

EUREKA TOWNSHIP
Dakota County, State of Minnesota
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
January 27, 2026

Call to Order

Chair Melanie Storlie called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:00pm and the Pledge of Allegiance was given.

Commissioners Present: Melanie Storlie (Chair)
Dan Heyda (Vice Chair)
Brian Storlie (Commissioner)
Dave Wheeler (Commissioner)

Others present: Amy Liberty (Deputy Clerk), Liz Atwater (Clerk), Hannah Rybak (Planner), Linda Ripley, Jerry Swedin, Matt Mettling, Ray Kaufenberg, Jim Aiken, Brian Ahern, Allen Novacek

Zoom participants: Julie Larson, Ralph Fredlund, Kbro, BC

Approval of the Agenda

Motion: Commissioner Wheeler moved to approve the agenda for the January 27th, 2026, meeting. Commissioner Brian Storlie seconded. *Motion carried 4-0.*

PUBLIC HEARING

Dakota Aggregates and Kelly Aggregate Inc., PID 13-00800-25-011 *Text Amendment to existing IUP

The request is for an amendment to the existing mining interim use permit, to increase the allowable depth of mining, to request a setback exemption to expand the stockpile area at the subject property, and to extend the termination date of the IUP.

Chair Melanie Storlie asked the applicant, Mr. Mettling, to provide a narrative of his request.

Matt Mettling, operation manager of Dakota Aggregates, presented three proposed amendments to the existing Interim Use Permit (IUP). Mr. Mettling emphasized that the amendments would not change current operations in key areas, including employee traffic, truck traffic, on-site equipment, hours of operation, extraction rate, mining phases, or the overall mining footprint.

Chair Melanie Storlie invited Hannah Rybak, WSB Planner, to present the report on the three proposed amendments request. A PowerPoint presentation summarizing the findings was provided, and a copy of the slides is included at the end of these minutes. Ms. Rybak concluded the presentation with a summary of the applicant's requests, applicable review criteria, and recommended conditions for consideration, and asked if the Planning Commission had any questions.

Chair Melanie Storlie asked whether deeper mining could affect nearby residential wells. Jim Aiken professional geologist of Barr Engineering, retained by Dakota Aggregates, explained that the groundwater report did not specifically address residential wells because no impacts to groundwater levels or quality are expected, as the operation does not involve dewatering and no contamination is anticipated. He also stated that groundwater flow will continue in the same northeast direction and that deeper mining is not expected to divert it.

The Planning Commission requested additional information about the proposed berms, noting that a defined minimum height is necessary to evaluate potential visual and noise impacts on nearby residents. Matt Mettling stated the plans currently assume a 25-foot berm and agreed a minimum height could be established, with additional material brought from elsewhere on the site if needed to meet that requirement. Mr. Mettling also clarified that berms are intended to fully screen stockpiles from view, that an existing berm will remain along the south side in addition to the proposed berm, and that the stockpile area is approximately 13.5 acres and can be clarified on the plans.

Public Comment opened at 7:34pm

Chair Melanie Storlie communicated the procedures and the expected conduct of this public hearing and opened public comment. A statement was also read regarding proper notification of the public hearing.

It was brought to our attention that landowners within 1,000 feet of the applicant's property did not receive notification through US Mail. The Planning Commission will initiate the public hearing process on January 27, 2026, and allow those in attendance to give public comments. To ensure all parties receive proper notice and have an opportunity to be heard, the Public Hearing will be continued.

The following individuals spoke before the Commissioners and submitted full written comments for the record, which are attached at the end of these meeting minutes.

1. Linda Ripley, 9460 235th St. W.
2. Ray Kaufenberg, 24510 Dodd Blvd

Gerald Swedin, 27561 Iberia Ave.

Mr. Swedin expressed concern about whether a performance bond or financial assurance is in place to ensure site restoration and prevent taxpayers from bearing future costs. He also asked whether protections exist, such as well replacement coverage if wells are contaminated or go dry, and whether the company would be financially responsible.

