

Daniel Murray

From: Gary D. Grantham <phdg1948@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2016 11:51 AM
To: Damian Peduto; Daniel Murray
Cc: Joe Kerby
Subject: GCC KCII Staff Report

Categories: saved to LF/CV

Damian and Dan,

This has been an arduous process. Throughout, I have tried to communicate the viewpoints of CR120N residents as clearly and succinctly as possible. Accordingly, there is something in the Staff Report to which I would like to take personal exception:

"An average of 80 average/96 maximum haul trucks/day is the initial recommended volume and loading during

the phases 1, 2, and 3 of road improvements as identified within the recommended conditions of this staff

report, as well as the recently provided, executed RIA. The allowance for 80 trucks/day is based upon the

level of hauling in 2013 (average 84 trucks/day) when there was a general acceptance of truck traffic on the

road. It was not until truck traffic increased in 2014 (average 110 trucks/day) that the volume of trucks was

determined to exceed what is considered compatible for the area as evident by significant public comment.

During staff engagement with the public in the autumn of 2014 and thereafter a common sentiment from the

public was that a year before (2013) was acceptable. The objective of the average 80 trucks/day is to return to

the previously acceptable truck level along with the introduction of significant mitigation measures in order to

achieve compatibility during the phased road improvements."

I do not believe there is anything in the public record to support the statement that the "common sentiment" was that the 2013 level of trucking was generally acceptable. Certainly nobody stood up

in the 11/2014 public meeting at FLMES and said "things were fine last year." As you are both well aware, our Letter of August 28, 2015 asks for a limit of **60** trucks. Your statement also totally ignores the number one recommendation of the Hay Gulch Citizens Advisory Panel, i.e. that trucks be immediately limited to 2010 levels until the road is upgraded. As of July of 2010, the average number of trucks per day was **46**. By the County's own design, the Hay Gulch Citizens Advisory Panel was intended to be the ultimate arbiter of "common sentiment."

Your attempt to provide an after-the-fact rationale for a negotiated number is disingenuous at best and at worst dishonest. While there is a great deal in this report I disagree with, this paragraph is the only thing I find deeply disappointing.

Gary D. Grantham, Ph.D.

1124 County Road 120

Hay Gulch

Hesperus, CO 81326

970 749-1092

Daniel Murray

From: mqjulie . <mqjulie@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2016 10:39 AM
To: Peterson Trent; Nance Gina; SW CO Advocates; Paula Mathias; Damian Peduto; Daniel Murray; Gwen Lachelt; Julie Westendorff; Brad Blake; Jim Davis; Victoria Schmitt; Gary D. Grantham; Sheryl Rogers; Todd Foutz; twmac; absherc@durango.net; Luke Danielson; hesperus6@yahoo.com; elknorge@yahoo.com; Jeff Robbins
Subject: let's be honest-shall we?
Categories: saved to LF/CV

To Whom it May Concern,

As the weather gets nicer and I am outside I shake my head in complete and utter despair at the parade of coal trucks rumbling past my house. One after another-no relief, it is ludicrous not to admit that CR 120 N is indeed a personal haul road for a foreign company. Let's just call a spade a spade.

Julie McCue

Daniel Murray

From: Tim Gallagher <azrsqr@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 24, 2016 10:46 AM
To: chris anderson; Edward Aber; Jim Davis; Damian Peduto; Daniel Murray; Joe Kerby
Subject: Traffic Update

Categories: saved to LF/CV

Guys,

Just a quick update on the GCC traffic issue. Myself and a few others met with Trent Peterson and a few of his guys on Fri. to discuss the current plan to have all employees use the southern routes during construction.

A few of our guys had questions about traffic counts, times of the day and what would be the best way to handle employees that were speeding down 119 or 120S. The GCC folks answered all the questions to our satisfaction.

Because the county has capped the coal truck count to 80 per day until the first phase of construction is complete GCC has decided to scale back operations. For now they will only be working 4 days per week. That is the actual coal miners doing production. Trucks will still run 6 days per week at the reduced count.

GCC will develop a policy that directs all employees to use the southern routes during construction that requires traffic control (Flagmen). Mon. thru Thurs. the first shift arrives at the mine between 4:30 and 6:00 am. That would be 40 - 50 inbound vehicles. Currently, approximately 20% of their employees use the southern routes. We all agreed that because there will not be construction activities and traffic control at 4:30 am that those employees coming from the Cortez area will still use 120N to get to the mine. So the morning wave on 120S and 119 looks like it will be unchanged from what it currently is.

M-Th those same miners will leave the mine between 4:00 and 4:30 pm and use the southern routes. That means there will be approximately 30 - 40 more vehicles leaving using 119, 120S or 116. Split evenly that would generate 10 - 15 more vehicles per day on each of those routes. Given the current ADTs I got from Jim Davis, that increase is negligible.

