February 7, 2009

RECEIVED
FEB - 9 2009
CITY OF SCANDIA

Anne Hurlburt, City Administrator
City of Scandia
14727 209th St N
Scandia MN 55073

Dear Ms Hurlburt,

I would like to submit these written comments regarding the EAW for the Tiller Corporation's Zavoral Mining and Reclamation Project. I attended the public hearing in Scandia last week and did not make any comments at that time.

I live in the Town of Farmington, Wisconsin, just across the river from the proposed mine site. I have lived here for nearly 60 years – my entire life. I have been a volunteer for Standing Cedars Community Land Conservancy since 1995, serving as a board member and in many other ways. I have concerns about the reopening of the gravel pit right across the river from my neighborhood and the Standing Cedars land trust. I ask that the City of Scandia think of the proposed gravel pit's impact on its neighbors on both sides of the river when deciding whether to require an Environmental Impact Statement or not.

My main concerns are noise from the operation of equipment in the pit and from increased truck traffic, visibility of equipment and gravel stockpiles from both sides of the river, and negative impacts on water and air quality and on wildlife.

Much of the Standing Cedars land across the river from the proposed mine will be dedicated as a State Natural Area this spring. SNA's are dedicated for the purpose of fostering public awareness, appreciation, understanding, and respect for our state's natural heritage and for protecting populations of native and rare plant and animal species, ecosystems, geological features, natural sounds, and scenic beauty. It seems to me that locating a gravel pit in the vicinity of this SNA (and a National Scenic Riverway and a Scenic Byway) goes against just about every one of those goals. Here are some of my specific questions and concerns:

Do you know if the equipment and stock piles at the proposed gravel pit will be visible from the across the river? Or from Highway 97 heading east toward Wisconsin? Has a view shed analysis been done? Would it be done as part of an EIS?

This part of the St Croix Valley is already a very noisy place. Sounds tend to be amplified in the valley. Traffic noise has increased considerably in the past 10 to 20 years, especially noise from large trucks. With the expansion of gravel mining in Franconia and across the river around Osceola, the problem of truck traffic noise has only gotten worse. Tiller officials have said that there would be no net gain of gravel truck trips on Highways 95 and 97 because the trips from the new pit would replace the trips from the Franconia and Wisconsin pits, one for one. But is this something that can be

controlled or enforced? Who monitors truck counts? Does the company keep records and are these records open to the public?

Does Tiller own the Franconia gravel pits and the Wisconsin pit they kept mentioning? The official said that they control these other pits. He also said that most of the gravel from the Franconia mine (at the Osceola cutoff) went south on Highway 95 and then west on 97, but that is not true. I go to work everyday on Highways 243 and 95 and Chisago County Rd 26, and I see loaded trucks leaving that pit headed across the river to Osceola, headed north on 95 to Highway 8, and taking the County 26 cutoff to Highway 8. The amount of gravel truck traffic is sometimes mind-boggling and is a real frustration for drivers who are trying to negotiate the roads during peak gravel hauling times. I don't trust this company when they talk about numbers of truck trips and their impact on traffic and on our roads. And about the noise from the mining operation itself – I remember the noise from this pit when it was in operation last time. It's not a quiet place and living anywhere near it is not a peaceful experience!

I was troubled to hear that the operations at the Zavoral site would include not just gravel mining, but also recycling of asphalt and concrete materials. Would this recycling mean additional dust, odors and noise? Does the recycling involve grinding of these materials? Does the recycling of asphalt mean heating it, so in effect you have a "hot mix" plant operating on the site? Does having these materials on site increase the chances of groundwater contamination?

Those are some of my questions and concerns. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to submit them. I look forward to hearing the comments and findings of the planning commission, and I appreciate all the work that city officials do for Scandia and for the greater St Croix Valley community.

Respectfully,

Ron Johnson

Ron Johnson
2878A 50th Ave
Osceola WI 54020
715-294-3977
rkjohnson@centurytel.net

22.

