1 2 3		Becker County Planning Commission May 8, 2018				
4 5 6 7 8	Jol Jin Zo	embers Present: Chairman Jim Bruflodt, Vice Chairman John Lien, James Kovala, Harry Inston, County Commissioner Larry Knutson, Mary Seaberg, John Skarie, Dave Blomseth, In Kaiser, Ray Thorkildson, Robert Merritt, Planning & Zoning Director Kyle Vareberg, Ining Technician Joseph Doll, Becker County Attorney Brian McDonald and Attorney Scott Inderson.				
10 11 12 13	Se	Meeting called to order by Chairman Bruflodt at 7:00 p.m. Introductions were given. Veteran Service Office Administrative Assistant Mary Lou Schmit recorded the minutes. Motion to approve previous minutes (Kovala with changes; Lien). Motion carried.				
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	The meeting was recorded. Chairman Bruflodt explained that because of the nature of the Strata application, new business will be conducted first for time purposes. Protocol for the old business of Long Shore Development – comments to board only. 2 minutes per person to speak. Avoid redundancy. Read correspondence after. Close testimony. Question applicant. Adjudicate within 60 days. If beyond next scheduled meeting adjudicate tonight. Applicant may table at any time. Forward to County Board of Commissioners.					
21	Ne	ew Business				
22 23 24 25 26 27 28	1.	APPLICANT: Mike Ullmer 27201 Co Hwy 9, Lake Park, MN. Project Location: 27201 Co Hwy 9, Lake Park, MN. LEGAL LAND DESCRIPTION: Tax ID number: 07.0002.000 Section 01 Township 140 Range 043 BEG 1163.38 FT W OF SE COR N1/2 OF SE1/4 TH W 766.40 FT N 196 FT NELY 834 FT E 154.05 FT & S753.10 FT TO BEG PT N1/2 SE1/4. APPLICATION AND DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT: Request a Conditional Use Permit to establish a boat and recreational repair shop.				
29 30 31 32		Mr. Ullmer has pictures of cleaned up property per previous request. Kaiser inquired about outside storage. Mr. Ullmer indicated that he will have in future, on higher ground.				
33 34 35		Kovala asked what size signs he is posting? Mr. Ullmer stated a 4x8 and 4x4. One is down road the 1 ¼ miles, and he has permission from landowner and is in compliance.				
36 37 38		Chairman Bruflodt asked for questions from the general audience; there were none. There was no written correspondence.				
39		MOTION:				
40 41 42		Jim Kaiser made a motion to accept the application as presented; Jim Kovala, second. All in favor; motion carried.				
42 43 44 45 46	2.	APPLICANT: Danny Olson 17705 Co Hwy 1, Lake Park, MN. Project Location: County Hwy 4, Lake Park, MN. LEGAL LAND DESCRIPTION: Tax ID number: 06.0248.005 Section 17 Township 138 Range 043 PT GOVT LOT 4: COMM NE COR TH WLY 330', SLY 412.5', ELY 330' TO E LN, NLY 412.5' TO POB; & S1/2 OF SE1/4 EX 5.74 AC IN				

