

Scott - DNR, Eric <eric.scott@state.co.us>

Golden Mine Permit No. M1976-007-UG; Denver Brick Company Proposal to Convert from 110c to 112c Permit. Construction Materials Reclamation Permit Conversion Application.

1 message

Fran Evers <franevers@centurylink.net> To: "Eric.Scott@state.co.us" <Eric.Scott@state.co.us>, drms_info@state.co.us

Wed, Oct 27, 2021 at 11:26 AM

To Eric Scott,

As a 50+ year resident of Jefferson County, I am writing to express our opposition to an expansion of the ACME mining operation at 21506 West 56th Avenue, Golden, CO 80403 (PIN 30-163-00-001), situated southwest of the intersection of State Highway 93 and West 56th Avenue. ACME's plan to rezone from Planned Development (PD) and Agricultural-Two (A-2) to a new PD for mining on the approximately 159 acres is simply not congruent with the needs, wants and health and safety of the community. We respectfully request that the application be DENIED by the DRMS Board.

I live at 4955 Pine Ridge Road which is on the west side of the hogback where the expansion of mining is being proposed. I was warned many years ago that this expansion of mining was something to watch as it was likely the top of the hogback would be removed due to the location of the clay vein. It has been extremely difficult to tell from the documents and also from the one meeting with the mining company the exact area that will be mined or impacted. We were told during the meeting the contour of the hogback would not be impacted, but verbal assurances during a meeting don't mean much. Even if the top of the hogback is not removed, this mining activity will leave an unsightly scar on the east side of this historic geological site. The current scar is ugly enough in our beautiful rural/residential area. This type of mining has no place in this area at this point in time. During the meeting the mining company totted their wonderful reclamation work on the area that has already been mined. That comment left me wondering if either the executive of the mining company or the state have bothered to take look at this area. It is ugly. There is simply no way effective reclamation can be accomplished at this sight. Please take a look at this area and see if you think it has been 'reclaimed' and looks anything like it did before the mining activity.

The small area that was already mined had an impact on our community. The additional traffic on 58th Avenue of the semi-trailer trucks was hazardous as this is a country road used by bicyclist and horseback riders. Also the truck entry onto State Hwy 93 is an extreme hazard as there is no stop light at 58th nor is there one at Pine Ridge Road. A left turn from Pine Ridge Road onto Hwy 93 is now disallow due to safety concerns. I have not seen any estimates on the additional semi traffic and the routing of the trucks. When mining was active, it was quite alarming to be outside when they were blasting. The blasting was fairly infrequent, but still concerning when it happened. For the proposed new mining area, the blasting will be closer to my home and I have some concern it is likely to spook by livestock. If it causes my horses to go through a fence and get injured will the mining company pay the vet bills? I think not. If I'm riding on my property when a blast goes off and my horse spooks and throws me will the mining company pay my medical bills or possibly by funeral expense. I think not. Every time a blast would go off in the past I wondered if a house blew up or some sort of bomb went off until I remembered it was probably the mine blasting. That was some time ago and now we have so many more people in this area. I suspect some may be veterans with PTSD which could be set off by the blasting. Is it fair to subject them to this unnecessary frightening stimulus? It is pretty concerning when it happens and posted notice is early enough warning.

I'd like to reinforce the following objections compiled by my neighbors:

1. Air quality issues: Kaolin and silica dust are known lung irritants, and possible carcinogens. These dust types are a byproduct of Fire Clay mining and processing.

2. Palustrine area on the property: A 4.8 acre wetlands area is on the property. It is classified as a 100-year Floodplain according to FEMA. Van Bibber Creek to the north and downslope may also be at risk of runoff.

10/27/21, 11:27 AM

State.co.us Executive Branch Mail - Golden Mine Permit No. M1976-007-UG; Denver Brick Company Proposal to Convert from ...

3. Water quality issues: Shallow residential wells are within 1/4 mile or less of the proposed expansion. Some of these wells are less than 150 foot deep. Also, the Denver Aquifer is under the southern half of the property. In this area, the aquifer is close to the surface. It is rated at Moderate Risk.

4. Noise and view issues: The Jeffco Master Plan references the Mineral Extraction Policy and the Aggregate Roundtable Resources Report. All three documents state that noise pollution and disturbance of views are to be avoided when possible. There are residents on all sides of the proposed expansion.

5. Fault line: A fault line runs north south through the property. ACME mine mentioned blasting activity at the mine to help extract ore. Combined with the fact that the area is in a Dipping Bedrock Overlay Zone as prescribed by Jeffco, these types of operations may prove incompatible.

6. Unique Heron footprint fossils on the property: Fossilized footprints of the modern heron's ancestor have been partly studied. The exact location is not disclosed to the public, but the area scholars and professors who wrote the scholarly research have been contacted regarding the mine proposal. The State Archeologist Board has been notified.

7. Numerous Environmental violations: ACME Brick has been fined for numerous stormwater, emissions, and other types of environmental violations at locations across the country.

8. Residential safety setbacks: It is our understanding that no oil and gas operation can occur within 2000 ft of a school or residential area; yet, ACME wishes to conduct their industrial operation (i.e., surface mining) within 500 ft of our residences. So, how can one state agency allow a 500 ft setback from one industrial activity, yet another agency dictates 2000 ft to protect Coloradans from another industrial activity?

For these reasons, we would request the DRMS to deny the application.

Thank you for your consideration.

Francine M. Evers 4955 Pine Ridge Road Golden, CO 80403 303-817-4818