Anne Hurlburt

From: Roger Harvieux [rjharvieux@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, February 09, 2009 12:39 PM
To: a.hurlburt@ci.scandia.mn.us
Subject: Zavoral Quarry Project

I am writing as a concerned citizen relative to the subject project. I question the project value to the city and the citizens of Scandia in a number of areas.:

1) The traffic and potential for safety are a large concern. Loaded trucks (60 per day) from the quarry & (60 per day) to the quarry, crossing a 55 mph thru State Highway is a major concern. Highway 95 is in terrible shape as it is.
2) The noise and potential for pollution (air, water, wildlife habitat, and the scenic St. Croix Valley and river) is of concern.
3) Protection of the environment has to be a major focus and concern for all involved.
4) The value of the operation to the city should be known and valued against the cost to the city of Scandia to administer, monitor the project, and protect nature and the environment.

I believe a full environmental impact study is definitely required.

I appreciate your review and response to my concerns.

Thank you,

Roger J. Harvieux
20258 St. Croix Trail N.
Scandia, MN 55073
rjharvieux@yahoo.com
651-433-1364

23.

Anne Hurlburt

From: Louie DiBerardini [lsd25350@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, February 09, 2009 1:15 PM
To: a.hurlburt@ci.scandia.mn.us
Subject: mining in Scandia

I believe that Tiller Corp. applied for their mining permit in November of 08 for the Zavoral Property before our new comp. plan could go into effect. There are also other residents of Scandia with the same concern. We do not need an ugly mining hole along one of the most beautiful scenic highways in Minnesota. Not to mention, all the noise, traffic, pollution, etc. that comes with it. Tiller Corp. is not thinking of Scandia, but all the money it plans on making. Let them keep their Franconia and Wisc. mines and not destroy a beautiful part of Scandia. If you drive north on highway 95 to Franconia and see the huge ugly holes on both the east and west sides, it reinforces that this is a sight we do not want in Scandia. Water quality to our wells and the St. Croix River is a major concern because of all the different mining tactics that will take place there. I really hope a decision to open the Zavoral property for mining is not determined by money. I don't believe the City of Scandia is that desperate for business that it can allow this kind of destruction along Highway 95.

Louie DiBerardini
20680 St. Criox Trl. N
Scandia, Mn. 55073

24

Anne Hurlburt

From: Mary Vogel [vogel001@tc.umn.edu]
Sent: Monday, February 09, 2009 5:09 PM
To: sherri.buss@tkda.com; a.hurlburt@ci.scandia.mn.us
Subject: Mining Concerns

Ann & Sherri,

I did not speak at the hearing, but I wish to raise some concerns about the proposed mine's impact on:

Water Quality:
In addition to the concerns raised at the hearing about the storm water run off and the small streams, the Saint Croix is fed by many seeps along the bank. Would the proposed mining impact these seeps?

Quality of the environment after the mining is finished:
The mitigation seems far less than ideal given the location of the pit: the slopes could slump, the planted vegetation could be unsuccessful and the berms seem to not be in keeping in the current conditions along the scenic byway. What guarantees will be given to ensure a quality environment, not just a planted hole?

Mary Vogel
725 Pine Cone Trail, P.O. Box 204
Marine, MN 55047

--

25,

Anne Hurlburt

From: georgiana anderson [simba@backpack.net]
Sent: Monday, February 09, 2009 7:27 PM
To: a.hurlburt@ci.scandia.mn.us
Subject: gravel pit

I am very concerned about water quality for those of us who have wells in the area. Our well is not immediately adjacent. I t 's is some distance. Nevertheless,even if ours is not impacted,it isn't fair that other find problems.

Water quality for the River is also important. We live down river. Not only is swimming quality important ,impact on the plants that grow along the shore(cardinal flowers etc),on critters like otters,turtles,fish,herons,eagles,ospreys etc are all going to be impacted. I do not understand how such an industry can be allowed anymore along this river.I know this is out side the Wild and Scenic River area but the impact on this river will still be felt on The River. Those who kayak,canoe,boat and camp along the river will be forced to listen to the noise that will be a direct result.

What about the water table? I am not talking about wells. I am thinking about those who wish to farm. Will their water be gone,used to wash the gravel.
Is there an economic benefit for Scandia? Will jobs come from there? I haven't heard that they will. What is in this for the community? We are going to put up with 10 years of 120 trucks a day on highway 95?Ten years of dust and noise. The dust,noise,dirt and traffic are showstoppers.What about traffic control?

