

Lennberg - DNR, Patrick <patrick.lennberg@state.co.us>

## **DRMS Comment Letter - Tucson South Gravel Pit**

#### mcsfh157@aol.com <mcsfh157@aol.com>

Tue, Nov 16, 2021 at 11:16 PM

Reply-To: mcsfh157@aol.com To: "patrick.lennberg@state.co.us" <patrick.lennberg@state.co.us>

Hello Patrick,

I knew it would be a long day. I did not have a chance to begin to review or see if the link you provided would allow me to finally review and search the permit. I will definitely still be looking at it even though I realize any thoughts/comments would now be pointless after tonight. Please see attached 9 documents with one being the "DRMS comment letter Nov 16 2021" (my comments) and the other ones being attachments to that letter. Sorry for all the downloads you will have to tackle. I did not know an easier way to share some of that and in the event anyone wanted to consider any of it, I wanted to include them.

Thank you so much for your time and efforts!

Sherie

#### Sherie Gould, GRI

Broker Associate Sterling Real Estate Group, Inc 303.919.1703 Cell

#### 9 attachments

From the sense involved BOOD Brunken cond Sent Turates, March 10, 2003 TOS FM To Congreys, I. Amore of Boot Reveal (and one of the sense)	
Ex Terena Hand Harma Josefferon anno Tadget Conditional De Peret Concerts	
Proc the emotional annual from Varigner Maller, dated (2015): higher with all of the potential patients in block were of inspections of the process of the p	Useda Damandaria
REMERATING THE THERE LET INCLUDE AN CON- Baring the instruction may be free expensive that you think	Hoods Damaged.png
not having it will core poir formi core more than jue will ever know! AUTO - HOME - LATE	1725
ANTIFACTOR EXPERIENCE ANTIFACTOR ANTIFACTOR ANTIFACTOR ANTIFACTOR ANTIFACTOR ANTIFACTOR ANTIFACTOR ANTIFACTOR ANTIFACTOR PROTECT DECAMES. FURSULE YOURS.	
Monie metri navele temper tetrate Veli di massa konzo i tempi tetra di Attorna della scata di intere tetra tetra di attorna intere di attorna di	
DRMS comment letter Nov 16 2 535K	2021.pdf
CGS recommendations Oct 15 217K	.pdf
Jim Hoods legal battles with A 154K	l.pdf
Prop Reference to damage to prop 195K	ertyREV78519.pdf
Letter from City of BrightonINS	SPEC38726.pdf
Pics for Planning Commission 4479K	ers.pdf
Plea for help PERMFILE108479	9.pdf

# MarilynKentcomplaint.pdf

November 16, 2021

Division of Reclamation Mining & Safety 1313 Sherman St. Room 215 Denver, Colorado 80203 c/o Patrick Lennberg

RE: Permit/Amendment Tucson South Gravel Mine

#### To Whom it may Concern,

The Tucson South Gravel Pits were originally approved in 2004 when the dynamics of the surrounding area and this entire valley and were completely different. The conveyor proposed to convey this material (sand, gravel, mud lens, etc.) to Aggregate Industries' Platte Valley processing facility up in Weld County will run over three miles. The easements that are required involve five separate property owners including the City of Westminster. As of Friday, November 12, 2021, per Westminster's Water Resources & Quality Manager, there was still no easement agreement allowing AI to run a conveyor across Westminster's land. Note: AI had turned over a large portion of this land (Wattenberg Mine) to the City of Westminster in December 2019 (water storage) and per their contractual obligations are supposed to turn over the remaining amount in June 2022.

Critical to all this is the fact that Aggregate Industries has promised over and over to be absolutely finished mining the Tucson South Pits in eight years. But then they promised eight years a second time round (2009) with the City of Westminster after the original eight years blew by (an agreement from 2000) and they STILL are not completed (Wattenberg Mine) - always having excuses. At one point when Aggregate Industries was applying for an extension with the Tucson North they stated "almost all of Al's efforts in the general area will be devoted to completing the Brighton Mine mining by 12/31/09 and reclamation by 12/31/10. After the Brighton Mine mining is completed, AI will begin mining the Tucson Pit . . . except Phases 3A&B reclamation won't be completed until the Tucson South's (EXG2005-0004) reclamation is complete in 2022) The Brighton Mine is STILL NOT FINISHED and the Tucson South was never started. These pointless promises only serve to generate the approval they desire. Al has NEVER completed something of this size in this amount of time (for endless reasons) and it is almost like the parable in *The Emperor Has No Clothes* - where no one wants to acknowledge an obvious truth. Note: In Al's initial 2019 County Planning Hearing AI proposed trucking for just a mere year (year and half MAX) till they got their conveyor up and running, and at that point they didn't even have a single easement.

This conveyor, aside from journeying some 3+ miles to a point of processing, will have to tunnel under roads as well as travel over a couple of property/driveway access points. It will sit in front of private homes, wrap around properties, and restrict wildlife crossing - likely driving more deer/wildlife to the roads. Because this mine location is not remote, is HIGHLY visible, and is sandwiched between

homes/residential neighborhoods and Brighton's downtown district, anything tied to these gravel pits and the conveyor will have a far reaching impact on the entire Community. There is substantial risks with a conveyor of this length, that requires this many separate legal agreements (with time restrictions). Please consider what that could mean to the entire operation - and in essence the entire VERY visible valley/community - IF an issue with just ONE of these easements were to arise or there was an issue with the conveyor itself. There would be no easy solution and this entire valley is at stake.

Note: AI permitted the Baurer Pit (south of Wattenberg) this past year to help them finish up and deliver the amount of water storage in Acre Feet (AF) they had contractually agreed to deliver to the City of Westminster. As yet they have not started it and there is only one conveyor that crosses the river.

