time to listen to your neighbors!

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Potential impacts related to groundwater will be addressed in the EIS as indicated in Section 5.1 of the scoping decision document.

#### **Commenter #6 - Pepin**

Hello, I'm writing as a Minnesotan on behalf of the environment, in opposition to the proposed limestone quarry in the Waterford Township.

As an environmental steward, I don't think we can continue to prioritize business/economic interests over those of *virtually every other interest*. I can respect the assertions of the business owner that they

will run the quarry in compliance with legal requirements, but running their business “in compliance” does not guarantee avoidance of potentially devastating consequences that are likely (and some inevitable) with this proposed operation. Simply put: the Bryan Rock business plan and those requirements do not make a compelling use of land and natural resources, nor does it adequately explain how the project will create more benefit than harm for the area’s current and future inhabitants.

The EAW states that below the quarry site is a shallow aquifer, connected to the underlying Prairie du Chien–Jordan Aquifer. Considering that groundwater from the Prairie du Chien–Jordan Aquifer is the largest source of drinking water not only for the immediate area but also for a large percentage of the Twin Cities metro area (including where I live), I believe the protection of this vulnerable resource needs to be prioritized over aggregate mining. And this is just one of MANY negative impacts that this operation will yield if it is allowed to go forward, including other environmental factors, safety, health and quality of life for human and wildlife inhabitants in the area.

For the benefit of local residents, and the environment on which we all depend, I urge a vote against allowing the Bryan Rock limestone quarry to mine in Waterford Township.

Thanks in advance for consideration of my views in this important matter.

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Potential impacts related to groundwater will be addressed in the EIS as indicated in Section 5.1 of the SDD.

#### **Commenter #7 –Bratland**

I’m writing in regard to the new limestone quarry that is being proposed for Waterford Township. I have many concerns about the proposal, due to its potentially serious effects on water resources, the environment, and public health, as well as the dramatic increases it would bring in terms of noise, vibration, traffic, and hazardous roadways. Quarry mining at this site will take agricultural land out of production, destroy wildlife habitat, and threaten local wetlands in the North Cannon River Watershed.

I understand there is a constant and growing demand for aggregate, but at what cost to Waterford Township? The Draft Scoping Decision Document and the Scoping Environmental Assessment Worksheet submitted by Bryan Rock Products, Inc. detail its compliance with legal requirements related to the proposed quarry. But meeting those requirements does not make this an appropriate use of land and natural resources, nor does it adequately explain how the project will create more benefit than harm to our area’s current and future residents.

Quarrying in limestone aquifers has been proven to interfere with groundwater flow paths, lowering the water table and changing groundwater flow directions. The dewatering process associated with this mine poses significant risks to local agricultural and residential water supply and quality, while also creating the potential to exacerbate localized flooding. According to the EAW, the quarry site is underlain by a shallow aquifer, hydraulically connected to the underlying Prairie du Chien-Jordan Aquifer. Considering that groundwater from the Prairie du Chien-Jordan Aquifer is the largest source of drinking water not only for our immediate area but also for a large percentage of the Twin Cities metro area, I believe the protection of this vulnerable resource needs to be assured and prioritized over aggregate mining.

The proposed quarry will necessitate the use of many diesel-fueled gravel trucks, as well as a diesel generator and other mining equipment, which discharge combustion emissions that include nitrogen

oxides (NOx), particulate matter (PM, PM10, and PM2.5), carbon monoxide (CO), greenhouse gases (CO2), and hazardous air pollutants (HAPs). Even at low concentrations and through short-term exposure, pollutants such as PM2.5 and NOx are proven to be harmful for human health, and they contribute to crop damage and climate change, both regionally and globally.

The EAW states that total average daily traffic generated by the project is estimated to be between 165 and 440 trips per day, or up to 40 trips per hour. This fact alone demonstrates the various impacts the project would have on our community. Gravel trucks weigh 20-30 times more than passenger cars, and require 20-40 percent more distance than cars to stop, combining to create a brand-new set of infrastructure and road safety issues for residents of what is supposed to be a relatively quiet rural-residential-agricultural area.

Finally, the singular and combined effects of blasting, excavating, drilling, pumping, and trucking — beginning at 7 a.m., six days per week — will likely be felt far wider than the immediate radius of the quarry. I believe this aggregate mine will diminish the quality of life, along with the real estate and property values, for a great number of area residents.