47 48		NE COR AKA 06.0254.001; & EX 6.72 AC IN SW1/4 OF SE1/4 OF ON S LN AKA 06.0248.0003; & EX 10 AC FOR 06.248.001 APPLICATION AND DESCRIPTION OF				
49		PROJECT: Request approval of a Preliminary Plat.				
50		J J J				
51	Scott Walz surveyed the preliminary plat. Application is for 2 ½ acre lot subdivision					
52	lots. The property meets and exceeds requirements for zoning. Road constructed per					
53		requirements.				
54						
55	Jim Kaiser asked if it was 16 lots instead of 14. Scott Walz indicated that it was an err					
56		lots is correct and meets all requirements.				
57						
58		Chairman Bruflodt asked for questions of the general audience; there were none.				
59						
60		Chairman Bruflodt asked for written testimony. Steve Sorenson, Chairman of Cormorant				
61		Township, submitted a letter in favor of proposed plat. Testimony closed by chairman.				
62		MORNON				
63		MOTION:				
64		Dave Blomseth made a motion to approve the Preliminary Plat; Jim Kaiser second. All				
65 66		in favor; motion carried.				
	3	APPLICANT: Gould's Hearts Desire LLC 1850 Skyline Ranch Road, Rapid City, SD.				
68	٠.	Project Location: 31376 Co Hwy 50, Park Rapids, MN. LEGAL LAND				
69		DESCRIPTION: Tax ID number: 34.0088.000 Section 13 Township 141 Range 36 GVT				
70		LOT 3 LESS N 100' W OF HWY and 34.0216.000 Section 14 Township 141 Range 36				
71		WEIGELS SUBDIVISION 141 36 OUT LOT 3 APPLICATION AND DESCRIPTION				
72		OF PROJECT: Request a Change of Zone from Commercial (Parcel #34.0088.000) and				
73		Agricultural (Parcel #34.0216.000) to Residential, a Change of Zone from Agricultural				
74		(Parcel #34.0216.000) to Commercial, and approval of a Certificate of Survey.				
75						
76		Gould's Heart Desire LLC wishes to retain a Change of Zone and Certificate of Survey. The				
77		property meets or exceeds requirements. Scott Walz spoke for Gould's Hearts Desire LLC.				
78						
79		Jim Kovala asked about the campground. Walz indicated that there are 5 campsites north of				
80		the lodge. Kovala remarked that there were some RVs parked there. Walz said there are 6				
81		cabin structures.				
82						
83		Larry Knutson asked if this was a change of the Conditional Use Permit. Walz said the				
84		Conditional Use Permit covers family and non-family use.				
85		John Lieu calved if it was just 2 new late. Well-said was with a small naming about				
86 87		John Lien asked if it was just 3 new lots. Walz said yes, with a small zoning change.				
88		Chairman Bruflodt asked for questions from the general audience. Martin Vanyo addressed				
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
		ė.				
89 90		the board; he has a home to south. He reiterated that there have been campers there for years. He asked the reason for rezoning. He is not opposed, he just wants to understand. He asked				

if there would be 3 new cabins. Walz showed him the map. Mr. Vanyo has no objections to

91 92

the application.

93 94

95 96

97 98 Glen Walters, Chairman of the Two Inlets Township Board, approached the board. He has several concerns and received many letters and phone calls regarding this application. The application and maps show residential zoning, and there is only a 200 foot setback. Area 88 is marked as agricultural, but is only forest or pasture. Two Inlets Township Board requests tabling the application until the application and maps are in agreement, then contact all concerned parties.

99 100 101

102

Walz concurred that the informational packet was not complete, and in error. The 3 tracts, A, B, and C, are zoned residential. He thought the landowner wanted to retain the original zoning, but they want it zoned commercial.

103 104 105

Walters asked to send corrected information to all surrounding property owners. He has received at least 27 phone calls about this. He asked to board to follow policy and put out correct information.

107 108 109

110

111

112

106

Larry Knutson remarked that it was a good point, and asked Walz to issue correct information. Jim Kovala recommended tabling the application until next month. Walz replied that the client was not here, but doesn't believe they would have an issue with tabling the application. Knutson won't accept the application without correction. Walz said to table the application.

113 114 115

116

117

118

119

Dave Keller, who owns a resort next door, had concerns about complex density. Based on entire amount of lakeshore, he didn't think they could build more. It would be too high of a density if they build on lots. The matriarch of the family has recently passed away, so the lodge should come down. Walz has done a density calculation, and it is still within allowable limits. However, per the deceased matriarch's wishes, the lodge will be coming down. There is enough room for 36 units.

120 121 122

Kyle Vareberg presented written testimony from June Goetzke. She remarked about the inaccuracy in information and septic issues.

123 124 125

Kyle Vareberg presented written testimony from Teresa & Dennis Goodrum, who object to dividing the parcel. They also cited septic issues, and requested denial of the application.

126 127 128

Chairman Bruflodt closed testimony, and the application was tabled.