Note: The De La Cruz family on Tucson St. is already experiencing stress issues with their livestock (these animals are not accustomed to this sort of noise) with animals trying to escape into their front yard - and this is just with AI staging on their south border. (All this land and AI stages their activity and plans their conveyor next to their property, their housing, and their livestock. Why is this even allowed?) Because there is a bit of a language barrier with this family, and because they will be so incredibly affected by all things AI does or represents to them, there should be an independent bilingual interpreter to verify what communications are being made to them as well as what their understanding is of what rights they may have.



**Regarding technical aspects of the Amendment**: Due to the fact that I was unable to timely obtain an easily searchable/viewable version of this application, most of the comments will come from the previous County permit. County estimate were \$150 for a hard copy of this new permit/amendment, or make an appointment to come in and read it there. OR, navigate around the complicated DRMS site where it is posted as a non-searchable image of a document (if you open enough documents to find it).

There is no reason in this day and age, with the technology that exists, that these permits/applications cannot be posted in an easily found, reviewed/searched (i.e. true pdf) format for the public to have easy access to. There should also not be any tolerance of AI's required public notices showing up under misleading headings (i.e. Notice of Final Settlement or Foreclosure Notice - no matter who is to blame) or their absence of signs. Where is the professional standard or accountability in this industry?

Per records tied to previous permits in this valley, there has been no shortage of issues with Aggregate Industries tied to damaged wells/septic, loss of crops and trees, no or slow responses, pointless time frame promises, etc. Also, neighbors have stated it took bringing in the Army Corp of Engineers to force Al to clean up a huge and long standing "mud lens" (dirt pile) from their previous mining activities.

--- Please see the following attached documents which cover only a fraction of the history the neighbors have shared: Hoods Damage, Jim Hoods legal battles, Marilyn Kent Complaint, Plea for help, Reference to damage, Letter from City of Brighton. Note: Marilyn Kent/Stough property issues occurred on the property that the current De La Cruz family owns.

Also, please consider the following:

- Whether coincidentally or not, following the addition of multiple slurry walls/liners west of the Platte, neighbors have reported an increased underground water table (induding some groundwater mounding) both west and north of the valley. Even though some of this area sits outside of the DRMS jurisdiction, the long term affects of even more restrictions on the natural flow of underground water (to the Platte) should be thoroughly examined.
- Aurora's Challenger Reservoir sits right in the NW corner of this valley and while it is no longer under DRMS jurisdiction, neighbors have talked about it taking on water for years (literally saying they could show you where it flows in). After investigating, (this last spring) it turns out ALL the water sitting in that reservoir (illegally) was leaking in (releasing some of this groundwater pressure). At the time, the water commissioner stated that literally "the whole thing is shot" and would have to be redone/replaced. Whether that's true or not I do not know as I was PROMISED follow up paperwork from him after the complaint was filed with the Attorney General's office, but I was never given any. (I'd be happy to supply the email trail surrounding all of this AND my persistent request for paperwork). Important though is AI's conveyor is slated to run all along the east and some north portion of this reservoir. Regarding both the increased water pressure/water table that will follow when this ground water cannot move into the reservoir, and the fact that presumably some form of construction/repair will happen around the reservoir, I would think it would only be logical to apply some engineering studies that actually take into account these new circumstances. note: Aurora's Baseline Reservoirs - Walker North and Walker South (just north of this area) also had water leaking in, and Thornton's Reservoir (Tucson North) has previously required repairs as well. There is a lot of underground water pressure here!

- In the County permit the CGS (Jill Carlson) STILL continued to recommend the County require a
   "stability analysis for at least one cross-section under a saturated slope (high pore water
   pressure)/rapid reservoir drawdown condition across the Tucson Street embankment."
   Perhaps I missed it in the 900 some pages of the County application but all studies I found
   appeared to predate this letter and AI appeared to protest (in past response) that the analysis
   was not within the scope of the DRMS review while she held that it was within the scope of the
   CGS review. Was this concern ever addressed on the state level? (see attached letter titled
   CGS recommendations Oct 15).
- The City of Brighton requested water to be filled in a reservoir as soon as it was finished (4 year estimate given by AI for each one). What they weren't informed of was that Aurora (the end user) has no infrastructure in place to even begin to fill it, has several empty deteriorating reservoirs sitting north of 168th St. (that they will fill first, YEARS from now when they finally do have water/infrastructure), and that this site was actually legally approved to be an ARR (aquifer recharge and recovery) basin which would require leaving all the material in place.

Below is an overall aerial view of the length this conveyor would travel to get to its destination. It measures 3.3 miles on Google Earth. It is our hope that after deeper consideration regarding the risky aspects of this conveyor, and taking into account the truth with timing issues, safety issues, and legal risks, that you turn down this permit and spare our community.



Thank you for your time and consideration,

#### Mark Cordova & Sherie Gould-Cordova

(Business owners and residents) Platteview Farms Plaza Retail Center 124-128 W. Bridge St. Brighton, CO 80601

Attached please find: 8 attachments - (7 documents and not yet referenced pdf "Pics for Planning Commissioners")

From: Hood, James [mailto:JHOOD@amfam.com] Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2019 3:25 PM To: Gregory L. Barnes <GBarnes@adcogov.org> Cc: Teresa Hood <teresa\_hood@msn.com> Subject: Conditional Use Permit Concerns

Per the attached email form Wayne Muhler, dated 2/10/19, I agree with all of his concerns. I also have 4 concerns of my own, as listed below:

- When the pit east of Tucson and east of my property was being mined, Agg Inc. killed a 3 acre grove of trees during their dewatering process. When I contacted them, the basically told me too bad.
- 2. When they dewatered my irrigation well was damaged and I consequently lost 2 crops. No help from Agg Inc.
- 3. My current irrigation well is new and functioning properly and I need protection for it.
- Both of my septic systems were damaged during the Apex mining operation. It cost me \$15,000 to replace and I
  need protection on same.