Absolutely, an Economic Impact Statement needs to be done? There is a question? That is a no brainer.

Georgiana Anderson
20453 Quinnell Ave S
Scandia,Mn

26.

RECEIVED
FEB 11 2009
CITY OF SCANDIA

Edmund & Judith Summersby
15 Vassal Lane
Cambridge, MA 02138

9 February 2009

Ms. Anne Hurlburt
Scandia City Administrator
14727 209th Street North
Scandia, MN 55073

Subject: Comments on the Zavoral Property Mining and Reclamation Environmental Assessment Worksheet, dated November 2008

Dear Ms. Hurlburt,

We are long-time part-year residents of Scandia, located at 20457 Quinnell Avenue, on the St. Croix River immediately south of Log House Landing, and we wish to submit our comments on the Zavoral Property Mining and Reclamation Project. We understand the Zavoral family's desire to improve the appearance of that portion of their property occupying the former Barton gravel mine, but because of numerous negative impacts to the surrounding environment that this project will cause, we are strongly opposed to the proposal as described in the Environmental Assessment Worksheet, and we urge the City of Scandia to require the preparation of a full Environmental Impact Study before granting any approvals or permits. Our comments are as follows:

1. Project Scope. We understand that the owner's intent after site reclamation is to place the land in a land conservation trust, certainly a laudable goal, but getting to that point by the methods intended will be far more destructive with long-lasting and deleterious consequences than a simple reclamation process would entail. The goal of reclaiming and restoring the site could be achieved by simply grading smooth the existing gravel piles and irregular landforms, filling the depressions, and then applying topsoil and establishing vegetation and landscaping, as is already proposed as the final stage of the current project. This would achieve the desired end result far sooner and without the long-term disruption, noise, dust and traffic associated with a full gravel mining and crushing operation as proposed.

2. Noise Impacts. We have vivid memories of the constant loud noise that accompanied the gravel mine operation when it was operated by Barton in the1970s and 80s. The St. Croix River valley acts as a natural amplifier that channels noise across the water and up and down the river valley, and as we live directly on the river and a half mile south, we were very aware of the constant and annoying sound of the gravel mine operations – tractors, backhoes, diesel trucks with loud backup alarms, and especially the loud clanking noise of the gravel crushing machines.

3. Hours of Operation. The project proposes to operate from 7AM to 7 PM weekdays, a 12-hour workday. We believe that is excessive and unreasonable due to the noise issues listed above. If this project is permitted, we urge the City of Scandia to limit operations to a normal workday, a maximum of 8 hours per day. The previous operator of the gravel mine routinely continued operating the crushing machines well into the night hours, often as late as midnight. That should not be permitted under any circumstance

4. Truck Traffic Impacts.. The project estimates an average of 120 gravel truck trips (coming and going) per day, with a peak hour of 40 truck trips (in and out) between 7AM and 8 AM. All these large trucks will enter and exit the site at the busy intersection of Highway 95 and Highway 97, which even at present often has heavy traffic backed up on Hwy 97 waiting to turn left onto Hwy 95 heading north, especially in the late afternoon. It is estimated that 95% of the truck traffic to and from the site will travel on Highway 97 heading west through Scandia. It is certain that such a large volume of added truck traffic at that intersection will lead to serious and possibly dangerous traffic congestion.

5. Duration of the Project. The prospect of a 10-year operation of the gravel mine is unacceptable. As stated in item 1 above, we understand the owner's desire to improve the site, but the prospect of a 10-year duration of a noisy and dusty operation, with resulting heavy truck traffic is most discouraging. If, in spite of widespread public opposition, Scandia allows the project to proceed, we urge a strictly limited duration, not to exceed one year.

6. Water Management. The gravel mining operation involves washing the crushed gravel and recycling the washwater. Given the permeable nature of the site soils (silty loams, loamy sands and gravelly coarse sand) Tiller Corporation should be required to be far more specific than "best management practices" about exactly how is it proposed that the water retention basins will in fact retain water. Unless properly lined with an impermeable membrane and carefully maintained, there will be substantial water leakage, runoff, and further erosion of the slopes leading to the St. Croix River, not to mention potential contamination of the groundwater aquifer, upon which many nearby residents depend for their water supply.