The Planning Commission discussed the date to reconvene the public hearing.

Motion: Chair Melanie Storlie moved to continue this meeting to Monday, February 9th at 7:00pm. It will be held here at the Town Hall. *Chair Melanie Storlie continued...* I make a motion to continue this public hearing to Monday, February 9, 2026, at Eureka Town Hall located at 25043 Cedar Avenue, Farmington, at 7:00pm. Commissioner Wheeler seconded the motion. *Motion carried 4-0.*

Town Board Meeting Report

Commissioner Brian Storlie shared items that were discussed at the December 9th, 2025, Town Board meeting. A full summary is provided in the meeting minutes and is available for viewing at the Town Hall and on the website.

Unfinished Business

Home Extended Business

The Planning Commission reviewed suggested edits to the proposed extended home business ordinance submitted individually by Town Board members. Discussion focused on the need to move the ordinance forward while ensuring it is clearly written, reasonable, and applied fairly across all property sizes. Commissioners debated whether Individual Use Permits (IUPs) should be required. The Planner noted that removing the IUP requirement could be feasible if performance standards were strengthened; however, concerns were raised about home businesses expanding beyond a residential scale and the potential impact on surrounding properties and property values.

Community Event (July 21st) -Chair Melanie Storlie, Commissioner Palmquist (co-leads)

The Planning Commission discussed plans for an upcoming community event, including potential activities like food trucks, equipment displays from the road contractor, and children's games. They agreed to seek donations for prizes and activities, with a bounce house being a potential addition pending insurance verification.

Sign Ordinance

Commissioners discussed clarifying the permit process for signs, particularly for small business signs and farm signs. They considered removing the accessory business designation and allowing more flexible signage for residential properties. The Planning Commission, which received a prior directive and approval from the Town Board, agreed to have WSB review the current ordinance for content neutrality and bring recommendations back at the February meeting.

New Business

Planner Engagement Policy

A draft planner engagement policy was presented to review. The Commissioners agreed to a proposal for up to 60 minutes of Planner time per month, with any additional time requiring approval from the Town Board. The Planning Commission recommends the policy to be approved by the Town Board.

Motion: Chair Melanie Storlie moved to send the Planner Engagement Policy to the Town Board for review. Commissioner Wheeler seconded. *Motion carried 4-0.*

Annual Meeting Presentation

The Planning Commission reviewed the PowerPoint slides prepared by the Deputy Clerk. Vice Chair Heyda agreed to serve as presenter, with Commissioner Brian Storlie designated as backup presenter.

Motion: Chair Melanie Storlie moved to present this Planning Commission report to the Board for their review and approval. Vice Chair Heyda seconded. *Motion carried 4-0.*

Before continuing with the agenda, Commissioner Wheeler wanted to share a concern about the potential for micro data centers in the area. The Commissioners agreed this topic should go before the Town Board for further discussion and possible regulations.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Motion: Chair Melanie Storlie moved to approve our meeting minutes from November 25th Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Wheeler seconded the motion.

Motion carried 4-0.

Adjournment

Motion: Chair Melanie Storlie moved to adjourn. Commissioner Brian Storlie seconded.

Motion carried 4-0.

Meeting ended at 9:50pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Amy M. Liberty
Amy Liberty, Deputy Clerk

Minutes Officially Approved by: Julie Starke on: 2/24/2026
Planning Commission Chair Date

wsb

23334 Dodd Blvd.

Interim Use Permit Amendment

Planning Commission Meeting
January 27, 2026

1

Proposed Stockpile Area

Stockpile area,
Approximately 10 acres.