129 130

Old Business:

131 132 133

134

135

136

137

- 1. APPLICANT: Long Shore Development, LLC 13274 435th St SW, Fertile, MN 56540 Project Location: 23677 W Long Lake Rd, Detroit Lakes, MN. LEGAL LAND **DESCRIPTION:** Tax ID number: **08.0549.000** Section 31 Township 139 Range 041 31-139-41 E1/2 E1/2SW1/4; NE1/4 NW1/4 E OF RR ROW; NW1/2 NE1/4; SW1/4 NE1/4; GOVT LOT 7 LESS 8.8 AC TO DNR; LESS PT GOVT LOT 7 S OF W EXT OF N LN
- GOVT LOT 9 & E OF LN COMM E QTR COR SEC 31, N 222.3', SW 41.9' TO POB: SW 138

212.2', SLY 333.9' TO LK & TERM and 08.0551.001 Section 31 Township 139 Range 041
PT E1/2 NW1/4: COMM SE COR NW1/4 E 663.86' TO POB: N 1664.17', SWLY AL
RWY 1731.9 E 408.06' TO POB. APPLICATION AND DESCRIPTION OF
PROJECT: Request a Conditional Use Permit to allow for development of a Sand & Gravel
Pit mining and processing operation.

Bill LaFond of Strata Corporation gave a power point overview of the basic project design and explained the project site, new and existing. LaFond Noted that there are already several gravel sites nearby, not all active. According to the power point, this will be a well-protected site. Material will be conveyed across the area to be washed. Only concrete aggregates will be made. Rock Ridge will continue with no change due to the introduction of the new pit. The new pit will extend the life of aggregate operations by 18 to 20 years. It is 92 acres, surrounded by forested areas on all sides except for 4 sites. This is where 4 sight and sound berms will be constructed to provide additional shielding. They will be soil berms, shaped, soiled, and seeded with additional erosion safeguards until the seeding has established. They will redirect the sound from the site.

The crushing operation is in the extreme southwest corner of the site. Noise and dust generation will occur with crushing, but Strata uses state-of-the-art dust control. They intend to operate this site on a part-time basis, 8 to 10 weeks per year, for 15 years. It is not intended for year-round use. No site reclamation will begin until the following year. The bottom surface of the pit is relatively level, while the top is not. It will begin in the southwest, then go east and north. They will reclaim on an annual basis; no open areas will be left until the end of the project.

The goal is to make the site as invisible as possible to the surrounding community, and they have considered all adverse impacts. From every viewpoint they have taken every effort to shield neighborhoods from these impacts. They plan to leave as many topographical areas as possible natural and intact. Younger spruce trees approximately 6 to 10 feet tall will be removed from the northwest area of the site and be replanted in the northeast area. There will be no impacts to the two wetlands near the northwest corner and the east side of the site. A 100 foot buffer will be maintained there, with a 50 foot buffer for the sight and sound berms. There will be ample storm and erosion protection to prevent sediment runoff from entering the wetlands. The portable crushing plant will move in and out on an annual basis.

Removal and stockpiling of soil from the project are separate operations, and can occur before, during or after operations. Projected use from 2018 to 2031 is 8 to 10 weeks per year; from 2032 to 2036-37 will be longer, 5 to 6 months per year. The gravel deposit will be depleted in the 2035-2037 time period, with over 5 million cubic yards of gravel removed.

All efforts will be made to protect native grasses and plants, and provide silt and storm water runoff. They will have a permit from the MPCA (Minnesota Pollution Control Agency). They expect the noise to be far below levels required by state and MSHA (Mine Safety and Health Administration) standards. Per standards, during one hour of monitoring, noise cannot exceed 65 decibels, but will be less than 10 decibels. It will be difficult to hear the operation outside of the area.

Dust output is also monitored by MSHA, as to how it impacts employees, and they maintain very strict standards. Strata has a state-of-the-art dust suppression system; statistics and additional information are available.

Visually, this is a clean operation. It is difficult to see the surrounding residential areas, even without leaves on the trees. Residents have expressed fears about property values. Strata commissioned a study of property values approximately 2 months ago, which was provided to the Planning Commission. This type of operation does not negatively impact property values in Detroit Lakes or the Becker County area. Taxable property valuations have actually gone up.

The Planning Commission then questioned Mr. LaFond.

Robert Merritt said he had looked at the mine reclamation plan and found things weren't quite right. He said that LaFond alleged that the pit won't be in a shoreline district. Merritt said the arrow is incorrectly placed, he has done a GIS measurement and has a map. The pit is within 1000 feet from the shoreline district, and below the water table. LaFond responded that they have no plans of mining below the water table within the shoreland. He also stated that he will check the information and get it corrected if necessary. Merritt said that figure 3a AA prime's ground water is connected to the lake. Mining below ground water level has the potential to change the head direction. The water is presently coming from the west. There is 7000 feet of shoreline, injected with water, running into the lake. Changing the direction will take out about 13% of that distance, creating a trench. This may drop the lake level, directing flows

to the south. LaFond indicated they will address these concerns, and experts are present at the meeting to explain this. The environmental review was completed several months ago, and no concerns were expressed. They have consulted with hydrologists and geologists, and will discuss these concerns later in the presentation. Merritt disagreed with LaFond's assertions.