7. Dust Control. Gravel mining and crushing operations are inherently dirty and dusty operations, as is evident from the experience of other communities located near active gravel pit operations, which report a constant need to wash windows and repeated efforts to keep dust out of houses, not easy to do in summertime when windows are open. Tiller proposes to control fugitive dust emissions by watering the haul roads and spraying the crushing machines to "minimize generation of dust during the extraction process". How will the City of Scandia enforce this procedure on an on-going basis?

8. Erosion Control and Impact on River Water Quality There are at least two watersheds that drain to the St. Croix River, and at some time during the years of the Barton gravel operation there was a "blowout" that resulted in substantial erosion of the

slope leading to the river, the results of which can be seen today in a prominent gravel delta in the river directly below the site, at the southern terminus of McLeod's Slough. Such runoffs lead to increased sedimentation of the river, and negatively impact water quality, and especially the mussel population. Similar events can surely be anticipated to happen again, and Tiller should be required to demonstrate exactly how they will prevent such occurrences.

9. Asphalt Reprocessing. While the EAS made no mention of asphalt reprocessing, it is our understanding from the February 3rd public meeting that the Tiller Corporation, the proposed operator, also intends to import broken asphalt pavement removed from highways and streets in order to break down the chunks, crush them and reprocess them for reuse in new asphalt pavement. That would be a totally unacceptable industrial use of this site, now zoned agricultural. The operator might consider this a good use of the crushing machines he has brought to the site, but importing old asphalt to this location would definitely exacerbate all the deleterious effects already cited, with the introduction of tar, oil, petroleum waste and other pollutants of the air, ground and ground water.

10. Impact on the St. Croix River National Scenic Riverway. Inasmuch as the Zavoral site is not visible from the St. Croix River, the impact of this project on the National Scenic Riverway will be limited to noise pollution, an unfortunate and unavoidable byproduct of gravel mining. Some twenty years ago, the federal government purchased scenic easements from all property owners abutting the river on the Minnesota side, including the Zavoral property (and our property as well), for the purpose of protecting and preserving the rural, peaceful and scenic qualities of this unique and beautiful waterway. While the project boundaries carefully avoid encroaching on that portion of the property included in the St. Croix River District and the USA scenic easements (except for restoration in the final phase) and therefore the project technically may not violate the scenic easements, nevertheless it seems to us to violate the spirit of the agreement that all we property owners made with the federal government to preserve the St. Croix River valley as an unspoiled natural scenic and recreational resource. Gravel mining, though not visible from the river, is totally at variance with the aims of the National Scenic Riverway and inconsistent with the spirit of the restrictions imposed upon all riverfront landowners by our scenic easements.

In conclusion, it is our belief that if permitted as presently conceived, this project will have significant negative environmental impacts and it is our recommendation that the City require a full Environmental Impact Statement before considering or permitting further action.

Yours sincerely,

Edmund K. Summersby - Judith A. Summersby

27.

Anne Hurlburt

From: Chauncey Anderson & Tracy Wygant [andrgant@hevanet.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 10, 2009 1:48 AM
To: a.hurlburt@ci.scandia.mn.us
Subject: Tiller Corporation / Zavoral Mine EAW Comments

Dear Ms Hurlburt,

I am part of a family that holds property in Otisville, MN, not far downstream from the location of the Zavoral property with the proposed Tiller Corporation Gravel Mine. I have been reviewing the online documents regarding the proposed mine and would like to submit some comments and questions.

For the record, our property is located on the Minnesota shores of the St. Croix River, immediately south of the loghouse landing and accessed from Quinnell Avenue, and approximately 0.6 mi downstream of the stream bordering the north side of the Zavoral-mine property that empties into the river. Our family has occupied this property, including several structures, since the early 1900's. I am a resident of Oregon but return frequently to the St. Croix for family vacations and to help maintain our property there. I also happen to be a hydrologist for the federal government, specializing in water quality studies of rivers and lakes; in particular I focus on studies of non-point runoff of pollutants, nutrients, and sediment to fresh waters, and the potential effects on aquatic biota and human health. I would like to state that this email and any of my time spent evaluating the Zavoral Mine is done entirely on my own time, outside of my official duties, and with my own resources, and any opinions stated herein and afterwards are mine alone and do not reflect the views of the federal government.