#### SIMPLYPROTECTED TERM LIFE INSURANCE

Having life insurance may be less expensive than you think... not having it will cost your loved ones more than you will ever know!

AUTO - HOME - LIFE



Jim Hood | James A. Hood Agency AMERICAN FAMILY INSURANCE

70 N 4th Ave | Brighton, CO 80601 Office: 303.659-0190 | Fax: 303.659.8511 E-mail: ihood@amfam.com

#### PROTECT DREAMS. PURSUE YOURS.

American Family Insurance Company | American Family Life Insurance Company | American Family Mutual Insurance Company, S.I. | American Standard Insurance Company of Ohio American Standard Insurance Company of Wisconsin | Home Office - 6000 American Parkway | Madison, WI 53783

# Memorandum

To: Jim Hood

CC:

From: Tom Maul

Date: 2/21/2005

Re: Tucson Pit Mining Impacts to Hood

Jim: the following bullet points outline relevant information regarding previous conditions and discussions related to the Aggregate Industries Tucson Pit:

1. In early 2001 I was appointed Operations Manager over the Tucson Pit.

2. Complaints were received by me from many neighbors of the pit, including: Ken and Gina Sayers, Ron Mallory, Richard Getz, Marilyn Kent, Bob Sakata, and Jim Hood. These complaints were mostly related to the impacts of dewatering operations at the mine: dead trees and well damage.

3. It was my opinion that the impacts sustained by the neighbors were, in fact, caused by the Tucson Pit mine dewatering operations.

4. Although the damage appeared to have taken place prior to AI owning the pit, it was my opinion that we had responsibility as the acquiring party, and therefore I authorized mitigation measures consisting of: replacement water delivery, well replacement, and tree stump removal and disposal, to several individuals included in the group above, including Jim Hood.

5. During that time (2001) AI augmented Jim Hood's irrigation well by direct pumping of water into the well.

6. In early 2002, Jim Hood's well pump failed. Upon inspection, it appeared that the pump had failed due to oversized gravel intrusion into the well column. Further inspection indicated that the gravel structure surrounding the column had been degraded, allowing the inflow of gravel into the well. It seemed plausible to me that the process of directly pumping water into the well could be responsible for this damage.

7. I agreed to repair Jim Hood's well pump and try to mitigate the gravel inflow issue as a short-term solution, and we discussed replacement of the well as a long-term solution. I expressed a commitment to Jim that AI would provide a long-term solution to his water needs. In addition, while the pump was being repaired, Jim was unable to water his field, and the crops sustained damage during that period. I agreed to work with Jim through the year to ascertain the actual impact of that damage to his crops, and to fairly compensate him for said crop loss.

- 8. Jim and I also discussed a former cottonwood grove on his property which had basically been destroyed. Several dozen trees had been killed, in my opinion due to the mine dewatering operations. I made a commitment to Jim that we would work with him toward mitigating this situation. The discussions considered removal and replacement of the trees, as well as monetary compensation, although no dollar amounts were discussed. These discussions were conceptual in nature, and were intended to indicate my willingness to act responsibly as a good corporate citizen.
- 9. In January 2003 I was terminated as an employee of Aggregate Industries. At that time, I am not aware that Jim had received any compensation for his 2002 crop damage, his damaged well, nor the dead trees.
- 10. As Operations Manager for AI, with up to 12 production facilities in my group, it was my job to "manage the business". It was common for me to make decisions in cases like this maintain the status as a responsible operator and ensure sustainability of the operations within their surrounding communities. The decisions I made in this instance were consistent with that objective, and with my handling of similar situations that occurred elsewhere within my operating group.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Thomas

## CONFIGENTIAL

DISTRICT COURT, ADAMS COUNTY, COLORADO Address: 1100 JUDICIAL CENTER DRIVE BRIGHTON, CO 80601	
Plaintiff: BESSIE HOOD	
v	
Defendant: AGGREGATE INDUSTRIES - WCR, Inc., a Colorado Corporation	
	<b>▲COURT USE ONLY▲</b>
David W. Pehr Attorney for Plaintiff 8787 Turnpike Drive, Suite 280	Case Number:
Westminster, CO 80031-4300	
Phone: (303) 427-1516	
Fax: (303) 428-7412 E-mail: <u>pehr@zaklaw.net</u>	
Atty. Reg. #7223	Division:
COMPLAINT	

**COMES NOW** Plaintiff, by and through her attorney, David W. Pehr of the Law Firm of Zak, Fox and Pehr, P.C., and, for a complaint against Defendant, states and alleges as follows:

#### FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Negligence)

1. Plaintiff is the owner of certain real properties, hereinafter *Plaintiff's property*, situate in Adams County, Colorado, and known and numbered as 16707 Tucson Street Brighton, Colorado, 80601 and 12502 E.168<sup>th</sup> Ave., Brighton, Colorado, 80601.

2. Plaintiff owns a certain adjudicated irrigation water well and associated water right located on Plaintiff's property.

3. Defendant is a corporation existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Colorado.

4. Defendant owns real and personal property located within the State of Colorado.

5. Defendant does business within the State of Colorado.

6. For the reasons aforesaid, Defendant is subject to the laws of the State of Colorado and the District Courts of the State of Colorado have jurisdiction over the Defendant.

7. Defendant operates a gravel mining facility on certain real property located immediately East of Plaintiff's property, which property is hereinafter denominated *Defendant's* property.

8. Defendant owes a duty of due care to Plaintiff and others to so conduct its mining operations as not to damage Plaintiff's property.

9. Defendant owes a duty of due care to Plaintiff to so conduct its mining operations as not to unreasonably interfere with Plaintiff's use and enjoyment of her property.