They will have a 2nd shift coming in between 3:00 and 3:30. That shift will generate 12 - 17 vehicles. During that time period all of those will have to use the southern routes into the mine. Possibly, an extra 10 vehicles per day at that time on those routes.

They will have a 3rd shift but it sounds like a skeleton crew. Between 8 - 10 vehicles coming in between 10:00 - 11:00 pm. Those that take 120N into the mine will probably continue to do so at that time of day.

Again, for now this is all Mon. - Thurs. Fri., Sat. & Sun. they will still have operations going but with a skeleton crew.

What those in attendance took away from the meeting on Fri. was that the increased traffic count on the southern routes was going to be negligible. And the only times the neighbors should notice it would be in the afternoon between 3:00 - 4:30 pm.

They assured us that any traffic safety or noise complaints (boom box) from the the employees will be dealt with in their typical corrective, progressive and lawful disciplinary manner.

All of us walked away from the meeting feeling good about what we heard and now much better informed so that that we can properly inform the other neighbors.

Trent did tell us they were ready to begin construction as soon as they got the permit approved. Hopefully all is well from here on out. I'll keep you posted if I hear anything else about it out here.

Thanks for all your work on this.

Cheers,

Tim

Daniel Murray

From: Paula Mathias <paulagmathias@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 12, 2016 2:45 PM
To: Daniel Murray; Damian Peduto; Joe Kerby
Subject: BOCC site visit May 18

Dear Daniel, Damian, and Joe,

It is my understanding that the BOCC will have the opportunity to tour 120 North, GCC, and the surrounding area on May 18th. I am grateful that they will be offered a first hand glimpse into the current state of our county road and the impacts we must live with daily along Hay Gulch.

I am concerned, however, that what is shared/pointed out along the tour route may only be what the county has achieved and/or plans to achieve in conjunction with GCC and the RIA. I would encourage the county to invite a few local 120 north residents to also participate, thus enriching the tour with personal perspectives.

In addition to what Southwest Advocated requested, I would ask that the following be part of the BOCC educational highlights as well:

- 1) 140/120 entrance
 - state of the asphalt
 - that coal trucks sleep in the vacant triangle and remove chains
- 2) 90% corner
 - line of sight is dangerous/private property
 - drop off created by the new culvert/concrete is a safety concern
- 3) Snyder residence
 - state of the cracking/crumbling asphalt
 - drop off along his fence/no shoulder for a man who loves to run
 - the narrowness of this road. Especially when two trucks pass one another
- *) Graham's/Beagles entrances
 - hidden driveways with limited sight distance create safety concerns
- 4) Variance Hill
 - NOISE levels of a truck climbing the hill
 - new pot holes
 - trucks attempt to make it in snowstorms and chain up in the middle of the road
- 5) Cougar Mesa Estates
 - if you walk 200 yards up the driveway you can look down on the Hay Gulch ditch and the McCue's and see exactly where the road could be moved to the south for privacy, noise, dust, etc
- 6) McCue residence
 - privacy, noise, dust, pavement transition, late hours of operation, temporary asphalt, WALL
 - the "track on" dirt left on the pavement when exiting the dirt portion creates dust
- 7) Hidden Ridges Ranch
 - blind entrance and a very steep incline (safety concern in the winter entering 120 N)
 - would the placement of the McCue's wall affect sight
- 8) Hunzeker residence
 - privacy, noise, dust, late hours of operation, temporary asphalt, WALL, horses
- 9) Krall residence
 - the lack of any communication with Mr. James Krall
 - first phase of paving should undoubtedly include paving in front of his property
 - would he like a privacy, noise, dust wall?
- 10) King Coal I
 - activity of dumping possible contaminants (lead and mercury)
- 11) Batching
 - note there are no pull offs along the populated section of 120 North
 - safety/danger created by a batch

- noise/dust created by a batch
- view shed interrupted by a batch

Thank You for considering these additions and the possibility of having locals participate in the tour from start to finish.

Sincerely,
Paula Mathias

Daniel Murray

From: mqjulie . <mqjulie@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 14, 2016 1:54 PM
To: Peterson Trent; Nance Gina; SW CO Advocates; Paula Mathias; Gary D. Grantham; Damian Peduto; Daniel Murray; elknorge@yahoo.com; hesperus6@yahoo.com; Jeff Robbins; absherc@durango.net; Chad Foutz; Luke Danielson
Subject: compliment to GCC

To Whom It May Concern;

Seems like I never get a chance to thank GCC but I feel compelled to do so. I am getting more water to drink after working outside. I honestly have to say that whatever the truck numbers are so far today, (it is close to 2:00 pm and I hope it continues) is a number that is completely tolerable, compatible, ect. for a resident to have to live with. So, thank you Trent, for allowing us to live cohesively, at least for this one day! I really am interested in the number of trucks for May 14, 2016. Any way to find out? Have a peaceful rest of the weekend-this is why we live here!!!

Julie