For the benefit of local residents, your friends and neighbors, I urge you all to vote against allowing the Bryan Rock limestone quarry to mine in Waterford Township.

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Potential impacts related to groundwater, noise, truck traffic, and blasting, will be addressed in the EIS as indicated in Sections 5.1, 5.4, 5.5, and 5.6 of the SDD.

**Commenter #8—Ozmun**

Dear Waterford Supervisors,

I share with you the following comments/concerns from my husband and myself regarding the proposed limestone quarry:

Effect on ground water level

Effect on Chub Creek

Noise pollution

Air pollution

Truck traffic

Adverse effect on property values

Clearly, we are opposed to the quarry.

Respectfully, Dick & Donna Ozmun

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Potential impacts related to groundwater, surface water, noise, truck traffic, and socioeconomic effects will be addressed in the EIS as indicated in Sections 5.1, 5.4, 5.5, and 5.7 of the SDD.

**Commenter #9 – Terry**

I am not sure how big the recharge area is but if they are pumping millions of gallons per day how many years will it take to replenish the ground water for wells in the area. Since water travels horizontally as well as vertical what is the impacted area and is the mining co. responsible for drilling new deep well for home owners when shallower wells dry up. How about road maintenance with all the increased truck traffic I do not think this operation is a good fit at the present time!



**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Potential impacts related to groundwater and truck traffic will be addressed in the EIS as indicated in Sections 5.1 and 5.5 of the SDD.

**Commenter #10 – Johnson/Doherty**

My main concern is around the dewatering aspect of the mine. I am concerned about the amount of water that this will take and how it will affect the surrounding wells. As a vegetable farm in the time of climate change, we rely heavily on irrigation to produce vegetable crops. If the capacity of our wells decrease, our livelihood could be at risk. I am also concerned about the possible contamination to the water from the mining process. My other concerns center around the environment and our neighbors in Waterford. I am concerned about the adjacent wetland and Chub Creek and what all the excess water will do to the surrounding natural lands and wildlife. I am also concerned about the increased truck traffic and the quality of life of those on the trucking route. We live in an ideal little township and I fear that this may affect many residents' lives in an adverse way.

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Potential impacts related to groundwater, surface water and wetlands, and truck traffic will be addressed in the EIS as indicated in Sections 5.1 and 5.5 of the SDD.

**Commenter #11 – Lundstrom**

Living in the Waterford Township for the first 18 years of my life I was fortunate to live in a place where conservation and well-being were prioritized. Hearing of this proposed limestone quarry I instantly became nervous of the negative effects that come along with such operations.

I understand that this is an opportunity for adding jobs and wealth for a select few individuals. But when looking into the true pros and cons of a project like this you have to take a moment to view it using a systems view not an economic one.

Life as we know it majorly relies on safe, healthy, and non-polluted water resources. Any time there are extraction operations near valuable water resources we see time over time that there are issues of contamination.

Looking to issues of the future, I feel that we should be prioritizing looking after our water resources over limestone. As we see the increased prevalence of droughts and other climate issues we will see how crucial taking actions to mitigate risk will be.

Do we wish to allow an operation where we can ruin an essential resource for millions of US citizens?

I personally believe that the true interest of our township and state lie with improving conservation and preparing for the future.

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Potential impacts related to groundwater will be addressed in the EIS as indicated in Sections 5.1 of the SDD.

**Commenter #12 – Grisim**

I am a local farmer in Waterford Township. I would like to share my concerns about the potential quarry in our area. What will happen to the water table if the area around the quarry is dewatered? Will it affect the surrounding wells and cropland for adequate water? Also it is my understanding there will be a large impact on truck traffic in our area. Waterford has prided itself on being a farming community for many years and when this quarry proposal was brought before the community years ago, the residents voiced their opinions to the board to vote against the approval of a quarry. I am hoping for the same outcome for this proposal.

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Potential impacts related to groundwater and truck traffic will be addressed in the EIS as indicated in Sections 5.1 and 5.5 of the SDD.

**Commenter #13 - Greenvale Township Preservation Watch**

We are writing to submit public comment on the Waterford Township proposed quarry on behalf of Greenvale Township residents and property owners who have wells.