10. Defendant has breeched its said duty of care to Plaintiff in that Defendant has so negligently conducted its above described mining operations as to cause Plaintiff's above described water well to fail and to cease producing water in usable quantities.

11. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants said negligence, Plaintiff has been injured and damaged as follows:

a. The casing, piping, lining and physical structure of Plaintiff's water well have been so damaged and injured as to render the same useless and valueless to Plaintiff;

b. The pump, pump motor, pipes, fittings, hoses and other accessories use by Plaintiff in conjunction with her use of the above well have been so damaged and injured as to render the same useless and valueless to Plaintiff;

c. Defendant has interfered with Plaintiff's use of her water right;

her water right;

d.

Defendant has effectively prevented Plaintiff's use and enjoyment of

e. Plaintiff has been unable to use her property for the agricultural purposes to which it is suited and to which it has traditionally been put as a result of the destruction of Plaintiff's irrigation well;

f. Plaintiff has lost the profits she would otherwise have obtained from agricultural pursuits during 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005;

g. Plaintiff has lost the profits she would otherwise have obtained from the application of her water right to her property during 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005;

property; h. Defendant has interfered with Plaintiff's use and enjoyment of her

I. More than seventy cottonwood trees which use to enhance Plaintiff's property have died as a result of the de-watering of Plaintiff's property;

j. Plaintiff has been otherwise injured and damaged.

12. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's aforesaid negligence, Plaintiff has been injured and damaged in an amount to be determined by the trier of fact.

WHEREFORE Plaintiff prays that this Court enter judgment for Plaintiff and against Defendant for compensatory damages in an amount to be determined by the trier of fact, for her costs and expert witness fees as incurred herein, for interest on the above amounts as provided by law, and for such other and further relief as to this Court may appear meet and just in the premises.

#### SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Trespass)

13. By its conduct of the mining operations hereinabove described, Defendant set in motion a force which, in the usual course of events, would damage Plaintiff's above described property.

14. By its conduct of the mining operations hereinabove described, Defendant set in motion a force which, in the usual course of events, would damage Plaintiff's above described well and water right.

15. The above acts of Defendant constitute a trespass by Defendant upon the property of Plaintiff.

16. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's aforesaid trespass, Plaintiff has been injured and damaged as set forth in paragraph 11, above.

17. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's aforesaid trespass, Plaintiff has been injured and damaged in an amount to be determined by the trier of fact.

WHEREFORE Plaintiff prays that this Court enter judgment for Plaintiff and against Defendant for compensatory damages in an amount to be determined by the trier of fact, for her costs and expert witness fees as incurred herein, for interest on the above amounts as provided by law, and for such other and further relief as to this Court may appear meet and just in the premises.

Respectfully submitted,

David W. Pehr - 7223

Plaintiff's address: 315 S. 20<sup>th</sup> Ave. Brighton, Colorado, 80601

-M-1991-140 cmr, ajw

60 Sept 26,2006 V Complaint

To division of minerals and geology:

My name is Marilyn Kent. I own four acres of land at 16400 Tucson st.Brighton Co. My property is adjacent to Aggregate inc mine to the north and east of me. I have a domestic well less than 600 feet from their current mining which began in aprox. June 2006. After that time I had little water pressure and problems with pumping.

I have talked to Lu Toxvard, their plant manager, often sinceJune." The last time I called, he told me that Mike Reefer would not do anything to remedy it. I also have called Adams Co. on three occasions; I left messages to Craig Tessmer and Chris LaRue. Neither returned my calls.

The available water in my well according to Bomaretos pump co. is 17 feet. When that runs out my pump shuts down for ten minutes to recharge, at which time I have no water.

I appreciate your looking into this.

Thank you fr Marilen Deut

RECEIVED SFP 2 9 2006 Division of Reclamation, Mining and Safety

Division of Minerals + Geology 1313 Sherman St Ry 215 . Bildhaulthaultahilahilahilah 80203 28 SEP 2005 PM 1 T DENVER CO 302 Denver Co 6422460208 4th Chers Rowe



October 28, 1996

NOV PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT nt

•

Mr. Mark E. Geyer Adams County Planning & Development Department 4955 East 74th Avenue Commerce City, CO 80022

Dear Mr. Geyer:

After exhausting every avenue of securing any communication with Tucson Resources/Alpha Six and Omega Inc., or with Mr. & Mrs. Jack Rogers, we are turning to you for help.

Since the above entities have not followed through with their committment as written in our agreement prior to mining gravel, all of our wells have been seriously injured to the point some are going dry.

We are now desperate to the point that we request that you shut down their mining until they honor their committment by delivering the water immediately to all of our injured wells.

WE NEED YOUR HELP!!

INJURED NEIGHBORS

Rick A. ∽ Rick Getz Caine Politzki Camet Don Stough Van Ken Sayers Kim 659-6208 Tom Span Charles L. Spain Charles L. Spain 659-2623 Jim Hood 💤 🕈 Horiuchi Brotherg 970-568-🙀 Haake Farms 🖉 - 659 - 1935 Bessie Hood Lessier \* Robert Y. Sakata Joama Please send any correspondence to Bob Sakata, P O Box 508, Brighton, Co. 80601 Telephone 303 659 1559 Fax 303 659 7865

#### Agreement and Recommendation for Adams County, Colorado, Conditional Use Application

This agreement made and entered into this // date of June, 1992, by and between Alpha Six and Omega, Inc., a Colorado corporation, and Jack Rogers and Gwenne Rogers, Individually, hereinafter collectively referred to as "Owners", and Sakata Farms Partnership, George Magee and Gloria Magee, Ervin Hood and Bessie Hood, Edward Getz, A.D. Smith and Dolly M. Smith, Horiuchi Brothers, Oscar Haake, and Bernice Larson, hereinafter collectively referred to as "Well Users",