The Chair asked for other questions from the board; there were none.

Jason Kirwin with Environmental Scientific presented on behalf of Strata Corporation. He presented information regarding geological, environmental, and hydrology issues. He reviewed the comments, and explained the EAW process. First, they look at the project and identify the issues. Second, they change the project to eliminate the issues. They constructed a draft, which was submitted to County, State and Federal levels. No state or federal agencies addressed Merritt's concerns. Due process ends because no issues were uncovered. He has additional information about this process.

This project is not new, and Strata is doing exactly what they proposed to do: mining down to the water table just like the present pit. The Conditional Use Permit addresses all of these concerns to hold them accountable to a higher standard. They are proposing removal of less than 10% of the available aggregate.

He referred to the DNR table regarding Long Lake water levels, which showed that an area mined from 2006 to 2008 and then reclaimed did not lower the water level. There was no

impact. It was lower in the 30s and 40s, so there is no correlation between mining and reclaiming on water levels.

233234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

231

232

Merritt cited a USGS study from 1982 regarding flow direction. The maps show that the flows where ponds are go south, and don't impact the lake. Jason showed a map of a USGS outwash deposit. Outwash is gravel and rock created by running water or glaciers. Strata is mining a small point, with an area of 800 x 1800 feet mined below the water table. LaFond stated that it is very difficult to measure aquafers. The mine area is on the edge of the deposit and the aquafer. Jason cited another study, Hydraulic Impacts of Quarries on Gravel Pits, DNR, 2005, which included several sites. At this point some members of the audience questioned the relevance of this information. Chairman Bruflodt reminded audience that comments aren't accepted yet.

242243244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

Jason continued, stating that most sites are mined below the water table. The DNR put monitoring ponds at some sites to monitor flow. They concluded that pits had no negative impacts on ground water levels, and will not affect water available to wells. They will alter ground water flow, which could affect wetlands. Alluvial pits had no impact on ground water levels. Redirection of ground water flow to a pond and ditch system did lower water levels. In the Felton ditch system, there was no culvert, and the ditch doesn't freeze. The ditch drains the Felton mine. Long Shore has no ditch system, and is not proposing dewatering of the site. They do not believe that they will impact water levels of Long Lake; Felton is not a comparable system. Merritt said he was incorrect, that the flow changed. Jason replied that they only talked about the most obvious one. Merritt indicated that there were problems with this. Jason stated that it was not a reasonable expectation that it would happen, and they would have mentioned it if it was. John Lien remarked that in 2000, the Conditional Use Permit stated no mining within 1000 feet. Jason said he was not an expert on ordinances, and the comment about 2000 was not about this project, which does not prohibit mining within shoreline zone. Lien wanted to know why the DNR was opposed. Jason replied that when you provide a detailed mine plan, it raises many questions, which are more likely to be answered. The new plan should have answered those questions. Lien said the new plan has a lot of data, but can be interpreted differently, and has more of an impact on the lake. Jason replied that ground water flow follows topography, generally, and the new project area was 35' higher before, with the flow going to the lake running south to east. Merritt said he wasn't right. Chairman Bruflodt said it was time to move on, as everyone had made their point.

265266267

Chairman Bruflodt then opened the floor for public comment, which was limited to 2 minutes per person.

268269270

271

Ron Bjorklund: lives half mile south of the current operation. Culverts across County 6. Loud. Cut all the trees down. Has complained to Township Official Ken Shroyer. Listens to noise all night long.

272273274

275

276

Mayor Matt Brenk, City of Detroit Lakes: appearing on behalf of City Council. Preserving assets. Carefully vetted. Rights of property owners. Potential for residential growth. Investments in jeopardy. Generates revenue, but short-lived. Economy needs additional

workers and residential development. Chairman Bruflodt asked if the city had a timeline for annexation.

