

GCC Energy King Coal II

Neighborhood Compatibility Meeting #2 – 12/19/13

Ft. Lewis Mesa Elementary School – 5:30 pm – 7:45 pm

Summary of concerns from the adjacent landowners

1. Water Quality

- a. Water quality is affected by the water that is pumped into the mine for dust control. The water in the mine is creating hydraulic pressure in the coal seam that is causing the migration of contaminants through the formation to neighbor's water wells. The study does not explain how much water is used in the mine for dust control and where the water flows to once it is applied to the mine walls, etc.
- b. Water quality samples did not test for the correct contaminants. Example used was Trichloroethylene (TCE), which is a de-greaser used on equipment. A list of relevant contaminants would ultimately be created based on the chemicals being used on the mine and which constituents in the coal are soluble and transported through the formation.
- c. Water quality sampling on domestic water wells should continue for the life of the mine for water quality monitoring purposes.
- d. Water quality sampling required by DRMS for King I could be used as a baseline for water quality.
- e. Mr. Coyne stated sampling conducted on his well was taken from the cistern instead of directly from the well and this makes the data (1) not useful and (2) inaccurately identified in the environmental report
- f. The cross section depicting the various coal seams and the domestic water wells, does not have a scale. It is hard to determine what the depth of the various seams and depth of the domestic wells are without a scale.

2. Noise

- a. The study did not clearly explain why the c-scale readings were targeting the ventilation fan at the mine, and does not clearly explain why the COGCC c-scale standards are guidelines for this particular mining operation rather than requirements.
- b. Adjacent landowners were concerned about the impacts on quality of life from the noise generated from the mine. They indicated state statute limits (as outlined in C.R.S. 25-12-103) are established for safety purposes to prevent hearing loss and do not contemplate impacts to quality of life.

3. Ground Vibration

- a. There is concern that the continuous miner is causing vibrations, not the ventilation fan. The applicant clarified in the meeting that ground vibration was taken near the residences and is a separate issue from c-scale, low frequency sound waves that were

thought to be emanating from the ventilation fan. This same issue can occur with large scale intake fans on O&G compressors, which is why c-scale readings were taken.

- b. When the mine started the vibrations were worse than they are now. The mining is further away from the mine portal. There is a concern that when the portion of the BLM lease modification is approved (southwest of the mine portal), that this area will be closer to the residences in the Visa de Oro subdivision, and that the vibrations will return. Neighbors indicated that when mining was occurring near the portal and closer to their homes, vibrations were occurring consistently at 10 pm. They asked what may have caused this.
  - c. The study does not clearly state where mining was occurring at the time that the ground vibration geophones were recording. A distance from the closest and furthest geophones is not outlined in the report.
  - d. The study does not clearly explain what is meant by “background” vibrations.
  - e. The study does not clearly articulate what level of activity the mine was operating at during the ground vibration testing. It was explained in the meeting that the mine was at full operation during the testing.
4. General Items related to the contents of the study
- a. The adjacent landowners are concerned about their names and addresses being in the study, because they are concerned that it will negatively impact the resale value of their homes. They are concerned that a buyer would find this study and it would impact the sale of their homes. The landowners requested their names and addresses be removed from the study.
  - b. In the study there are several references to the adjacent landowners “perceiving” impacts. They don’t like the term perceived and want it replaced with some other term. There were also concerns with some of the quotes in the report being incorrectly recorded from the adjacent landowners. GCC explained that if they would provide the correct language they would change these items in the study.
  - c. The study does not cite studies or publications to substantiate the portions of the study or the conclusions of the study.