#### WITNESS:

WHEREAS, the Owner under application for a Conditional Use Permit, Adams County, Colorado, Number Oll-92-C, has applied for a Conditional Use Permit to dry mine a gravel pit of approximately 70 acres, (interior measurement), located in the NE 1/4 of Section 1, Township 1 South, Range 67 West of the 6th P.M., Adams County, Colorado, and

WHEREAS, to properly dry mine the proposed gravel pit, the Owner has applied to the State Engineer's Office for a well permit to pump a maximum rate of 3,000 gpm from the location of the pit to the South Platte River flow basin area, and

WHEREAS, the Well Users have been advised that such proposed  $\pm ind$ pumping will result in draw-down and injury to their respective  $\pm i F^{\mu} f^{\mu}$ wells, including irrigation, stock and domestic wells, unless a  $p_{+}, f_{-}$ method of water replacement is developed and authorized by the  $\epsilon_{\mu}$   $= g_{-} F$ proper governmental authority and installed prior to the  $f_{-} g_{-} F$ commencement of mining by the Owner, and

WHEREAS, the Well Users believe that unless the Planning Board of Adams County, Colorado, and/or the Adams County Commissioners make the following agreements a condition of final approval of the requested Conditional Use Permit, the Well Users will be injured both monetarily by loss of crops and by their wells not producing the historic production permitted by the State of Colorado, and augmented and ajudicated in the Water Court of Water Division No. 1.

THEREFORE, be it agreed between the Owner and Well Users, notwithstanding the application of the Owner and amendments made thereto, that the Owner will comply with the following restrictions, conditions and requirements.

> 1. George Palos, Senior Associate Hydrologis of the firm of Resource Consultants and Engineering, Inc. shall perform engineering studies for both Owner and Well Users and the cost thereof shall be paid by the Owner. That all programs, studies and other data developed by George Palos shall be available to the Owner, Well Users and

> > Post-It" brand fax transmittal memo 7671 (# of pages > 24

To Kim Lawrinee From Beorge Palos

Adams County, Colorado.

2. Prior to the commencement of dry mining, the Owner shall obtain a well permit from the office of the State Engineer of the State of Colorado, or the Water Court, Division 1 of the State of Colorado, whichever is applicable and has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the application for Applicant's Well Permit, authorizing pumping from the gravel pit to the South Platte River and also providing authority and authorizing the Owner to replace any and all damage or draw-down to the Well Users' wells by pumping directly from the gravel pit pump to such wells or recharge pits appurtenant to such wells a sufficient amount of water to replace any depletions, draw-down or injury to such wells caused by the pumping of Owner's well for dry mining purposes.

3. That the pumping of replacement water as aforesaid shall be monitored and supervised by George Palos or his designee, and all necessary pipelines or facilities necessary for delivery of replacement water shall be in place before commencement of dry mining.

4. That the Owner shall reimburse the Well Users for all legal expenses incurred by such Well Users in representing such Well Users pending such Conditional Use Permit and shall pay any and all legal expenses necessary to enforce this agreement.

5. That such requirements and conditions stated herein be a condition of the final Conditional Use Permit issued by Adams County, Colorado.

Dated the day and year above written.

ALPHA SIX AND OMEGA, INC.

Aresident

ALPHA SIX AND OMEGA, INC.

Secretary

Sucres Rogers

SAKATA FARMS PARTNERSHIP By total J. Datale a partner

George Magee

Gloria Magee ( Cale aun)

Erin Hand by Being That

Desie Sland

Edward Getz

A. D. Smith by Delly M. J.

Page 3

Dolly M. Smith

HORIUCHI BROTHERS

By those Harris les

Last.

Out if Town

s₩y, BARN Sle S/W South North rth CONNER CONNER 16 16" 191 12'6" b 11-18-96 : 116 20' 5-15-96 1161 6" VY. 11 6-17-96 19.6" 11'4" 116" . bi July Nugast Ą PIRE TAKEN FROM TOP OF MEASURMENTS PIPE TO GROWD LEVEL TOP OFT 2-34-50 H

(CSR) H	rdro Conduit	
NOU		DATE
PROJECT Mor	Toring Weils	PAGE OF PAGE
	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	SCPTEMBER 96
Weil No	$2 - 12^{-10^{-1}}$ $3 - 12^{-10^{-1}}$ $4 - 10^{-10^{-1}}$ $5 - 11^{-10^{-1}}$	october 96
	6 - 16-1-1"	2
Well 110	1 11'10' 2 14'10' 3 18'3' 4 12'0' 5 11 5' 6 18'	Nevember 965
USE. 11 AZG	/ 2 3	December 96
	5 4 5 6	· · · · · · · ·

.

I.

i.





# ADCO Consulting

2090 E. 104th Avenue, #305 Thornton, Colorado 80233 450-2204 Fax: 452-4515

## FAX TRANSMISSION COVER SHEET

Date: July 5, 2001

To: DMG, c/o Jim Stevens cc: Aggregate Industries, c/o Mike Refer

Fax: 303-832-8106 (DMG); a: 303-716-5299

Re: Permit M-91-140, Tucson Resource Mine Amendment Application

Sender: Robert N. Fleming

## YOU SHOULD RECEIVE 5 PAGE(S), INCLUDING THIS COVER SHEET. IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE ALL THE PAGES, PLEASE CALL 450-2204.

Attached to this fax is proof of the mailing to the adjacent property owners. The attached includes all of the property owners, except one. The one is Mr. Stough, who has conveyed his property to his aunt, Mrs. Kent. Aggregate Industries has reached an agreement with Mrs. Kent on potential damages to her house on what is now her property. As soon as I'm provided a copy of this agreement, I'll sent you a copy of the agreement and of her deed. Thus, subject to you receiving this agreement and a copy of her deed, I'll assume we have complete the mailing requirement, unless I hear further from you.