Charles Ramstad, City Attorney, appearing on behalf of the city. Submitted a letter April 5. Conditional use, effects on surrounding property. Noise, dust, lights, can they be adequately addressed. Primary concern-orderly and consistent development. Will project impede uses predominant in area. Area is becoming urban, Long Lake is prime development area. A 2.7 million sewer project around Long Lake is in the works. The new mine is in a residential neighborhood. CUP should not be granted because of effect on orderly development. If the plan proceeds, see conditions in the letter submitted. The County's own ordinance requires performance bond to ensure that taxpayers don't get stuck doing reclamation. Strata is operating under a lease. The County should determine the cost of reclamation and post bond. Make sure Strata is limited to their promise of 8-10 weeks.

Tom Anderson, President of Long Lake Association: read list of speakers. The new mine boundaries are right next to neighborhoods, the Concordia station, and a spring-fed lake. Bad for environment, makes very little sense for Becker County.

Tera Guetter, Pelican River Watershed, Technical Review Panel: EAW refutes the plan; Kyle indicated the board received her packet. Letter from Bill LaFond; July 2017 met with Bill to review EAW document. April 2017 County discussions, would not complete scoping EAW. Nobody told Review Panel. County requested standard EAW instead of EIS. EIS was urged.

Jaimie Deraney, doctor: lives 450 feet from boundary of project. Constant noise, dust, trains, all night long. Plans by Strata are not reasonable. Noise not in compliance. Becker County has a 20 year comprehensive plan, should work with city. Page 92 of ordinances addresses water quality, infrastructure, and annexation, stewardship of lakes, waters, and wetlands. A better location could be found for this project.

Bob Koshnick: Silicosis- silica is the main ingredient from sand, causes respiratory problems, kills a lot of people. Silica and dioxide goes into the bloodstream, causes autoimmune reaction, rheumatoid arthritis, lupus, etc. Turn down the application, it's too close to residential area.

Paul Orth: Questions the transparency of the project. Believes there is a need for an EIS. County Administrator said applicant wrote document. All property owners didn't get notices. Kyle stated that notices were sent to all residents within a quarter mile radius, and was listed in the legals in the newspaper. The tour of the project was advertised, but turned out to be a meeting. First hearing tabled. Chairman Bruflodt said that on the tour everyone was allowed to speak. When the Committee tours, they also meet. Kovala was surprised that no citizens spoke at the tour.

John Riewer: Wants board to deny. There are environmental concerns. A home is most people's largest personal asset, their dream and refuge. Says he was naïve to believe that it would not be commercially developed further. Shady Hollow's application was denied to protect residential properties. This is a quality of life issue. Additional noise, dust, and

blight too close to homes. Mary Seaberg asked if the development was built after Rock Ridge was already there. Riewer replied yes, but they hoped it was going to conclude, not expand. Afraid of what the future holds for the neighborhood.

Levi Wold, Long Lake Campsite: in operation since 1972, project is so close to resort and city limits, mining close to lake and water table. Radon in ground. Lots of noise and dust for campers. 2007 U of M study, \$300 spent per day in Becker County by tourists. Will hurt lodging tax and number of campers. Noise and dust.

Kregg Wolf, Lakecrest Resort: the new project will hurt tourism. Negative long-term effects on drinking water and water level. Please deny.

Lee Kessler-Retired civil engineer. Impact on ordinary high water level. Disagrees with conclusions of effects; they are opinions, not based on fact. Not expected, not likely, typically: translates to 'they're not sure'. Too much ambiguity. Request denial. If approved include clause, no mining below ordinary high water level. Merritt- would you used those same words in your line of work. Kessler-no, I wouldn't, I would want to more positive.

Mike Ring-Counselor Realty. Sold dozens of properties in that area. Proposed operation will have an effect within 3 mile radius, if not more. Already affecting sales. Why did Strata contact Barnesville for a market study and not use a local individual to conduct the study. Property taxes far outweigh gravel tax. Right to enjoy homes.

Dr. Brian Bishop-chair of Biology, Concordia College. Involved with shoreline restoration, developing 40 acres of corn and soybean into pollinator and native grasses habitat. There has been a doubling of bees since pollinator projects. Use area for research and outdoor classroom which serves several thousand students. Gravel pit will seriously impact experience for them and for area middle school students. Dust will impact plants, wildlife, pollinators, photosynthesis, and can cause invasive species. Impacts migratory birds. Affects nature enjoyment for residents and visitors. Vote no.