Berm (topsoil/common from Field)

1250' Setback

5

Aerial View

2

Grading Plan

STOCKPILE AREA
(30' HEIGHT MAX)

6

Overview

- Applicant has submitted a revised request, separating their requests out into phases
 - Request to increase depth of mining
 - From 30 feet below the average ground water elevation to "the extent of usable material above bedrock"
 - Request for new stockpile area and associated setback reduction
 - Proposed stockpile area south of mine, 250 feet from nearest residences
 - Request to extend the duration of the IUP
 - From December 31, 2030 to December 31, 2036

3

Phasing Plan

7

Depth of Mining

4

Comprehensive Plan

The portion of the Township rich in aggregate resources also contains other natural resources important to the Township. Aggregate resources coincide with the highest level of groundwater sensitivity along the Vermillion River corridor. The Vermillion River is a designated trout stream fed by groundwater, and is included within the Natural Resource Corridors. It is important to the Township to allow for mining of aggregate materials, while protecting against adverse environmental impacts to nearby soil and groundwater resources. The Township recognizes that areas rich in aggregate resources also provide valuable recharge and filtration for soil and groundwater resources.

The Township will work with land owners, mine operators, and the Vermillion Watershed Joint Powers Organization to understand potential effects of mining on groundwater and other natural resources, and to identify options to protect those resources when it considers mining permit requests.

8

Mining Permit Criteria

- A. The use must not create an excessive burden on existing parks, schools, streets and other public facilities and utilities that serve or are proposed to serve the area.
- B. The use must be sufficiently compatible or separated by distance or screening from adjacent agricultural or residentially zoned or used land so that existing homes will not be depreciated in value and there will be no detriments to development of vacant land.
- C. The structure and site must have an appearance that will not unreasonably create an adverse effect upon adjacent residential properties.
- D. The use must be reasonably related to existing land use.
- E. The use must be consistent with the purposes of Chapter 243, Zoning, and the purposes of the zoning district in which the applicant intends to locate the proposed use.
- F. The use must be in conformance with the Eureka Township Comprehensive Plan.
- G. The use must not cause traffic hazards or congestion.
- H. Existing land uses nearby must not be adversely affected unreasonably by intrusion of noise, glare, dust or general unsightliness.
- I. The use must not cause significant adverse impact to surface water or groundwater resources.
- J. Dewatering to obtain materials intersecting the groundwater shall not be allowed. The use of equipment such as draglines, track hoes and backhoes to obtain materials intersecting groundwater shall be allowed.
- K. Depth of excavation. Excavation and extraction shall not occur beyond the depth set by the Board in the permit. In setting the depth of excavation, the Town Board shall consider the standards stated herein (Article R, § 165-5), as well as recommendations from Dakota County, the Soil and Water Conservation District and the independent engineering firm selected by the Town Board under Article IV, § 105-11E. In addition, the Town Board will consider whether the application is a renewal of an expired permit where the depth was consistent with a previously approved permit.

Recommended Conditions

7. The applicant is responsible for any approval or permitting required by the Dakota County Soil and Water Conservation District.
8. Copies of any required permits from other jurisdictions shall be provided to the Township upon issuance.
9. The applicant shall provide final plans for the berm, depicting exact proposed height, to the township prior to construction.
10. The applicant shall provide proposed vehicle trip numbers, to be documented in the IUP, for the time period of 2030 to 2035.

Interim Use Permit Criteria

1. The interim use is identified as a permitted interim use in the zoning district where the property is located.
2. The interim use will meet or exceed the performance standards set forth in this chapter and other applicable Township ordinances.
3. The interim use complies with the specific standards for the use identified in the ordinances allowing the interim use.
4. The date or event that will terminate the use can be identified with certainty.
5. Permission of the use will not impose additional costs on the public if it is necessary for the public to take the property in the future.
6. The applicant agrees to any conditions that the Town Board deems appropriate for permission of the use.
7. The use will not create an excessive burden on existing parks, schools, streets and other public facilities and utilities which serve or are proposed to serve the area.
8. The use will be sufficiently compatible with or separated by adequate distance or screening from adjacent agricultural or residentially zoned or used land so that existing property will not be depreciated in value and there will be no detriments to development of vacant land.
9. The structure and site shall have an appearance that will not have an adverse effect upon adjacent properties.
10. The use will not cause traffic hazards or congestion.

