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| -----Original Message-----From: Mark Sethne [mailto:sethne@uwplatt.edu] Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 1:40 PMTo: Cupp, Mark E - LWRSubject: Please Protect the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway from the Impacts of Sand MiningDear Lower Wisconsin State Riverway Board,I appreciate that your mission is to protect the scenic beauty and natural character of the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway for all citizens. Pattison Sand Company's sand mine proposal could dramatically change the character of the River we love so much.Please reject any sand mining permit that:. Allows mine-related structures or stockpiled materials to be visible from the Wisconsin River; . Compromises the natural characteristics of the Wisconsin River; . Undermines the ability of people to recreate and enjoy the Riverway.Sincerely,Mark SethneBoard member Friends of the Platte River Board member Fox-Wisconsin Heritage River Friends of the Lower Wisconsin River Alliance of Wisconsin - memberMark SethneR4Platteville, WI 53818608-642-0080  |
| Editor -Open Letter to the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway BoardAugust 8, 2013 Dear Lower Wisconsin Riverway Board, Please vote “No” on all four of the applications for industrial frac sand mining on Riverway Lands in Bridgeport Township in Crawford County at the Aug. 22 special Riverway meeting in Prairie du Chien at the County Administration Building at 5:00 pm. We are writing to inspire citizens to attend that meeting and for each of us to speak for the habitat and for the creatures of the Riverway and to ask that the Riverway Board stand tall for their mission “to protect and preserve the scenic beauty and natural character of the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway.” Millions of dollars and countless hours have gone into the Riverway, an asset for all Wisconsinites. Are you willing to turn it into an industrial open pit frac (silica) sand mining zone operating 24/7 for generations? Has the Riverway figured out who is responsible if the River becomes polluted? Sand mine companies  have already been issued violation notices of contamination to steams and wetland.  Why would anyone in good faith and conscience grant permits to contaminate our Riverway.  We know the storm water permit was approved with very lenient regulations for the environmental impact that this industry will have.  It is too late after the fact to decide how to clean it up.Is the dust that is likely to show up in plumes above the mine and on the River meet the visibility criteria of the Riverway? If not, who’s going to stop it? The noise from trucks, blasting, mining, screening, as well as night lighting will all change the experience dramatically for Riverway outings.  Riverway tourism contributes to our local economy. Please protect this irreplaceable resource!This 60 year project needs more research study of the ramifications, than a few months to approve permits that were sprung on the residents of Bridgeport and surrounding neighbors.Please vote "No" because there will be more visibility of environmental and habitat damage besides leaf on condition visibility.Thank you for all your wise considerations and actions you continue to show in this issue.Becky MartinEthel DrengbergFred DrengbergWauzeka, WI |
| **From:** Gene [mailto:unger10@merr.com] **Sent:** Friday, August 09, 2013 11:15 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Fw: Spring Green River way open Meeting 08/08/13Mark Here are my notes and comments from the Riverway meeting of 08/08/13 in Spring Green.Nice to see you again and thanks for your time, efforts and expertise!Gene **Subject:** Spring Green River way open Meeting 08/08/13 Edie,RE: River way notes and comments My assessment of the meeting exchanges last night were that the Riverway Board and the DNR are hoping to maintain the Bluff to Bluff view shed. I am not sure if the current permit allows mining in the view shed or not. I believe efforts should be focused on protecting the scenic bluff view from mining. As promised, my notes: These comments are things that should be addressed by the appropriate agencies: either the town of Bridge Port, Riverway Board or the Stewardship Project.If agencies do not comply or monitor as required, they must be held accountable to the public.1.    Far field noise limits. Simply put sound needs to be limited, monitored and controlled. 2.    Fugitive Dust. All companies operating anywhere need to comply with dust and dust control. Water tankers need to be of capacity to handle all the roads and equipment being used and frequency is important. Who will monitor? Will they draw from the river? Need a permit! Yes!! DNR should Monitor compliance3.    