I would also like to state that my interest here is not to disparage the Zavorals or their right to develop their property -- rather I am primarily interested in protecting the outstanding resources of the St. Croix River Basin, including water quality and recreational (fishing, swimming, boating) opportunities that it presents, and ensuring that this is an open process with no future unpleasant surprises to the community. Secondly, our family, like many if not most others in the vicinity, draws our drinking water from a relatively shallow well about 0.4 mi downslope from the proposed mine and I am interested in protecting the quality and quantity of our drinking water. Finally, I am also interested in ensuring that any nuisance effects of the proposed mine relative to noise levels, traffic, dust, or other aesthetic issues are effectively mitigated.

General and specific comments on the EAW and proposed mine are listed below. I can be reached at 503-869-2639 or by email to andrgant@hevanet.com. Thank you for your consideration.
Chauncey Anderson
Portland, Oregon

General Comments:

Based entirely on reading the documents available at the Scandia city website's page dedicated to this mine, I think some sort of larger environmental assessment is warranted. While the Tiller Corporation appears to have prepared a reasonable Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW), some holes remain unaddressed concerning prevention of sediment runoff to the river, potential effects on groundwater, and nuisance levels of noise, traffic, and dust. Furthermore, I would like to request that a professional, unbiased review be commissioned of the EAW and whatever additional environmental studies are done in response to the comment period, that this review be performed by an entity not associated with Tiller Corporation or the Zavorals, and include at least one site-visit encompassing the St.

Croix river immediately adjacent to and downstream of the proposed mine and the stream basin bordering the Zavoral property on the north side, in addition to the mine-site itself. Finally, I would like to request a site visit open to the public or at least those commenting during this comment period, to give Tiller Company representatives the opportunity to explain their proposed mitigation plans in a setting where the actual mining environment can be viewed. The site visit should be during a time period when the ground can be seen and accessed - that is, not during winter with snow on the ground.

Specific concerns on the EAW and potential local impact of the mine are listed below:

1. From figures 1-6, the northern boundary of the proposed quarry borders on and appears to intrude into the watershed for the small creek that flows to the St. Croix at the point across from the old Main Channel. In the river this stream's mouth provides important fish habitat and controls boating navigability along the one deep channel during low-water periods. While recognizing that the plans involve maintaining an undisturbed area along the stream, I cannot tell if any of the mined area is within the watershed boundaries of this stream or not. How will sediment runoff be mitigated and monitored to prevent siltation in the stream and to the river? This is particularly important during storm runoff periods and spring snowmelt. What are applicable statutes and environmental standards regarding turbidity, sedimentation, or nutrient export to this stream and to the St. Croix River, and how will they be measured? What will be used to assess background or reference conditions?

2. For washing the aggregate, how much water will be used? Question 13 is not answered with enough information to determine the volume used. Will there be any impact to local aquifers, wells, or water levels in wells? This is unaddressed.

3. Future development is addressed in the EAW in question 29, p. 14. After repeatedly denying there will be future development, Tiller Corporation and/or the Zavorals clearly are leaving the door open for it, even if not actually having formal plans to develop it. E.g., one might be somewhat skeptical at this statement:

> *"There are no future projects, planned or foreseeable, which would involve mining at this site. The reclamation will leave the site in a condition ready for ultimate development. However, the parameters of the development have not been established and are not included for consideration in this EAW".*

What laws govern the mitigation and reclamation of this site for future development following the cessation of mining there, especially given the proximity to the St. Croix river? Will there be a river access right associated with this property that could increase traffic to and on the river, downslope from the mine property? What about construction of houses that could be seen from the river? Should future development be addressed in more detail than is given here?

28.

RECEIVED
FEB 10 2009
CITY OF SCANDIA

February 9, 2009

Ms. Anne Hulburt
City Administrator
14717 209th St., N.
Scandia, MN 55073

Dear Ms. Hulburt:

My name is Terry N. Saario. My husband, Lee Lynch, and I own a cabin on the St. Croix river at 19708 Quinnell N., Scandia.
I am writing with regard to the Zavoral application to renew mining on their property. Without judgment about the inherent value of the proposal, I strongly urge the city of Scandia to conduct a very thorough environmental impact study of the proposed project. I admit to worries about the impact of the project on the river and its water quality, the value of adjacent properties, the increase in truck traffic, and the increase in noise and dust for all surrounding properties.