## GCC Energy King Coal II

Neighborhood Compatibility Meeting – 9/11/2012

### Summary of concerns from the adjacent landowners

1. Vibration
  - a. Vibration through the ground that can be felt in the homes at the Vista de Oro subdivision.
  - b. The vibration appears to be constant and the ALOs feel that it is from the underground mining operation itself, rather than from the surface equipment.
  - c. The vibration is noticeable at night, more so than other times of the day.
2. Noise
  - a. Noise from the conveyor belts and alarms onsite (back-up alarms on trucks, conveyor start alarms, etc.).
3. Groundwater/Water Well Contamination
  - a. The ALOs have found coal fines in their ground water wells.
  - b. It is unknown what is causing this, but it was brought up that maybe vibration from the underground mining is causing the formation around the groundwater wells to agitate and that is what is causing the coal fines to show up in the water wells. So, not a direct cause from the mining, but a result of the vibration from the mining.
  - c. There is concern that the fines will result in well maintenance issues (pumps, etc.).
  - d. There is also a concern about water quality, and health related issues with the fines.
4. Water Quantity Impacts
  - a. The ALOs are concerned that the mining operation will reduce the amount of groundwater in the area, and if a drought were to occur that their water wells would go dry.
5. Traffic
  - a. ALOs were concerned about traffic going south on CR 120, 116, and 119.
  - b. The applicant is proposing all heavy truck traffic go North on CR 120 to Hwy 140. The county is reviewing this and will impose COAs.
  - c. The ALOs were concerned about truck turnovers, apparently this is common along the south route.
6. Expansion to the west under the Vista de Oro Subdivision
  - a. The ALOs were concerned about future development going under their homes.
  - b. It is unsure if this would be allowed since room and pillar mining results in surface subsidence, which could affect residential foundations.
7. Covering Coal Trucks
  - a. One ALO wanted to make sure that the coal trucks are covered before they leave the site, rather than at the intersection of CR 120 and Hwy 140.

GCC Energy King Coal II

Neighborhood Compatibility Meeting #2 – 12/19/13

Ft. Lewis Mesa Elementary School – 5:30 pm – 7:45 pm

Summary of concerns from the adjacent landowners

1. Water Quality

- a. Water quality is affected by the water that is pumped into the mine for dust control. The water in the mine is creating hydraulic pressure in the coal seam that is causing the migration of contaminants through the formation to neighbor's water wells. The study does not explain how much water is used in the mine for dust control and where the water flows to once it is applied to the mine walls, etc.
- b. Water quality samples did not test for the correct contaminants. Example used was Trichloroethylene (TCE), which is a de-greaser used on equipment. A list of relevant contaminants would ultimately be created based on the chemicals being used on the mine and which constituents in the coal are soluble and transported through the formation.
- c. Water quality sampling on domestic water wells should continue for the life of the mine for water quality monitoring purposes.
- d. Water quality sampling required by DRMS for King I could be used as a baseline for water quality.
- e. Mr. Coyne stated sampling conducted on his well was taken from the cistern instead of directly from the well and this makes the data (1) not useful and (2) inaccurately identified in the environmental report
- f. The cross section depicting the various coal seams and the domestic water wells, does not have a scale. It is hard to determine what the depth of the various seams and depth of the domestic wells are without a scale.

2. Noise

- a. The study did not clearly explain why the c-scale readings were targeting the ventilation fan at the mine, and does not clearly explain why the COGCC c-scale standards are guidelines for this particular mining operation rather than requirements.
- b. Adjacent landowners were concerned about the impacts on quality of life from the noise generated from the mine. They indicated state statute limits (as outlined in C.R.S. 25-12-103) are established for safety purposes to prevent hearing loss and do not contemplate impacts to quality of life.

3. Ground Vibration

- a. There is concern that the continuous miner is causing vibrations, not the ventilation fan. The applicant clarified in the meeting that ground vibration was taken near the residences and is a separate issue from c-scale, low frequency sound waves that were

thought to be emanating from the ventilation fan. This same issue can occur with large scale intake fans on O&G compressors, which is why c-scale readings were taken.

- b. When the mine started the vibrations were worse than they are now. The mining is further away from the mine portal. There is a concern that when the portion of the BLM lease modification is approved (southwest of the mine portal), that this area will be closer to the residences in the Visa de Oro subdivision, and that the vibrations will return. Neighbors indicated that when mining was occurring near the portal and closer to their homes, vibrations were occurring consistently at 10 pm. They asked what may have caused this.
  - c. The study does not clearly state where mining was occurring at the time that the ground vibration geophones were recording. A distance from the closest and furthest geophones is not outlined in the report.
  - d. The study does not clearly explain what is meant by “background” vibrations.
  - e. The study does not clearly articulate what level of activity the mine was operating at during the ground vibration testing. It was explained in the meeting that the mine was at full operation during the testing.
4. General Items related to the contents of the study
- a. The adjacent landowners are concerned about their names and addresses being in the study, because they are concerned that it will negatively impact the resale value of their homes. They are concerned that a buyer would find this study and it would impact the sale of their homes. The landowners requested their names and addresses be removed from the study.
  - b. In the study there are several references to the adjacent landowners “perceiving” impacts. They don’t like the term perceived and want it replaced with some other term. There were also concerns with some of the quotes in the report being incorrectly recorded from the adjacent landowners. GCC explained that if they would provide the correct language they would change these items in the study.
  - c. The study does not cite studies or publications to substantiate the portions of the study or the conclusions of the study.