Pattison indicted they would use light plants power by diesel generators. If so, they will need additional air permits, special fuel (Low Sulfur),  limited quantities on site, fueling plan and spill plan and emergency clean up supplies on site. Town to monitor compliance. Permits by State? Use the local power company as suggested by the River way Board (Safer).4.    Pattison spoke of using basins for run off. That may be fine, but in the case of clay banding or basin failure what is the alternate plan and will they stop mining until corrected? What is in place for the 100 year flood condition? My guess this land is part of a controlled water shed program now. Crawford County should be in charge of water quality?5.    My understanding was that Pattison had the bulk of the compliance burden, simply stated, this should be performed by a third party company, qualified and paid for by Pattison.6.    Pattison said, no chemicals would be used at the site. That is impossible as fuel, oils, lubricants, anti-freeze agents etc are needed for this type of operation.  They later spoke of a spray glue to control dust. That said, has Pattison delivered to all parties a Hazardous Communication Plan as required by Law.  Haz Com 29CFR, 1900 series.7.    Could this mine if not operated and monitored properly ever become a Super Fund site? Does cradle to grave apply here (25 years)? Who is on board for the responsibility.  I think it would be the land owner first as they profited from the sale of sand. I would suggest the mining company does not want to own the site for that reason. They don’t want to be tied to it for ever. I think they will be anyway as they were the operator.8.    Someone needs to know Pattison is complying with all applicable laws and Home Land Security requirements for the dynamite and blasting components. If stored on site, residents need to know and an emergency action plan submitted and local emergency crews notified of quantities. 24-7 security?9.    The discussion of the longevity of Pattison as operator is interesting as a business succession plan needs to be shared with the land owner and town by providing proof of a written contract that the agreed upon “Agreement” and Contract conditions between parties needs to survive and copies provided to all parties to insure that a quick sale or transfer to another party (Successor) does not end or nullify the agreement in whole or part. What language in the contract /s protects this “Agreement”? Has anyone checked to see if Pattison is a good steward at other mine sites they operate? This may be a “Marriage” of 60 or more years, will everyone think this was a “good” idea forever? Some marriages don’t last! 10.    Pattison has stated that a $164K Performance bond is in place for the project. What are the draw conditions? This is important as the draw conditions may be impossible to meet or force payment if needed. The land owner and the town should required some type of cash bond or a Letter of Credit (LOC) that could be drawn if the operator defaults or is in non compliance. This is generally used when a company is unwilling or unable to remedy per the conditions of the agreement.11.    It seems inconceivable that clear cutting this much land does not fall into DNR and Crawford County jurisdiction. I would think a permit must be requested and monitored for compliance. Everyone else has to.12.    My understanding is that there is a Eagle Roost and possible nesting site on or near the mining area. I also understand that a study by the DNR indicated that there was a sufficient buffer between the mine and roosting area or nest? Is this study published or available? 13.    This being historic Native American traveled land, are there any Mounds or Burial site with in the affected mine area? Has anyone checked?14.     The roads will take a beating from the heavy hauling of the sand. Some roads may be state and possibly some local roads. Is there a provision for the roads to be reconditioned if damage occurs? The bond ($164K) won’t be enough. Has a traffic plan been published and agreed upon? If the mine is run 24-7 will there ever be a quiet time for the locals? Fugitive dust plan for roads surrounding the mine?15. What happens if State Hwy 60 is closed for major repair? The alternate routes are most likely town roads! Again if the current operator is unwilling or unable to comply with the requirements, should the mine land owner be responsible? The operator most likely has product delivery requirements and subject to LDs or some kind of financial penalty?  Who pays?The town? The land owner? The local Tax Payer?16.     Since there is so much frac sand in the Wisconsin area, why would the river way view shed even be considered for mining? I am a land owner on the Wisconsin River and have been subject to the Lower Wisconsin Riverway rules for many years, why don’t they apply now? I think the land owners that had building or use permits rejected by the Riverway rules may be a little upset that the rules were not enforceable! Should the local Townships be able to overrule state law in any case?17.  Companies come into towns and cities, win over locals and boards with the promise of a great partnership, push the letter of the law, and take their profits elsewhere leaving the locals to clean up the mess and mother nature to mend the mistakes. Urge the local people, town boards, land owners, government agencies and operators to act both professionally and responsible. We have lots of Frac sand and only one Wisconsin River.Is this the only land that was offered to Pattison? Anyone else submit a permit request? If so, was it a better option? |