Does the DMG have any comments or issues which needs to be discussed? We went through the County Planning Commission hearing without any objections, or even anyone coming to the hearing. Anyway, please let me know or have the specialist you have assigned this case to, let me know.

Complete items 1, 2,	A. Received by (Please Price why) 6. Dataset Deliver
item 4 If Restricted Depays Is desired.  Print your name and address on the reverse	Kellie PUSturi S
so that we can return the card to you,	C. Signature
Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the tright of the pace permits.	* Pelculoteli Prome
1. Article Addressed to:	D. is delivery address different from item 1? Thes If YES, enter delivery address below;
Marcus Politzki	
Dineen Kellie	
11915 WCR #2	3. Service Type
Brighton, CO 80601	Certified Mall     Storess Mell     Registared     Receipt for Marchandis     D Insured Mail     C.O.D.
	4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee)
2. Article Number (Copy from service label) 	1.24 40266 Return Receipt 102556-00-M-0852
	Return Receipt 102596-00-M-0852
SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY
Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Rastricted Delivery is desired.	A. Received by (Please Print Cheerly) B. Date ph Dallvery
Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.	C. Signature
Attach this gald to the back of the mailpiece.	Agent
or on the front if-space permits.	D. is ealivery address different from term 17 U Yes
1. Article Addressed to:	D. Is delivery address different from item 1? The Yes If YES, enter delivery address below: INO
Bessie Hood	
12502 E. 16th Avenue	
Brighton, CO 80601	3. Service Type       Certified Mail       Registered       Recipitered       Insured Mail       C,O,D.
	4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee)
2. Artigle Nurphy (Copy front service label)	71/4019
PS Form 3811, July 1999 Domestic Rec	
	um Receipt 102595-00-M-0952
SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY
Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete	A. Received by (Please Print Clearly) By Date of Delivery
item 4 If Restricted Delivery is desired. Print your name and address on the reverse	C, Signature
<ul> <li>so that we can return the card to you.</li> <li>Attach this card to the back of the malipiece,</li> </ul>	X , Agent
or on the front if space permits.	Addresses
1. Article Addressed to:	0, is delivery address different from item 11 100s If YES, enter delivery address below:
Donald Peterson	(**( 💉 )3)
12055 WCR #2	
Bighton, CO 80601	3. Service Type
	Certified Mail     Depress Mail     Registered     Depress Mail     Registered     Depress Mail     Depress Mail     Depress Mail     Depress Mail     Depress Mail     Depress Mail
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee)
2. Article Number (Copy Home service laine)/4/1/07	1/040
PS Form 3811, July 1999 Dormestic Retu	In Receipt 102595-00-M-0952

.

1

ł

4

1

<ul> <li>Complete items 1, 2, and</li></ul>	A. Received by (Place Print,
2. Article Number (Copy from seption/abel) 2. Article Number (Copy from seption/abel) 3. Article Number (Cop	1624.4088 rourn Receipt 102595-00-14-0852
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY
<ul> <li>Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired.</li> <li>Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.</li> <li>Attach this card to the back of the mallpiece, or on the front if space permits.</li> <li>Article Addressed to:</li> </ul>	A Received by (Please Print Clearly) B. Date of Clearly C. Signature X Dullbulle Stant D. Is delivery address different from item 1? The If YES, enter delivery address below:
Brighton Industrial Park (	<b>3</b> D
1123 Auraria Pkwy #200	
Denveg, CO 80204	3. Service Type         Certified Mall       Express Mall         Registered       Return Receipt for Merchandise         Insured Mall       C.O.D.         4. Restricted Delivery? (Extre Fee)       Yes
2. Article Number (Copy into service tabe) 1 - (1-	4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee)
1099 3400 0014 144	2074
PS Form 3811, July 1999 Domestic Re	turn Receipt 102595-99-M-1789
, — ·	
SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION Complete Items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete Item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired. Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you. Attach this card to the back of the mailplece, or on the framely space permits.	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY A Received by (Please Print Clearly) B. Dete of Delivery RACHEL K. MA DION B. Dete of Delivery C. Signature X. Addressee D. In delivery different here the the second addressee
1. Article Addressed to:	D. Is delivery address different from item 1?         Types           If YES, enter delivery address below:         D No
HIBE, LLC	· •
3026 Fourth Avenue	
Greeley, CO 80631	3. Service Type       3. Certified Mall       Certified Mall       Registered       Residence       Insured Mall       C.O.D.       4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee)
2. Article Number (Copy from service jebel)	11 71/1027
-1199 3400 104	102595-00-M-0862 .

٠

į

<ul> <li>SaNDEA: COMPLETE THIS / TION</li> <li>Complete items 1, 2, and Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired.</li> <li>Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.</li> <li>Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the tropt if space permits.</li> <li>Article Addressed to:</li> <li>David &amp; Penelope Morrison John &amp; Mary Kloefkern</li> </ul>	A Received by (Please Print ) B. Date of Delivery PLNNY MORA:SON 6-20-0/ C. Signature X p Moran Addressee D. Is delivery address below: Yes If YES, enter delivery address below: No
16322 Tucson Street Brighton, CO 80601	Service Type     Centified Mall     Express Mali     Registered     Return Receipt for Marchandles     Insured Mali     C.O.D.     A. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee)     D Yes
2. Article Number (Copy Apprile Jabel) PS Form 3811, July 1999 Domestic Rel	UZE4 39999 turn Receipt 102595-00-M-0952
<ul> <li>SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION</li> <li>Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired.</li> <li>Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.</li> <li>Attach this card to the back of the malipiece, or on the front if space permits.</li> <li>Article Addressed to:</li> <li>James &amp; Sarah Mumford 11825 WCR #2</li> <li>Brighton, CO 80601</li> </ul>	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY  A. Received by (Plaase Print Classify B. Data of 2001)  Signature  Signature  Costing Mail Addresse  S. Service Type  Cartified Mall Express Mail  Registered Return Receipt for Marchandise  Insured Mell C.O.D.  4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee)  Yes  Yes  Yes
2. Article Number Copy from applice label PS Form 3811, July 1999 Domastic Re	102595-00-M-0952
<ul> <li>SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION</li> <li>Complete Items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired.</li> <li>Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.</li> <li>Attack this card to the back of the mallpiece, or of the front space permits.</li> <li>Article Addressed to: Renneth &amp; Virginia Sayers 16529 Tucson Street Brighton, CO 80601</li> </ul>	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY      A. Received by (Please Print Clearly)     B. Date of Delivery     L & 2001     C. Signature     Agent     Agent     Addressee     Addressee     Addressee     S. Is delivery address different from item 17
2/article Number (Copy Index Service Ison) 1099 J400 00/4 /( PS Form 3811, July 1999 Domestic Ret	Insured Meil     C.O.D.       4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee)     I Yes       74     4090