Engineering Considerations

The review by Bari Engineering for the Vermillion River JPO appears to indicate no adverse effects on the groundwater, nearby trout stream and other environmentally sensitive criteria. If any impacts to groundwater or the trout stream occur, the Township may require that mining activity be halted until a solution is devised.

Drainage of disturbed areas appear to be contained within the mining extraction areas. Drainage near the site is proposed to be diverted around the site in undisturbed areas (east berm is proposed for construction with this expansion with drainage diverted along 235th and then north east of the berm). Permit from Vermillion River Watershed Joint Powers Organization (VRWJPO) may be required.

Site reclamation notes indicate use of 3" of topsoil for planting vegetation. 4" thickness is required by ordinance.

Schematic sediment pond details are provided in the plans. Calculations on pond sizing were not provided for this review. Permit from Vermillion River Watershed Joint Powers Organization (VRWJPO) may be required.

The proposed expansion of the extraction area is more than 10 acres by scaling drawings. A staging plan is required for each 10-acre increment.

Proposed Lake Slopes between the bottom contour and shoreline are proposed greater than 6:1 as indicated in Township Ordinance Article V, 165-13.13 U. (3) (f).

A detailed cost estimate of the site reclamation was not provided for engineering review.

A minimum separation of 15 feet is required between the bottom of sand and gravel mine excavation and the top of the bedrock.

See attached site plan for additional comments.

Recommended Conditions

1. Any changes to any on-site operations due to the increased mine depth, outside of the scope provided in the application materials submitted with this request, shall require an interim use permit amendment.
2. Depth of mining shall not extend closer than 15 feet to the top of the bedrock surface.
3. All comments and conditions in the "Engineering Considerations" section of this memo, and the redline plan set shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the Town Engineer.
4. The applicant is responsible for any approval or permitting required (including permits related to stormwater management) by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency.
5. The applicant is responsible for any approval or permitting required by the Vermillion River Watershed Joint Powers Association.
6. The applicant is responsible for any approval or permitting required by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources.

Linda Ripley 9460 235th St. West

Madame Chairperson:

I have submitted a 3pg comment prior to today that I would like to have on record.

Tonight I am commenting on the recent notification of Dakota Aggregates and Kelly Aggregate regarding the proposal of 3 IUP mining amendments.

I suppose some might call me a "trouble maker" since I live within the 1000 ft setback of the mine and me and my neighbors did not receive a letter of notification regarding these amendments that could affect us.

I have heard some say at these meetings they thought it might be nice to have a lake by their house, but they won't be affected by the mining noise that is involved with the making of that lake. We retired people though who are home during the day will have to endure the noise involved with making that lake. Even though we are told there will be no additional noise pollution for us to endure.

Among the 3 IUP amendments they are asking for is a setback operation of 250 feet from property owners who are within the 1000 ft of the mine. From the meeting notes dated oct 21st listed on the Oct 28, 2025 Planning Commission meeting The WSB recommended a possible 300-500 ft setback if appropriate. For who? The mining company disregarded that suggestion and went even closer – to 250 ft. Referring to the proposed amendment Section 165-11 noted in the minutes from the same above October 28th meeting talking about possibly requiring a new EAW , they have crossed out text that says "if the amendment does not include any change involving ..., or intensification of use..." I don't see that to be true in this case.

When this amendment comes up again, and it will, we residents expect the drawings of the truck pattern mentioned in their amendment that would be

Public Hearing 1-27-26 (Dakota Aggregate - amendment to mining Interim Use Permit)

To: Eureka Township Planning Commissioners and Supervisors

From: Ray Kaufenberg, 24510 Dodd Blvd, Lakeville, MN 55044

*[NOTE: below is an approx. transcript of my verbal testimony 1-27-26. I spoke using these notes as a guide. I used **bold font** or **red font** to help me emphasize points, very small fonts to skip words to shorten my speech.]*

My name is Ray Kaufenberg, I live at 24510 Dodd Blvd, Lakeville, south of the proposal. I started my research by asking Google's AI:

“What are the “guiding principles” of Eureka Township, Minnesota?”

