I. Introductions
   A. Chris Hiniker, senior planner, SEH, provided an overview of the meeting purpose, which was to focus on presenting the methodologies, assumptions and findings for three technical subject areas addressed in the EIS process (Air Quality, Noise and Traffic).

II. EIS Update
   A. Chris Hiniker reviewed the tentative EIS preparation timeline. The tentative schedule for distributing a public/EQB copy of the Draft EIS is February 2010.

III. Air Quality
   A. Andrea Hayden, air quality specialist, SEH, summarized the technical air quality/dust analysis that was completed for the proposed sand and gravel operations and ancillary use operations on the UMore Mining Area. Hayden presented the study methodologies, model inputs/assumptions, and technical conclusions. Based on the proposed operations and best management practices (BMPs) – mitigation, the analysis concludes the proposed action will not result in significant air quality/dust impacts.
      1. It was suggested that the EIS discuss possible timelines for corrective actions (mitigation) if air quality impacts occur during operations.
      2. It was suggested that mitigation be considered for future land development on the UMore Park property. A possible buffer or other BMPs could be identified for future land use development closer to the ancillary use facility area.

IV. Noise
   A. Erik Tomlinson, noise specialist, SEH, summarized the technical noise analysis that was completed for the project. The noise analysis was conducted in two categories: traffic operations and site operations. Tomlinson described the study methodologies, model inputs/assumptions and technical conclusions for both traffic noise and site operation noise. Based on the proposed operations, the analysis concluded that changes in traffic noise levels are attributed almost entirely to the growth background traffic. Traffic noise increases associated with the mining operations are approximately 1 decibel or less on average, which is not perceptible. Adverse noise impacts associated with ancillary site operations are not anticipated because there are no sensitive
receptors within close proximity of the ancillary area. Furthermore, no significant noise impacts are anticipated with other site operations given the proximity to sensitive receptors and the provision of berming.

1. The TAC discussed the potential for noise impacts during off-peak hours for traffic that were used in the model because truck traffic from the mining operation might represent a higher percentage of the overall traffic volumes during these times of day. Tomlinson indicated that the state and federal noise models assess only the peak hour traffic condition when traffic noise levels are assumed to be the highest.

2. The high noise levels shown for the monitoring sites along the shoulder of County Road 42, were discussed and it was suggested that these sites also be considered receptors so that modeled levels can be predicted to establish context of the noise levels immediately adjacent to County Road 42. Additional monitoring within the residential neighborhood north of County Road 42 was also suggested.

3. The TAC discussed the ongoing monitoring plan that has been successful in Empire Township. The Township will forward any data from monitoring results at existing sand and gravel facilities.

4. At the request of the TAC, the noise section in the Draft EIS will include a discussion of noise sources and will include a figure depicting noise contours associated with these sources.

5. The City of Rosemount expressed the importance of identifying noise mitigation (e.g. berming) as part of the EIS.

6. The mitigation commitments should discuss how proper maintenance of equipment can minimize noise and how this can be enforced through permitting.

V. Traffic

A. George Calebaugh, traffic engineer, SEH, presented the information gathered as part of the traffic impact study completed as part of the EIS process. Calebaugh discussed the traffic impact study methodologies, model inputs/assumptions and technical conclusions. Based on the operational results, the analysis concludes the proposed action does not generate any significant traffic impacts. However, growth in the background traffic (traffic from surrounding land uses/development) will generate the need for some transportation improvements by the year 2030.

1. The lower level of truck trips indicated for 2011-2020 in the traffic study should be confirmed based on the current Mining Plan.

2. The distribution percentages on Figure 4 are not clear. Also, 145th Street between Highway 3 and CR 42 should not be identified as a “Major Route”.

3. The TAC suggested that there may be a need to further resolve the allowable access points to the site and that Figure 3 should qualify the access points as representative locations and that the specific locations will be determined at the time the access approval is requested.

4. The TAC suggested that access points should be coordinated with future development plans.

5. 2011 forecast traffic volumes along Biscayne Avenue, 145th Street and on roadways south of CR 46 may be high given development trends over the past two to three years.

6. The TAC discussed background traffic assumptions used in the analysis and whether any development on the UMore Park property east of the Mining Area was included in the model.

7. The traffic study assumed any development as depicted in the City’s Comprehensive Plan. The need for a traffic signal at Biscayne Avenue in the year 2011 was discussed. The forecast volumes as well as possible improvements needed at this location will be revisited.

8. The need for acceleration lanes in conjunction with the access points was discussed. Currently, Dakota County does not have a policy requiring acceleration lanes, but could be considered at the time an access point is being reviewed for approval.

9. The TAC discussed the threshold and timing for when a gravel road may need to be paved to accommodate the proposed increase in heavy truck traffic. This also relates to the structural capacity of these roadways and possible weight restrictions during specific times of the year.

10. It was noted that the Dakota County Transportation System Study is nearing completion and its conclusions may need to be considered.

11. Empire Township indicated they will be submitting a formal comment letter regarding their review of the three technical studies.

B. As appropriate, follow-up with the City of Rosemount, Empire Township and Dakota County will be coordinated to address the comments raised through the course of the meeting.

VI. Next Meeting – The next TAC meeting will be scheduled at a later date. It is anticipated it may occur around the Draft EIS official comment period and public meeting.