.

700 🖻

~

۶

۰.

<ul> <li>Complete item 1. and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restrict Delivery is desired.</li> <li>Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.</li> <li>Attach this card to the pask of the mailplece, or on the front if space permits.</li> <li>Article Addressed to:</li> </ul>	A. Received by (Planet, Clearly) B. Date of Delive C. Signature X Agent D. Is delivery address different from Item 17 D Yas If YES, enter delivery address below: D No:
Bernice Dersham 764 earle Court	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	3. Service Type
Cheyenne, WY 82009	Certified Mail Express Mail     Registered Return Receipt for Merchandla     Insured Mail C.O.D.
2. Article Number (Copy from service label)	A. Hestricted Delivery? (Extra Fee) □ Yesa
PS Form 3811, July 1999 Dornestic Re	etum Røcelpt 102595-00-M-0957
SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY
Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired. Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you. Attach this cand to therback of the mailpiece. or on-the tront if space permits.	A Reported by (Please Print Clearly) B. Date of Dailypro C. Signature X C. Signature X C. Addressee
. Article Addressed to:	D, is delivery address different from item 1?
HS Resources, Inc.	
c/o Chris Greneaux	1
1999 Broadway #3600	S. Sérvico Type
Denvar, CO 80202	Certified Mail     Express Mail     Registered     Return Receipt for Merchandiae     Insured Mail     C.O.D.
Andela Humber (Consultantes vice labor)	A. Restricted Delivery? (Entra Fee) U Yes
S Form 3811, July 1999 Damestic Ref	
SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY
Complete items 1, 2, and 3, Also complete item 4 If Restricted Delivery is desired. Print your name and address on the reverse	A. Received by (Please Print Clearly) B. Date of Delives
so that we can return the card to you. Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front it space permits.	X Addresse
1. Anticle Addressed to:	D. Is delivery address different from item 1?  Yes If YES, enter delivery address below:  No
PSCO (xcel Energy)	
CZO Dan Teckavec	
550 17th Street #700	3. Service Type
Denver, CO 80202-4256	Registered     Return Receipt for Merchandia     Insured Mail     C.O.D.
	4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee)
2. Articla Nuprher Copy from service label 0/4/	UZ4 3977 Frum Receipt 102505-00-14-0952

. \*

1

.. .

.

	-						
	· 7 .					RECEIVED	)
	-mi				~	AUG 11 2004	
$\checkmark$			нтс			Division of Minerals & Geo	
	Fax	Tra	ncn		<b>1</b> 2	oot	
	To: MR. Ha	ery F	) osly	From: (	ity Ma	nager Joh	Bramble
	Fax: 303.	882 8	3106	Date:	<u>340.04</u>		-
	Phone: 303	5-866.	3567	Pages:	3		-
	Re:			CC:			-
		For Review	🗆 Please Col	mment 🛛	Please Reply	🗋 Please Recycle	
	•Comments:						-

M-1991-140 Complaint CC: LDO

P. 02 RECEIVED

AUG 11 2004



**Division of Minerals & Geology** 

22 South 4th Avenue • Brighton, Colorado 80601 • (303)655-2000

August 10, 2004

Mr. Harry Posey Colorado Division of Minerals and Geology 1313 Sherman St., Room 215 Denver, CO 80203

Dear Mr. Posey,

The Aggregate Industries (CAMIS) Tucson resource sand and gravel mine appears to be in violation of the state issued permit (M-91-140) at this time. The City is very concerned about the quality of this site, which is one of the entrance points to our community. In a review of the documents filed with the State of Colorado numerous variances from the mining plan are apparent when viewed from the surrounding roads. A partial list includes:

- 1. The fence around the property is down or missing in several areas.
  - 2. No attempt has been made to concurrently reclaim any area of the mine.
  - 3. Noxious weeds are not being addressed.
  - 4. The roads on the property are not maintained as per plan.
  - 5. Signage at the mine is not in compliance. They have been given previous notice to fix this.
  - 6. The main haul road is not 1 1/2 inch crushed rock called for in the plan (dust and mud control).
  - 7. Spoil and stock piles do not appear to be aligned with the floodway.
  - 8. Berms are not per plan.
  - 9. Highwalls (30 to 40 foot not 2-1 grade) are present which pose a very real danger, especially considering the fence.
  - 10. No dust control has been accomplished for at least twelve months (no watering of roads, stock piles, spoil piles, and there has been no planting of grass on areas not active for more than one year.

