

## Anne Hurlburt

---

**From:** Lisa Philippi [lisa.philippi@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, December 02, 2011 12:19 PM  
**To:** Anne Hurlburt  
**Subject:** Fwd: FW: Draft EIS comments by 12/1/2011 -- Corrected e-mail - please replace with other e-mail

Anne,

I would like to make my comments known regarding the draft EIS. Here they are as follows:

### Economic Study:

I believe the Economic study is flawed and that the property value loss will be much greater and much further than 1/4 mile from the proposed gravel site. Here are my reasons:

1. The EIS states on draft study and the EIS that they used Comps from 2006 and 2007. They felt this was a stable market and did not reflect a run up on prices nor the rapid decline that we have experienced in 2008 and on. This is all together incorrect. I am a Mortgage Banker and deal with appraised values of properties throughout the country and property values peaked in 2006 and 2007. The fact that they used these comparables would show a lesser value change near the mines due to the high demand of housing at that time. In order to use a stable market they should have used comps from 2000 and 2001 before the rapid increase in property values. I spoke to a local appraiser by the name of Patricia Gunderson and she confirmed my opinion that 2006 and 2007 was the peak of the market and that they should have used comps from prior to the run up in values.

2. The EIS states that they used comps from Maple Grove, Hastings, Rosemount, South Andover, all of which are in a suburban setting. The appraiser that I spoke to also agreed that comps from a suburban setting is not at all comparable to rural properties and river front properties which we have in Scandia.

3. I do not agree with the EIS study that only properties 1/4 mile from the mining site would be effected by only 2%- 5%. I have reviewed a property value study that Diane Hite, a professor at Auburn University with a PHD in Agricultural Economics. Diane developed a standard hedonic price statistical model which is used in researching property value reductions of property near mining areas. Her study states the homes 1/4 mile from a mining site will have 32% property value reduction. The appraiser that I spoke with also said that she was aware of Diane Hite and has used her hedonic price statistical model. Here is her value reductions taken from a graph called impact of Gravel Pit on Residential property values:

1/4 mile from gravel mine - 32% value reduction  
1/2 mile from gravel mine - 18% value reduction  
1 mile from gravel mine - 14% value reduction  
1.5 mile from gravel mine - 11% value reduction  
2 miles from gravel mine - 8% value reduction  
2.5 miles from gravel mine - 6% value reduction  
3 miles from gravel mine - 5% value reduction

### Air Quality:

After reviewing the EIS it appears that the Airborne Silica would exceed allowable limits required for the protection of the public's health, unless they used mitigation such as water or Calcium Chloride to reduce the Particulate Matter. After studying the effects of Calcium Chloride in the environment it should be required that Calcium Chloride not be used and only water to mitigate the Particulate Matter. There was an expert panel that researched the potential environmental impacts of dust suppressants in 2002. This study states the effects of Calcium Chloride would be the following:

1. water quality impacts from elevated Chloride concentrations in streams down stream from the mining area and shallow ground water contamination
2. impact the growth of fruit trees, pine, poplar and spruce trees.
3. alterations in the plant nutrition due to increases in the osmotic pressure of soils

4. Chloride concentrations as low as 40 ppm have been found to be toxic to trout - ( there is a trout stream near the mining site)
5. Chloride concentrations of 10,000 mg/L have been know to be toxic to other fish species
6. Chloride concentrations greater than 1,800mg/L have been found to kill daphnia and crustaceans

Erosion:

The EIS states that their could be possible erosion to the South Creek area where the previous blow out occurred. Although I am in favor of the no build alternative, we must pull the mining back from this sensitive area. I would suggest not mining the additional 9 acres and pull the mining back from the edge of the proposed mine in all areas nearest the river.

Water Use:

Given the pump test failed and never ran long enough, nor did it run during the time the Abrahamson's nursery was using water. This pump test must be redone for a longer period of time and during a real life use of water in the area. Also, not all wells were listed on the Well Map. Only a couple wells were show on Quarry Avenue and there were 3 new wells drilled there within the last 4 years.

Traffic Study:

It appears from the Traffic study that Tiller will be mining approximately the same amount of gravel whether they take gravel from the Zavoral site or not. So, my question is: Why would the City want to deal with years of monitoring all the mitigates when Tiller can get all the gravel they need without the Zavoral site. Also, the one turn lane will not correct the problem of having numerous trucks one after the other coming out of that intersection. Residents will avoid the intersection and will travel on other City roads. This will cause wear and tear on Scandia's City roads that they must maintain and which they already have problems with not enough of a budget to maintain the roads we have.

Mitigates:

Mitigates must be paid for by Tiller and must be hired by the City of Scandia to avoid any conflict of interest. Penalty for non- compliance must be to revoke the CUP and end the mining and have the land reclaimed. Given the lack of previous compliance on that site, how are we to trust that the mitigates will be complied with.

Thanks for your consideration:

Lisa Philippi  
21813 Quarry Ave N  
Scandia, MN 55073  
[651-433-4091](tel:651-433-4091)