The 340-page document provided notes the quarry will do dewatering. We have researched and learned that dewatering affects the flow of water both at the surface and areas below the surface, thus affecting wells, especially shallow ones. There will be long-term effects of this mine to the local water supply and its movement.

According to research we did, in a Department of Natural resources (DNR) study dated 2005, and called *Hydraulic Impacts of Quarries and Gravel Pits*, the writers of this study acknowledge the needs for gravel and limestone. However, the GTPW notes their ultimate findings which are, "Ultimately, aggregate mines can only be located in areas where there are aggregate resources. Our studies have shown that in certain areas, these mines can affect the local water resources. Quarries and pits that actively dewater may have impacts on neighboring wells."

The presence of this quarry is undesirable as it is too close to vital agricultural and residential properties who rely on ample, safe, clean water.

The GTPW's purpose is to aid the Greenvale Township community at-large by watching, advocating for, and communicating about: 1. Agricultural landscape and rural way of life preservation, 2. Environmental and watershed protection and/or community-wide clean-up initiatives, 3. Repair of the community through promotion of ordinance/law abidance, 4. Promotion of neighborly, honest, fact-checked information and promotion of all resident property owner speech, 5. Education of the community on Township matters, 6. Annual all-candidate forum at which residents and property owners may hear all candidates speak, and/or 7. The positions of elected officials and/or persons running for Township office concerning these aforementioned issues. Additionally, the Greenvale Township Preservation Watch is designated as a public benefit, community welfare corporation. It exists on behalf of all residents and property owners of Greenvale Township and is not affiliated with any political party or specific political candidate current or future.

**Response:** The potential impacts related to dewatering and impacts to groundwater wells will be addressed in the EIS as indicated in Section 5.1 of the SDD.

**Commenter #14 – Bentz**

I am concerned about the increase in truck traffic associated with the mine. There was an accident with a belly dump semi and an SUV directly in front of my house on Monday Sept 11, 2023. The trucks driving in and out of our township go too fast and don't slow down to let us turn into our driveway on CSAH 47. We've nearly been rear ended several times. They also engine brake and are extremely loud.

I am concerned about the dewatering associated with the mine. My farmhouse was built in 1885 and has a shallow well. It does not have the large amounts of iron that the newer deeper wells have and I do not want to have a new well drilled because it will have too much iron. We will need filtration which may not take enough of the iron out. This will directly affect the water we drink, cook with, wash our bodies and clothes with, and our ability to wash wool.

I am also concerned with how the water they remove is being handled. It should be returned to the aquifer here and not sent off to flood our creeks or sold to another state and shipped away on a train.

I am concerned with the blasting they will do to create the mine. They have not established any good communication method to let township and neighboring township residents know when they were doing tests pumping water out. I do not expect them to establish any reasonable way of communicating to residents when blasting will occur.

I'm concerned about the destruction of and impact to wetland and wildlife habitat.

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Potential impacts related to truck traffic, dewatering, well interference, management of dewatering discharge, and blasting will be addressed in the EIS as indicated in Sections 5.1, 5.5 and 5.6 of the SDD.

**Commenter #15 - J Skluzacek**

I am very concerned about what my water will do when they start the mines start. Will they fix any problems, including drilling a new well. The other problem is traffic. How will they fix the roads? Also how much noise will we be hearing when they blast, and noise from all the trucks make

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Potential impacts related to groundwater, noise, truck traffic, and blasting will be addressed in the EIS as indicated in Sections 5.1, 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6 of the SDD.

**Commenter #16 - L Skluzacek**

Financial Impact: I am concerned that the amount of money returned to Dakota county and the city or town (which I am assuming is Waterford Township) is inadequate to cover the impact. If I do my calculations, the 26MM cy of limestone will provide \$5.5MM based on the Aggregate Tax of \$0.215 per cy over 50 years. The township share sounds like a lot; \$2.375MM. That is until you divide that by 50 years, then it is only \$50,000 per year. With time value of money, historically, that works out to only \$7,000 per year at the end of this contract. Will this be enough?