Ans: **“Based on the 2040 Comprehensive Plan and local zoning ordinances**, the **guiding principles** of Eureka Township, Minnesota, are focused on preserving its rural, agricultural and low-density character while managing growth through local, democratic governance.

So, it was a **good answer!** (AI continued):

Key guiding principles include: (AI listed 7 bullet pts, I will call your attn to #7)

[I deleted some of AI's response [...] to shorten my verbal testimony, and I skipped reading small font words.]

- **Preservation of Rural Character:** Maintaining the Township's identity as a rural and agricultural community, which includes protected open spaces and very low-density non-farm housing with private utilities.
- **Agricultural Priority:** [...] Protecting land for long-term agricultural use and ensuring farming remains the primary land use.
- **Controlled Growth and Development:** [...] Promoting well-managed, staged development, specifically limiting non-farm development to designated areas and ensuring new, low-density residential development does not negatively impact agricultural, natural resources, or existing rural lifestyle.
- **Natural Resource Management:** [...] Protecting priority natural areas, water resources, and, where applicable, allowing for the economic, responsible removal of natural resources like sand and gravel.
- **Geographical Integrity:** [...] Maintaining the township's established geographic boundaries.
- **Local Control and Governance:** [...] Utilizing the traditional town meeting style of government (Board of Supervisors) and a citizen Planning Commission to make land-use decisions, exercising "urban town" powers to control zoning locally.
- **(I will call your attention to guiding principle #7) Compatibility of Land Use:**
Ensuring new developments or **land uses are compatible** with existing agricultural and residential uses to avoid excessive burdens on public facilities, traffic congestion, or environmental degradation.

In my opinion, this hearing is essentially about **avoiding excessive burdens caused by environmental degradation** --- AND I would ask you, Commissioners, and later Supervisors, to **ENSURE** that this **does not happen. That's your job.**

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is extremely powerful --- It cannot just tell you, anecdotally, “I never heard of a mine that contaminated a well,” but **it can search 1000's of mines** across the United States and **look at the documents**, and **look at the results** and **give you conclusions** --- **objective conclusions.** So, I asked AI a simple question:

“Does sand and gravel mining **deep down to bedrock**, run a **higher risk** than more conventional mining depth, **risk of environmental degradation?**”

Ans: “**Yes**, sand and gravel mining that extends deep down to the bedrock generally poses a **higher risk of environmental degradation** compared to more conventional, shallower extraction methods. While all sand mining creates large pits and alters the landscape, **deep excavation increases threats to groundwater, accelerates erosion**, and **causes more permanent disruption to local hydrology**.”

(AI then listed): **Environmental Risks of Deep Mining to Bedrock (5 categories of risks):**

- **(#1) Groundwater Disruption:** Deep mining, particularly when it goes below the water table, can **directly affect aquifers**, (pretty important if you want to drink water in this township) **lowering the water table**, and **potentially causing nearby wells to dry up**. (*We talk about it draining to the N/E, well guess what, it's like a bathtub, pull the plug on one side, and you SUCK it out of the other side, suck it out of the earth as it drains --- potentially drying up wells [this analogy is my opinion, not AI's.]*). It can also create deeper, permanent, or **stagnant ponds** that change the local hydraulic system.
- **#2) Increased Erosion and Channel Stability:** Removing large volumes of material **down to the bedrock in or near rivers** (like the Vermilion River) **can lead to severe channel incision** (deepening) and **bank collapse**, as the river works to adjust to the new, deeper, and more stable bed.
- **#3) Contamination and Water Quality:** **Deep, open pits** (which is what this is) are more susceptible to collecting runoff. **If not properly managed, this can introduce contaminants directly into the groundwater, including sediment, heavy metals, or chemical spills** from machinery. (*I will show you how the proposal demonstrates bad management planning*)
- **#4) Habitat Loss:** The sheer volume of material removed in deep mining requires more extensive clearing of vegetation, leading to greater destruction of wetlands, forests, and wildlife habitats.
- **#5) Long-Term Site Reclamation Challenges:** Deep, **steep-sided pits (that's what is being proposed that we are going to focus on)** are often harder to rehabilitate than shallow ones, sometimes leaving **permanent, unusable, or hazardous features** in the landscape. (*What they are talking about is a stagnant, hazardous feature. I will show you that their “lake” is potentially this.*)