I will reserve judgment about the project pending the environmental impact study.

Sincerely,

Terry N. Saario
34 Park Lane
Minneapolis, MN 55416

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
520 Lafayette Road North | St. Paul, MN 55155-4194 | 651-296-6300 | 800-657-3864 | 651-282-5332 TTY | www.pca.state.mn.us

February 10, 2009

RECEIVED
FEB 10 2009
CITY OF SCANDIA

Ms. Anne Hurlburt
Administrator, City of Scandia
14727 209th Street North
Scandia, MN 55073

Re: Zavoral Property Mining and Reclamation Environmental Assessment Worksheet

Dear Ms. Hurlburt:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) for the proposed Zavoral Property Mining and Reclamation project (Project) in the city of Scandia, Washington County, Minnesota. Regarding matters for which the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) has regulatory responsibility and other interests, the MPCA staff has the following comments for your consideration.

Permits and approvals required / Regulatory requirements
Item 8 of the EAW lists the need for an 'NPDES Storm Water' permit. Gravel mining operations typically require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System/State Disposal System (NDPES/SDS) General Permit for Construction Sand and Gravel, Aggregate and Hot Mix Asphalt Facilities (MNG490000). The MNG490000 covers both construction and operation related stormwater issues. Application forms and instructions are available on the MPCA's Web site at http://pca.state.mn.us/water/permits/sandgravel.html.

Water quality: surface water runoff
Lake St. Croix, a receiving water for runoff from the Project area, is listed as impaired by the states of Wisconsin and Minnesota (see the 2008 303(d) Total Maximum Daily Load [TMDL] list of impaired waters on the MPCA Web page at: http://www.pca.state.mn.us/water/tmdl/tmdl-303dlist.html) due to excess nutrients. Under the federal Clean Water Act, this impaired status requires both states to conduct a TMDL study and implementation plan for the lake. The TMDL implementation plans will assign waste load allocations to watersheds and permitted sources throughout the watershed. The target date for completion of Minnesota's TMDL study for Lake St. Croix is 2011. Our concern with the proposed Project with respect to the TMDL for Lake St. Croix involves the potential for runoff carrying sediments and phosphorous to leave the Project site. Both sediment and phosphorus are a concern not only for Lake St. Croix but also for wildlife that uses the St. Croix River. In light of these concerns, the MPCA makes the following recommendations:

- The EAW indicates that buffers will be left along the boundaries of the pit area. There should be extra protection given to the bluff areas along the eastern edge of the site. This area contains steep slopes and ravines which allow easy flowage of sediments and storm water from the site. These areas should be given extra buffering to protect the resources and to prevent the loss of sediment and phosphorus from the site.

- With the stockpiling of the excavated material, there is concern about sediments being carried by wind and deposited into the St. Croix River. Efforts should be made to ensure that fine sediments do not leave the site.

- The plan for reclamation of the old gravel pit areas should involve local government and resource managers and ensure that native vegetation is used. Along with the restoration activities, efforts should be made to ensure that runoff from the area is limited or at least treated before entering the St. Croix.

Cumulative potential effects

A cumulative potential effects analysis must consider other projects in the vicinity of the proposed Project that might reasonably be expected to affect the same natural resource(s) as the proposed Project, including future projects already planned or for which a basis of expectation has been laid. This does not appear to have been done in this EAW, which focuses solely on the proposed mining and reclamation activities at the site. Guidance on cumulative potential effects analyses may be found in Chapter 3 of the 2008 Guide to Minnesota Environmental Review Rules, published by the Minnesota Environmental Quality Board (EQB), and available on their website at http://www.eqb.state.mn.us/documents/2008%20Guide%20to%20Mn%20Env.%20Review%20Rules.pdf. In completing this item, you must identify any other projects (and explain how they were identified), identify the cumulative impacts that may occur as a result of interaction of the other project(s) with the proposed project, and identify the natural resource(s) affected and how it may be affected.