Water impact: I am concerned about the impact to the water in the area as well as my own property. As an area with a rich history around water, including our beloved bridge. I see a lot of water impact reporting. Will my home and farm wells be impacted by the quarry? Either by the dewatering sump sucking water out of the quarry, or the contamination entering the Chub Creek system? What if

the water is contaminated? Then what? Water is a fragile system and is increasingly on the radar of the world. Climate Change is exacerbating our water systems. Let us not be short sighted.

Traffic impact: I understand the truck traffic will be 165 – 440 trucks per day for the quarry. I was unable to understand how the processing of recycled concrete and asphalt is being calculated in the aggregate tax and traffic impact.

Finally, I do support the rights of farmers to use their property as they see fit. The Devney family feels this is the best use of their land and I support the request for this review process. I need the township to make sure the proposed Quarry development does not impact the fair and free right to use my property as I see fit.

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Potential impacts related to socioeconomics, groundwater, and truck traffic will be addressed in the EIS as indicated in Sections 5.1, 5.5 and 5.7 of the SDD.

**Commenter #17 confidential**

I would like to inform you that I am against the quarry. I have many concerns about it from an environmental standpoint, to personal. I used to drive truck for a road construction company, so I know what impact this will have in the community. I don't want the noise, dust, or construction traffic that this WILL bring. We have a pleasant nice and quiet community and I would greatly appreciate it if it would stay that way. I know it will not if this goes through. I worked my butt off to buy my house and to have the peace and quiet. I bought my first house when I was 19, have worked 60 plus hours a week since I was 15. I did NOT work that hard to have a loud, dusty, traffic filled quarry go in right across the road. If this goes through... That really does make me consider moving. I WOULD BE VERY DISAPPOINTED. We have had traffic diverted down our road due to accidents before. Hundreds of vehicles driving WAY TOO FAST down our quiet street. Now with is going in I know that it WILL be this way ALL DAY EVERY DAY.

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Potential impacts related to noise and truck traffic will be addressed in the EIS as indicated in Sections 5.4 and 5.5 of the SDD.

**Commenter #18 – Bartsch**

I wanted to send over my thoughts re: Bryan Rock Products, Inc.'s Waterford Township Limestone Quarry. As a farmer in Waterford/Northfield, I am concerned about a number of issues the limestone quarry would present.

First, dewatering and its impact on our wells is a huge concern. We are in our third year of drought-like conditions so irrigation is a must if we want to properly grow our crops. I have never had an issue with water for irrigating my crops, but with dewatering, I am unsure the impact on the amount of water I would have to water my crops. The unpredictable weather conditions including drought, sporadic rainfall, and unusually warm weather takes a toll on crops quickly, so water as a consistent dependable resource is essential to our success. I am also concerned about the impact on wells and the minerals that can present a challenge for processing my specific crop after harvest. My crop is very pH sensitive and sensitive to the presence of minerals like iron. If there are minerals in the water it ruins the end product of my crop and would require me to replace all my water sources for processing the crop once harvested.

Second, I am concerned about the impact on wildlife and wetland habitat in addition to wastewater disbursement and how that impacts Chub Creek and other wetland areas. Many of the crops I and other farmers in the area grow require pollination in order to successfully fruit, seed, and germinate. I have noticed a robust assortment of native pollinators in my field and fear that we would see an unknown impact on them and by extension our ecosystem with this quarry. Once we begin tampering with one aspect of our ecosystem, the rest of us will feel that impact one way or another, one that can be a costly burden for local farmers and growers.

Third, our area benefits from tourism and commerce due to our clean waterways and wildlife recreational features. As someone who benefits from tourism which brings consumers to the area, I am concerned about the financial impact on recreational opportunities and the decreased traffic of consumers to the area.

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Potential impacts related to groundwater, surface water and socioeconomic impacts will be addressed in the EIS as indicated in Sections 5.1 and 5.7 of the SDD.

#### **Commenter #19 – Stuber**

It is very disappointing to have learned the last couple of days of a push to allow mining of aggregate in Waterford Township. Twenty three years ago it was very clear the residence of Waterford Township were not interested in rezoning from agriculture to allow mining. The residence wanted to maintain three things. Farming, community, and family.

The proposal for the aggregate mining generates numerous concerns.