The City also has a copy of the "Application for Permit" filed by Aggregate Industries for a new mine to the south of the present operation (M-2004-044). It is the City of Brighton's request that this application be held until an inspection of the Tuscan mine is completed and remediation of all compliance issues are completed. The City has several concerns with the application. Aggregate Industries proposes to stock pile overburden near 12310 E. 168<sup>th</sup> Ave in piles approximately 300 feet long, 100 feet wide and 30 feet high. This storage method will lead to significant erosion/runoff problems and real dust generation. Their plan specifically calls for NO chemical or vegetation dust control methods to be employed if the piles are to be "active" for less than one year. Movement of one shovel of material in each pile per year would allow them to employ NO control method for the entire life of the mine. This is a practice the City finds unacceptable

The reclamation plan calls for concurrent reclaiming of each mined area. The plan is to sell the pits for water storage. To meet this plan, Aggregate Industries will only grade the area around the pit, plant "dry land grasses" on these areas, and plant some cottonwood trees along the South Platte River. When the pits are full all reclamation would be complete. The City requests that Aggregate Industries evaluate the impacts on the Morgan Smith Nature area, which is quite close to this mining area.

Aggregate Industries also proposes to remove approximately 27 acres from the current mine and include this area in the new mine. This area to be reclaimed as wet land and upland meadow. If this is included in the new mine the area will not be reclaimed for up to 28 years.

The City is well aware that your office does not consider air pollution, noise, traffic, and other "non mining" issues. However, these issues have an impact on the City of Brighton and our residents. We request that your agency established an Annual Review by you office, Adams County, and the City to assure that these negative impacts on our community do not continue.

Sincerely,

Beulaush

Janice E. Pawlowski Mayor

Cc. City Council Members, City of Brighton Adams County Board of Commissioners Craig Tessmer, Adams County Planning & Development

## COLORADO GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

1801 Moly Road Golden, Colorado 80401

October 15, 2020



Karen Berry State Geologist

Greg Barnes Adams County Community and Economic Development Development Services Division GJBarnes@adcogov.org

Location: Section 1, T1S, R67W, 6<sup>th</sup> P.M. 39.9926, -104.8363

#### Subject: Tucson South EXG2020-00001 Adams County, CO; CGS Unique No. AD-21-0001-2

Dear Greg:

Colorado Geological Survey has reviewed the Tucson South EXG2020-00001 resubmittal and responses to comments, including an Aggregate Industries-WCR, Inc. Response to Colorado Geological Survey Review Comment on Tucson South EXG2020-00001 Referral (September 23, 2020).

The Tucson South applicant's 9/23/2020 response to comments is intended to address my 9/30/2020 review comments regarding post-reclamation reservoir slope stability under a drawdown condition. The applicant is correct that this analysis is not within the scope of DRMS review, since it is a post-mining, post-reclamation stability concern. However, it is relevant to the long-term stability and viability of the project as proposed, and therefore is within the scope of CGS review.

Since the lined water storage reservoirs are components of the post-reclamation project plans, and Tucson Street is proposed to remain a public road, CGS continues to recommend that the county require stability analysis for at least one cross-section under a saturated slope (high pore water pressure)/rapid reservoir drawdown condition across the Tucson Street embankment, to verify that the proposed slopes below Tucson Street will be stable under all conditions, or to determine a stable slope configuration.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this project. If you have questions or require further review, please call me at (303) 384-2643, or e-mail carlson@mines.edu.

Sincerely.

Jill Carlson, C.E.G. Engineering Geologist



**Reclamation and end use of land:** The end use of this land is just as inappropriate today, as the **industrial mining use.** Not every community has the opportunity to have river front property - or access to it. It should be valued (especially sitting right outside the downtown gateway), as it has access off of MAJOR roads, has an additional intersecting/cross road, and should serve to connect the city with the residential neighborhoods that support it.



**Veterans Park** sits literally across the river from the proposed gravel mining operation. Who is drawn to a park with a gravel pit across from it? These two uses are not compatible.



















Above is looking south (east) off Tucson St. towards the east parcel. There are a significant number of trees and wildlife habitat that will be destroyed to create one of these ugly reservoirs. (Trees noted in green on the first aerial map and the white arrow above shows these trees as well).

#### Below is looking Northeast



Aside from the gravel pit use, there is the end use to consider as well.



Above is the Challenger Pit - (Aurora's reservoir off of Tucson St.) - just south of 168<sup>th</sup>. Aurora has additional reservoirs north of 168<sup>th</sup> that are currently NOT it use. Augmentation Reservoirs may or may not have much water in them - if they have any.

Below is another angle of Aurora's Challenger pit looking NW to 168<sup>th</sup> St. **The arrow points to a pickup truck** for size and height reference. These ugly "storage" reservoirs should not be occupying land off of a significant corridor that could offer so many higher uses AND benefits to both the community and the County.



Dust does not fly or swirl equally. Dirt devils are frequent! And little bit of moisture in the air causes the dust to adhere. The main anchor at the Platteview Farms Plaza development, at the start of Downtown Brighton, is a Car Wash and 99% of the vehicle that leave there have varying degrees of moisture on their vehicles - which would cause ANY airborne dust to adhere!!!

Because air dispersion is unequal, the amount of dust can be heavy in one area and non existent in another. The picture below shows some of where it was heavier or lighter. That is the problem with air monitoring - it is not a true representation. If you had had an air monitor here 200' to the north, it would not have picked up any of this significant dust.



13902 E 168th Ave Brighton, Colorado

Regarding Land Use: Aggregate Industries has frequently claimed there is no other use of the land off Hwy 7 and Tucson St. land. This beautiful facility sits on the NW corner of 168<sup>th</sup> (County Rd 2) and Hwy 85. It was built on both floodway and flood plain. This is looking northward off of 168<sup>th st</sup>.

Note the bridge and creative use of land. - All beneficial to the community, and wildlife.



🛕 Click any parcel for parcel details.

Same building looking primarily westward off of 168<sup>th</sup> (near the corner of Hwy 85)







Please weigh in on all of the above. The proposed land use is NOT compatible or harmonious, it would endanger future development as well as hurt existing development, and the problems it creates can not be adequately eliminated.