Linda Brown-vice president for finance, Concordia College Corporation LLC map. Provided a hand out to the record. Land given to the college in 1974 for biological and environmental field station. Valuable station and experiences for all ages. Long Lake is presently free from invasive species. The present project application threatens this balance. Do not grant.

Steve Menden-Wenck Associates. Reviewed the EAW. Plan did not cover all impacts. Additional monitoring of ground water and surface water would be advisable. Incorporation of annual or semiannual review of mine plan, review potential or actual impacts. Robert Merritt-with regards to monitoring. If we monitor and find alterations in flow dynamics, how will we mitigate that? Steve-not sure he has the best answer for that. Agrees with broader statement that quantity of water won't probably be very significant. However, rerouting of ground water should focus on quality of ground water.

Barry Burchill: there are so many non-binding phrases and contradictions. Aggregate will not be trucked from site, but if it is, they will water the road. How to take all of this.

Environmental impact of building a house. Legacy. What is Plan B if this goes wrong. Take a step back and consider.

Jim Wensman-didn't get a letter. Power washed the patio, amount of sludge from dust that rolls in from three quarters of a mile away is getting worse. Didn't get a notice. House values can go down. Questioned Lafond on the average depth of the mine in the water table. LaFond-15 feet deep mining, 5 to 10 below water table. Wensman – for every 11 feet into the water table, Long Lake can drop 1 foot.

Walt Aanenson: don't approve the application. Ambiguous wording. Petitioner wrote the study that says they don't anticipate any problems.

Mike Herzog, Herzog Roofing. OSHA requires commercial roofer to vacuum silica dust when roofing. Why not in a gravel pit? What will that dust do right now?

Chairman Bruflodt asked for further public comment; none. He then asked for any written comments not previously submitted for review.

Kyle Vareberg read a letter from Don Maristuen.

There was no further written evidence to present.

Chairman Bruflodt stated that this portion of the hearing was closed. Applicant has the right of rebuttal.

Scott Anderson, Attorney, clarified for audience that applicant has opportunity to respond.

Chairman Bruflodt asked if Bill LaFond had anything to rebut.

Bill LaFond asked the commission if they had any questions. The big picture perspective is, previous projects proposed are not the project proposed here. Comments made about EIS vs EAW was dictated by administrative rule by the State of Minnesota. When ruling came about, this project fit the category of an EAW. If there had been significant environmental effects, then an EIS would have been requested. They were properly reviewed. Not profitable for his geologist to debate Mr. Merritt. Chairman Bruflodt stated to hold off now, there was nothing further to add.

Harry Johnston asked how necessary is it to excavate below water level. LaFond- hard to answer. It is not absolutely necessary, but desirable. They are trying to recover as much gravel as possible, and trying to mine outside of the shoreline district. He took strong exception to previous allegations about water affect. This practice is done all over the nation, the same kind of mining. When you are not dewatering (dewatering has bigger impact), we are not proposing dewatering. We are just taking a scoop of gravel out of the water table. We have lots of experience doing that over the years. Its common practice.

 Larry Knutson did some calculations, and asked if mining under the water table was about 13% of project. LaFond stated that they estimate net cubic yards of 5.4 million. 631,000 of that come from mine #5, under and above water table. Less than 10% of the project involves mining under the water. NO (response from audience). A lot of other things, irreversible damage by mining under water table. Seaberg asked the difference between scoping EAW, mandatory EAW, before an EIS? Why was it changed? LaFond replied that an EIS includes socioeconomic factors, traffic, and other issues. It can get very complex...You do a quick EAW for scope of EIS. Seaberg also asked if Strata was governed by MPCA and OSHA. LaFond replied that they fall under MSHA and a lot of other federal agencies. Seaberg-do they regulate you? LaFond-yes, all the time.