- Dewatering
  - Many of us have shallow wells. Approximately 9 years ago we had to lower our well pump because of a lower water table and the pump sucking air. Dewatering will only aggravate this further.
  - The ground measurements were taken 9/21 – 12/21. Since then we have had two very dry or drought summers. Are the numbers from 2021 still valid?
  - Over the last three summers with the dry conditions we have had a few areas in our yard that have sunk. Dewatering will again only aggravate this.
- Traffic
  - All roads are gravel and will not support or have the structure to carry the heavy truck traffic. Some of our gravel roads today will not support residential traffic without having ruts and mud holes.
  - Their estimate of 440 loads a day in quarter 3 averages about 1 truck per minute leaving the facility. That also means empty trucks have to arrive at the same rate.
  - With this many trucks it will be a traffic jam at CR 86 and Hi-way 3. Drivers will become impatient and start using other roads (300<sup>th</sup> street and Canada road) to not sit in line at the stop sign. If they are paid by the load it will make it even worse.
- Pollution
  - Dust pollution will be over a large area. It could be similar to the fires and smoke we get from Canada. This dust will be generated by the mining operation, truck traffic, and crushing.
  - Emissions from engines is obvious with 400 trucks a day and the heavy equipment.

- Noise from all the traffic, heavy equipment, and mining will take away the peacefulness of a farming community in the country.
- Home and property values
  - A mining operation will add no value to our homes or properties. It can only lower the values due to traffic, dust, and noise.
  - Only the farmer and Bryon Brock will make a substantial profit at the expense of the rest of us.
- We certainly hope that the board will see that this proposal should have moved through a rezoning process and not quickly moved forward without giving all home owners a formal notification and chance to respond to rezoning other than the purpose of farming. Thank you for reconsidering and denying a mining operation in Waterford Township.

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Often times pumps are set at shallow depths even when the well is deep. Lowering pumps is a common practice when the regional water table drops due to drought or well interference. Baseline water level monitoring will continue throughout the EIS study timeframe to capture seasonal fluctuations and longer-term trends. In addition, water level monitoring is expected to be required as part of the water appropriation permit. Potential project related effects to groundwater from dewatering and well interference will be addressed in the EIS as indicated in Section 5.1 of the SDD.

A traffic impact analysis will be included in the EIS to establish the Project's impact on surrounding roadways and nearby intersections. The traffic study will identify recommended improvements as may be applicable, including paving Arkansas Avenue from the Site entrance to 280th Street so the haul routes will be on paved roads. The estimated truck traffic trips included in the EAW are trips not roads. The worst-case traffic generation anticipated is 200 loads/day. The 400 trips per day indicated in the EAW reflects 200 empties in and 200 loads out. Under the highest estimated production rates of 700,000 tons per year and the busiest time of year, the estimated 200 loads per day would generate an average of approximately 18 loads per hour, one haul truck leaving the facility every 3.3 minutes, not every one minute. Potential traffic impacts will be addressed in the EIS as indicated in Section 5.5 of the SDD.

Air emissions including fugitive dust is regulated under the MPCA air emission permit that will be required to operate the facility. The site will operate under a fugitive dust control plan and air emissions related to truck traffic will be included in the traffic impact study. Socioeconomic impacts will be evaluated as indicated in Section 5.7 of the SDD.

**Commenter #20 - Podritz**

I have some questions as I am a new resident to Sciota Township - Previous Randolph City resident and Council member.

What are the environmental impacts of this quarry when water is being pumped out? As a resident that has a natural pond behind us that has a natural creek/artesian well we are concerned with this going dry as you pump water. While we are not opposed to mining the removal of water that will then be flushed into Chub Creek is rather alarming. Would you consider mining without allowing water to be pumped?

2 Years ago southern states approached Dakota Co about pumping and freighting water to dry southern states. This was greatly opposed as it should have been. However, mining and removing water and

forcing it into a small creek ultimately will flush water to southern states defeating the purpose of opposing the proposal 2 years ago.

Please consider the following:

1. Dry residential wells. Who will be responsible for residents in Sciota and Waterford's wells drying? If your response is, 'We will take care of it' there will be a time, place, and threshold in which any agency would no longer be willing to be responsible for dry wells. At what point would you STOP fixing the well situation? 5 Wells? 10? 25?