Comparison with Conventional Depths - While shallow, conventional mining can often be reclaimed for agriculture or recreation, deep mining that reaches the bedrock significantly changes the site's geology, making it much more difficult to return to its original state or to a productive, stable condition. [*I skipped reading this small paragraph in AI's response.*]

Mitigation Measures *[continuation of AI]*

Proper management, such as establishing buffer zones, implementing sediment control, and developing robust reclamation plans, **can mitigate, but not eliminate, the higher risks associated with deeper extraction.** So, they can't mitigate it away.

Now, Commissioners, having just heard **5 categories of increased Environmental Risks of Deep Mining to Bedrock**, you should find it **baffling** to read on Eureka PDF page 24, of the **Barr Engineering report**, submitted by the Applicants, under point #4, it says, and I quote: "There is **no** environmental risk related to increasing the mining depth below the water table."

There is **none!** --- Yet, AI, which **is equivalent to a genius**, says there are **5 full categories of increased risks in going below the water table to bedrock.**

So, I would respectfully suggest that the **Barr report should be seen as critically lacking** (because they did not cover this) and **heavily Applicant biased**, and therefore you should **take their conclusions with a grain of sand.**

I'd like to call your attention to the **Extraction Plan**, page 7 of your pages (17 Eureka PDF).

Notice they started at 971 ft above sea level (elevation of undisturbed ground (Eureka township is 980 ft above sea level, on avg.) Then they go DOWN to 883 ft at the base of the pit. **That's an 89 ft drop -- ALMOST 90 ft or 9 stories.**

The scale of this drawing is 1" = 100 ft. This implies that the **width** of the vertical elevation lines is approximately 2 inches. 2" = 200 feet. **So, in 200 linear ft the pit gets 89 ft deeper.** $200/89 = 2.3$ --- rounding off, **there is a 2 to 1 slope here.** That is a **very steep slope to the bottom of that pit!**

On PDF pg. 53 (page 7 of your report) **WSB Planner says, point #6, quote: "Proposed Lake Slopes** between the bottom contour and shoreline are proposed **greater than 6 to 1** as indicated in Township Ordinance Article V, 165-13-13 U. (3) (f). **So, they are supposed to be 6 to 1 on a lake not 2 to 1!**

It may interest you all to know that Hoover **Dam** has a slope of **14 to 1** (at the top its 45 ft wide, at bottom it's 660 ft wide) **and they have cement walling!** Holding out hydraulic water pressure is no easy task. (I built a wooden retaining wall 4 ft high, and it needed anchors 6 ft into the gradual sloping hill to prevent erosion).

And here, you are **asking us to believe** that you can go **straight down at 2 to 1** and you are **not going to see that porous sand and gravel wall** start to introduce **sediments and contaminants straight down to the water table ground water** --- **that's absurd**, it's **ludicrous!** In my opinion that Barr report is ludicrous in that regard.

So, **I had AI search and tell me: "What contaminates are found near the top layers of a sand pit that could contaminate ground water?"** So, we are not talking about surface runoff and berms and all that, but about the top layers, vs lower ones as we extend to 90 ft.

AI's ANS: "**Top layers of sand pits** are highly permeable, allowing contaminants from surface runoff and land use to **rapidly infiltrate and pollute groundwater**. Key contaminants include nitrates from fertilizer and septic systems, pesticides/herbicides, petroleum products (oil/gas), heavy metals (lead, arsenic), and pathogens like coliform bacteria."

So, who are you going to believe, someone who the applicant paid for, Barr, or an objective source like Google AI, which is the equivalent of a genius, frankly?