We look forward to receiving your responses to our comments and notice of decision on the need for an Environmental Impact Statement. Please be aware that this letter does not constitute approval by the MPCA of any or all elements of the project for the purpose of pending or future permit action(s) by the MPCA. Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the Project proposer to secure any required permits and to comply with any requisite permit conditions. If you have any questions about our surface water quality comments or the Lake St. Croix TMDL study and implementation plan, please contact Christopher Klucas at 651-757-2498. Please contact me at 651-757-2328 if you any other questions about our comments on the Zavoral Property Mining and Reclamation project EAW.

Sincerely,

Jessica Ebertz
Planner Principal
Environmental Review and Feedlot Section
Regional Division

JE:mbo

cc: Christopher Klucas, MPCA
Denise Leezer, MPCA
Craig Affeldt, MPCA
Terry Mader, MPCA

RECEIVED
FEB 10 2009
CITY OF SCANDIA

30.

February 10, 2009

Scandia City Council
Scandia Planning Commission

I write to you to reiterate my concerns about the Tiller Corporation's mining proposal for the Zavoral property. I urge the Council and the Commission to require an EIS to further study the impact of such a project. It is clear that the EAW was rushed to be submitted before the new laws would be put into effect that would surely prevent any such a proposal from even being considered. As such, the EAW is cursory and incomplete. Also, the presentation by the Tiller Corp. geologist and Mr. Caron presented new information and incorrect information that needs to be clarified.

The incorrect information includes the Tiller Corp. geologist stating that southbound highway 95 already has a left turn lane at the intersection. This is not true and will require modifications to the intersection to make it true. Also, the Tiller Corp. representative stated that there is an average of 20 trucks a day moving through Scandia. This is a dishonest averaging of the traffic pattern over the course of the entire year. The fact is during the warm months there are well over 20 trucks per hour traveling through Scandia. Indeed, during the summer the race track was being built in Columbus, I could count more than 35 trucks every time I travelled between Forest Lake and Scandia. This in the span of a 15 minute, 10 mile drive.

I do not want to see this project move forward.

- The intersection of 95 and 97 feels treacherous as it is. It will become even more so with scores (perhaps hundreds) of additional trucks every day entering and exiting that site. I can never forget that one of our dear neighbors was killed by one of these trucks a couple of years ago just a short distance from that intersection.
- The addition of asphalt recycling to the project is going to make this an even more unattractive blot on our landscape. This will extend the life of the project by many years. The gravel could be extracted in a much shorter time than 10 years but the asphalt recycling will drag this out to their proposed 10 years.
- 10 years of noise and traffic and dust from 7AM to 7PM on property abutting mine is unacceptable.
- You mine where the material is, but this is still one of the worst places I can think of to reactivate a strip mining operation not to mention trucking in asphalt for recycling. The scenic river valley view from Scandia will be a blight rather than a destination for visitors. Then, on top of that, they are going to also install an asphalt recycling operation. This is going to greatly increase the traffic, the pollution risks, the noise and the life span of this operation.
- The debris from the trucks along 97 is dangerous and I have no doubt the life span of the road is greatly reduced by all that heavy traffic. Was the MNDoT thinking it was a waste of resources to repave the shoulders of 97 between Olinda and 95 even though the other 10 miles was repaved all the way to the edge of the road because all the truck traffic would require a repair job sooner than later?

There are many additional reasons I have not stated to require more thorough study of this project. Many of my neighbors spoke to them more knowledgeably than I can at the Feb. 3rd meeting. It is clear this needs more study. But, more honestly, I do not want this operation going on just yards from my house in the beautiful quiet woods.

But if the city approves the mining operation, I ask, at least, that there not be asphalt recycling allowed. Get the gravel out fast and then clean up the site. I can't bear to think that I will have to put up with a mining and asphalt recycling pit right next to my house 12 hours a day for the next ten years.

I urge the Council and the Commission to reject this proposal. And if not full rejection then at least require further study of this. And if the project goes ahead eventually, please shorten the term of the CUP and limit the project to extraction only.

Thank you,

Scott T. Westphal
20685 ~~Olinda Trail~~ QUINNELL AVE
Scandia, MN 55073
433-2722(h)
433-2723(w)