2. Natural organic material. Flushing additional water down Chub Creek will move all the natural organic matter. Silt, soil, plants, wild life, insects, nature that country folk want. We do not want to lose our natural creek

3. Chub Creek - While naturally creeks and rivers are winding, when large volumes of water are flushed down them, the passage will change and straighten out over time, what will this do to homes/properties along those waterways? What will happen if homes are flooded? Mother nature works in unpredictable ways - What if there is a massive rain added to pumped water, and natural water flow - what is the protection for homes and properties if Chub Creek Floods. While a large amount of water could change the flow - it can also add streams/arms off of it.

\*\*Will a study on the water flow, with added volume, and time be done BEFORE this project is approved??

4. Flooding fields - washing away seed/crop.

5. Location - It is rather alarming that your location is in the northeast part of Waterford Township to dump into the North Branch of Chub Creek DIRECTLY impacting Sciota, Randolph City, and Randolph Township, into Lake Byllesby. How can you make such a drastic choice that will benefit your township while negatively impacting surrounding townships and towns. This fact alone is selfish and mind blowing that you are allowed to make choices that harm others dramatically to benefit yourselves.

PLEASE, if you proceed, get hard true answers to these questions and proceed with CAUTION. While you have shared the details from Barr Engineering there are additional concerns that I have included here that are not being addressed in their reports. In my professional experience, large projects like this with large engineering companies will give you enough details to feel 'safe' or 'confident' in your choice but not enough details to be able to hold them accountable for environmental and personal property/damage.

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Potential impacts related to groundwater, well interference, downstream impacts to surface waters including Chub Creek, will be addressed in the EIS as indicated in Section 5.1 of the SDD. Studies included in the EIS are not limited by municipal boundaries, but rather by the footprint over which a potential impact is anticipated to occur.

#### **Commenter #21 – Ottaway**

Dear Waterford Township council members,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the limestone quarry proposal. I am a resident of Dakota County who lives in Northfield, but I frequently use the area around Canada Ave. and 300th St. for

horseback riding. I am concerned about the increase in large equipment and traffic on these roads, which, in my experience, are always full of walkers, joggers, bikers and horseback riders. This agricultural land area seems to be filling a crucial role for both farmers and recreational users, and I worry about the effects of the quarry, both environmentally and socially.

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. In general, the EIS is prepared to assess potential environmental effects, evaluate mitigation, and inform permitting processes. Project related traffic and socioeconomic effects will be evaluated in the EIS as indicated in Sections 5.5 and 5.7 of the SDD.

**Commenter #22 – Ehrmann**

We were attracted to this area because the township has always valued agriculture over development. As a farmer I rely on clean water and soil to make a living. If our township is willing to allow a mining industry to ship this soil, gravel and land outside of the township what else are we willing to do? This land should stay here, please don't allow someone to sell the ground below our feet.

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. The EIS will include an evaluation of land use compatibility as described in Table 4-1 of the SDD.

**Commenter #23 – Tyler**

I am Vickie Tyler a resident of Greenvale township. I am opposed to the potential limestone quarry on the grounds of concerns for our water supply. We have been in drought conditions since 2020 and have seen drops in agricultural yields. As a strong farming community, I would advocate keeping the available water in our area for our impressive and vital farmers. If this drought continues, more and more of us will need to irrigate our land to continue growing the food that feeds the world, and we will need our healthy water tables intact to do so. Please block this quarry as best you can.

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Potential effects on groundwater quantity will be evaluated in the EIS as described in Section 5.1 of the SDD. The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources regulates water appropriations. Minnesota Statute 103G.261 prioritizes water for residential water supply and agricultural use over mine dewatering.

**Commenter #24 – Croy**

We live near the Waterford Township area and spend much time enjoying the tranquil environment around Chub Creek.

We are very concerned about the potential back up of water caused by the proposed quarry on Chub Creek. We have seen the affects of heavy rainfall that intermittently cause the Creek to swell beyond its banks.

It is unfathomable what the damage will be, with sustained back up of water due to changes in water flow patterns.



Plus, the change in traffic on small township gravel roads would negatively impact the quietness of the area. It's for these reasons and more, that we ask that the township supervisors to please vote against allowing a limestone quarry to operate in Waterford Township.

**Response:** Thank you for your comments. Potential effects to Chub Creek will be evaluated in the EIS as indicated in Sections 5.1 SDD. Potential traffic impacts will be evaluated in the EIS as indicated in Section 5.5 of the SDS.