Jim Kaiser asked if Strata owned the land for the project. LaFond-no. Kaiser - have you ever owned the Land. Bill – not to my knowledge. The lease was recently updated and filed with the county, but he was not privy to the details. Kaiser-So Strata has always had a lease. Bill-yes, and there's a new one on Long Shore for the new project. Kovala told LaFond that when he talked to them in April, he was surprised to learn they would only mine for 8 to 10 weeks. They wouldn't be able to mine in a late spring like this one, which pushes it into May and June. Could you mine only in April and May. LaFond replied that their desire is to mine as early in spring as possible. Seaberg asked, desire, could it go all year. LaFond- no, only the 8 to 10 weeks. Chairman Bruflodt reminded the crowd to give respect to speaker, as the public part of the hearing is closed. Knutson-so if it's a late spring, could you mine in September and October. LaFond-you mean if we can't in the spring, yes we could, but that's difficult to answer tonight. Chairman Bruflodt commented that their product demand will dictate a lot of that. LaFond stated that they have no desire to mine during summer months. Merritt asked why not. LaFond replied that it was because of the lakeshore, and they don't want to disrupt people's lives and the tourist season. Knutson asked how many stockpiles they would have. LaFond said not many, and they would never be any higher than the old tree canopy. Chairman Bruflodt asked what the difference between this project and Rock Ridge was. LaFond stated that 30 to 40 years have created a large sand inventory which is being whittled down. For every ton of rock produced, you need one ton of sand, but it produces 4. It will not be stockpiled at Long Shore. Kaiser asked about the trains running in the middle of the night. LaFond explained that they have 24 hours to load the rail cars and notify Burlington Northern, or pay extra. They own the cars but still have to pay extra if not released to BN within 24 hours. They have no control over when BN picks them up. Chairman Bruflodt asked if there were any other questions; there were not.

Chairman Bruflodt asked for discussion by the board.

John Lien remarked that it was a lot of info to go through. He read from the Zoning Ordinance and stated CUP criteria. He highlighted the criteria and the potential problem with uses. Is it a nuisance, are there adequate measures in place to prevent noise, dust, fumes, etc. Shoreline areas face potential soil erosion, pollution, and water diversion.

Chairman Bruflodt commented that it was hard to hear 2 professionals disagree

Robert Merritt stated that he is a Minnesota Licensed Professional Geologist and worked for over 32 years as a DNR Hydrologist. He asked Attorney Anderson the following question: during the pre-meeting, where is the burden of proof, and who has the burden of proof. Is it on the applicant. Anderson replied, yes, in general. The applicant has the burden of coming forth with evidence that the criteria of the ordinance is met. It's a little broader than that, in that others may bring forth evidence.

Jim Kaiser stated too Larry Knutson that there was nothing in the environmental review process for the EAW that sparked an EIS, correct.

Larry Knutson stated correct, a negative declaration was made by the County Commissioners for the need for an EIS, and all agencies were given a comment period and comments were received.

Larry Knutson asked Attorney Scott Anderson under the conditions of the Zoning Ordinance for CUP criteria in Chapter 8, Section 11 if a CUP could ever be approved. Anderson said things can be different in different lights, people look at things differently. The Planning Commission is to view the evidence and come to a conclusion you want to, but some conditions are broad.

Ray Thorkildson stated he could not vote for the application because of health issues, environmental concerns, the City's concern for future development, but the number one issue being water. It's just the wrong place.

Mary Seaberg asked LaFond why they could not go elsewhere. LaFond stated if they did, they would have trucking issues.

Jim Kaiser stated the applicant has been attempting to obtain a CUP since 2002. The only way to control things, is to own the property. He told the audience they've had the opportunity since 2002 to negotiate to buy the property, and control it. He stated he could live with voting for it but would not be in favor of mining into the water table so a stipulation would have to be made not to mine into the water table.

John Lien made a motion to deny the Conditional Use request as written. Attorney Scott Anderson suggested that the motion be reworded as a Motion to deny the conditional use permit and to direct Staff and Counsel to draft findings consistent with a denial. John Lien adopted the suggested motion language and made a motion to deny the conditional use permit and to direct staff and counsel to draft findings consistent with a denial. Robbert Merritt Second. In favor: Kovala, Johnston, Seaberg, Skarie, and Thorkildson. Opposed: Knutson, Blomseth and Kaiser. Motion Carried.

The Planning Commission agreed to hold a special meeting at 7:00 a.m. on May 22 to consider the findings of fact drafted by staff and counsel.

Informational Meeting: The next informational meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, June 6th, 2018 at 8:00 am in the Third Floor Meeting Room of the Original Courthouse.

505						
506 507	Since there was no further business to come before the Board, James Kovala motioned to adjourn. All in favor. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned.					
508						
509			-			
510	Jim Bruflodt, Chairman	John Lien, Vice Chairman				
511						
512	ATTEST		_			
513		Kyle Vareberg				
514						
515						
516						
517						
518						