

Lodi Township Board of Trustees discussion meeting with Stoneco., and surrounding property owners. May 15, 2012 – 7:00 p.m. Lodi Township Hal.

The meeting opened with the flag pledge. All board members were present as well as Attorney O'Jack, Marcus McNamara from OHM and 13 others. Those that signed in included: Steven Lemons (Waterland), Richard Becker (Stoneco), Sue Hanf (Stoneco) Jay Ellis (Stoneco) Keith Smillie, Jenny Thompson, Karl Schultz, Katherine Simpson, Thomas Giordano, and Julie Roesch.

Mr. Becker, Vice President of Aggregates in Michigan for Oldcastle Materials, is from Monroe. He gained responsibility of the Stoneco. operation in 2003. Stoneco has been trying to be a good neighbor. Target of the consent judgment was removal of 1,000,000 per year. The decline of the market in 2008 has put them behind as to what was anticipated to be sold. Stoneco contacted the township and shared the situation with the township that there may be a possibility of needing to change the consent judgment. They have installed a sprinkler system to help address the complaints of dust on the surrounding property. They are trying to mine as rapidly as they can to get the residential side completed. It has been difficult the way the mine plan was set up. They are committed to the community.

Sue Hanf, in 2010 Stoneco. sent a letter to the township asking to revise the consent judgment. The letter was to revise the reclamation plans behind the school and an extension in mining in order to mine the amount anticipated in the consent judgment. Even if they were in full production right now, they would not be able to mine the current reserves in the amount of time left under the judgment. If full reclamation is done with current mining, the lake would be much smaller than the current plan. The current reserves are about 5.1 million tons. Sales have dropped to about ½ of where it was. Could take about 7 to 8 years to remove the 5.1 million tons. Dust suppression system was installed. They would like to be a good neighbor and understand that there are problems with the dust suppression system. If there is an issue they would like to be told so they can address the situation. They are committed to be there. Stoneco requested that the neighbors notify them if there are problems.

Neighbor's to the north voiced their concerns. They don't feel that there is a difference since the sprinklers have been installed. Another neighbor doesn't feel that any suppression system will take care of the issue. Another neighbor stated that her property is still having lots of sand and dust. She feels that getting rid of all the dust and sand is not achievable. Another neighbor stated that the ultimate end goal is the approved drawing. Discussion was held on the reclamation plan and Stoneco's desire to change the reclamation plan. A revision of the plan needs to be done. Mr. Becker stated that reclamation maybe 10 to 15 percent complete. There is some vegetation on a portion

Steve Lemons explained how stripping and mining and reclamation are done at the same time.

A neighbor asked whether the reclamation could be completed by the end of 2014 with a new plan B? Would it involve, smoothing out the sloops all the way around and getting them to proper grade?

Mr. Becker stated the reclamation is being done according to the current plan.

A neighbor asked if they didn't get the extension and revised the plan could it be done by the end of 2014.

Mr. Becker stated that it would be targeted to that.

A neighbor discussed the requirement of reclamation of the site.

Question asked about the value of product that would be un-mined. No number was shared.

Concerns of the property values and health consequences living next to an active gravel pit were raised.

Revision of slope behind Emerson School is also in the letter. Request is to soften the slope and leave behind some of the berm that is currently in place behind Emerson School.

Concern was raised about the real-estate values and inability to sell the homes located near the pit.

Michigan Paving Materials holds the assets and is a subsidiary of Old Castle.

Timing set for receipt of a revised plan by July 1st.

Marcus McNamara stated that the plan if there is no extension is important. Reclamation Bond, amount set by the judge, is not appropriate and probably should be set higher based on acreage. His suggestion would be to submit modifications to the berm and slope.

Is there any possibility of compromise in time for closure?

Stoneco will not be able to remove all the material that they planned in order to restore by December 2014, according to the plan. The neighbor's want the project closed. That is why they went to court and agreed to a consent agreement.

Plan made to meet again July 11, 2012 at 7:00 p.m.

The discussion ended at 7:23 p.m.

Elaine Masters, Clerk