Neighbors might like to know, what are these contaminants? (AI's continued answer):
"Common Contaminants in Top Layers of Sand Pits:

- **Nutrients (Nitrates):** Derived from agricultural fertilizers, animal waste, and failing septic systems, these are highly mobile in sandy soils.
- **Organic Compounds & Pesticides:** (You don't think from that **Sauber farm** you aren't going to have) **Herbicides, insecticides, fungicides, and pesticides** (and **cow manure**) used on nearby land can leach through porous sand.
- **Petroleum Hydrocarbons:** Gasoline, diesel fuel, and motor oil from spills, machinery, or industrial runoff.
- **Heavy Metals:** Metals such as iron, manganese, chromium, lead, and arsenic can be released from industrial waste or, in some cases, naturally occurring in soil.
- **Pathogens:** Coliform **bacteria, viruses**, and parasites from animal or human waste (septic systems).
- **Salts & Other Inorganic Compounds:** Road salt (Sodium Chloride), sulfates, and chlorides.
- **Synthetic Organic Compounds:** Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) or solvents from dumping.

Contamination Mechanism:

(LISTEN TO THIS, as AI cont.'s): Sand pits **lack the thick, protective clay layers needed to filter contaminants**. Surface runoff, especially during heavy rain or when pit water levels rise, carries these materials **directly into the groundwater table**, say reports from **Kansas Geological Survey** and **Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources**."

I believe them, better than Barr, that they (the applicants) are paying for.

The question really is: Do we want these applicants, in Eureka Township, to build an On-ramp for contaminants --- to potentially contaminate our ground water --- both directly, and through percolation? --- They didn't mention percolation, did they? --- but if you are a farmer, you know that in a field with open water, you can **sink your tractor in way back from the water -- because of percolation through the soil.**

So, imagine, a **90-foot chasm of water** --- don't you think water is going to **percolate** over, across the road, into those **10 wells** and get in **drinking water? Of course it will!**

[I skipped the below indented section in my verbal testimony because of time]

These are **AI results** for **“can groundwater from a deep sand mine percolate a distance from the pit and get into wells?”**

ANS: “Yes, groundwater from a deep sand mine can travel a significant distance from the pit and enter nearby water wells. Sand and gravel pits often intersect the water table, creating a direct conduit for contaminants—such as suspended sediment, fuel from machinery, or minerals—to enter the aquifer and move toward surrounding properties.

How Contamination Spreads from Sand Mines to Wells:

- **Direct Interaction with Aquifers:** When sand is mined below the water table, the pit fills with water and becomes an open, unprotected part of the surrounding groundwater system (aquifer).
- **Contaminant Plumes:** Activities at the mine, including fuel/oil spills, machinery leaks, or processing, can introduce contaminants that travel in the direction of the groundwater flow.
- **Turbidity Travel Distances:** Research has documented that water turbidity (cloudiness) caused by gravel washing and mining operations **can travel more than a mile (over 5,000 feet) downgradient in highly permeable, sandy, or gravelly aquifers.**
- **Distance and Impact:** While the risk decreases with distance, **contamination can affect wells several hundred feet to several miles away.** In sandy, fast-flow aquifers, the impact can be rapid.

In summary, because sand is porous, groundwater moves through it, and the deep excavation of a sand mine can directly connect to the aquifer that supplies residential or agricultural wells.”

If you, Commissioners, accept this proposal you put our Township at excessive risk. The Comp Plan requires that you **ENSURE** against **ENVIRONMENTAL DEGRADATION.** And you could be sued if you don't do it. **This is a BIG DEAL** --- The applicants have extracted what they need by following the rules by-in-large. **By allowing this extra step** you go **beyond what they can control, or what we can monitor,** given **our financial resources.**

If all these 10 neighbors sue because their wells go dry or are contaminated, who are they going to sue? Barr? **They are going to sue Eureka Township,** the deepest pocket . . . **because YOU APPROVED IT!**

Thank you for listening, please respect my testimony.