| **From:** nptimm chorus.net [mailto:nptimm@chorus.net] **Sent:** Thursday, August 08, 2013 11:07 AM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Bridge Port PermitI 'm a 40yr resident of  Mazomanie. I love  the Wis  River. Please do not grant this permit. Nate Timm. |
| Please consider voting "no" to the frac  sand mining vote later this month.  This area of our state is too preciousto throw away.  Mining the area would forever change the community's health and environment.  It would justbe plain bad business for tourism.  This are is an untouched gem - PLEASE help keep it that way!Thanks,Jean KriegMadison,WI |
| -----Original Message-----From: carolsommers@centurytel.net [mailto:carolsommers@centurytel.net] Sent: Monday, August 12, 2013 12:00 PMTo: Cupp, Mark E - LWRSubject: Bridgeport's Saturday Mt'gMark, FYI:I attended an urgent meeting in Bridgeport of its Planning Com at 8 a.m. Saturday; it was called after the Riverway Brd's Spring Grn meeting. It seems clear that the Pattison lawyer was reacting to the specters raised by Gene Unger as well certainly as the new statements from the Board's lawyer that circulated somewhat among attendees (pink sheet). The Bridgeport Planning Com mumbled quickly through a 15min session to pass a rushed two-part motion to drop the whole landscaping issue for now, and to start mining immediately (no reference to limits on where to mine immediately). This is their recommendation at the ready then for the Bridgeport Board set to meet on Wednesday of this week. We know of course that the B.Board will rubberstamp this recommendation. Beth of Pattison was present at the Planning Com mt'g. Very few "public" were there/knew of the meeting. People who need to know this, e.g., the Riverway Board's lawyer, Don Greenwood and other Board members, Tim Zumm, whoever, plus any other interested persons should hear of it. I don't know how to contact them. I'll ask Sharon Swiggums if she'll pass this on as well. Carol  |
| **From:** Sharon Swiggum [mailto:sgswiggum@mwt.net] **Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 1:18 PM**To:** ;**Subject:** Bridgeport Plan Commission--Last Saturday As you know, the one and only condition placed on the Bridgeport Mine is ‘planting trees to buffer the sound’...Landscaping. Now, this Bridgeport Plan Commission meeting addressed that “a lot of the landowners that it has affected did not especially want trees in the middle of their fields”. Meeting video at: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lkLTCdmTwYI>  Meeting called to order by Ryan Stram at 8:00 a.m. on Saturday, August 10, 2013  Called to Order: at the 8:00 point in video Motion: 12:07 minute segment Motion made by Linda Smrcina as follows: “Landscaping plans on hold until Spring. Mining can commence in meantime. Plan Commission will address the landscaping issue after start of mining in Spring 2014.” Four Plan Commission members in attendance. Meeting length: 4 minutes 55 seconds It is my understanding that Pattison Sand Company was represented by Attorney Dorothy Stroschien and Beth Regan, Pattison Mine Company’s permit and compliance coordinator. --------------------------------------------------------From a  person who attended the meeting on Saturday: Are there people who want to attend the Bridgeport Board meeting on Wednesday?  Other than this statement, I do not have any information about a meeting of the Bridgeport Board. ---------------------------------------------------------- The tent is in the car and the Perseid Meteor Shower is calling me! -----------------------------------------------------------Standing Strong Against Sand Mines in Wisconsin!Sharon Swiggum |
| **From:** Thomas Garver [mailto:thgarver@gmail.com] **Sent:** Tuesday, August 13, 2013 3:19 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Sand mine on Lower Wisc. Riverway?Mark Cupp:Tom Garver here. Some years ago I wrote an article on the Wisconsin River for the magazine American Heritage of Invention & Technology. At that time I interviewed you about the Lower Wisconsin Riverway and the care you took to preserve its historic and pristine vision.With that in mind, I would think that it would be terrible to permit a sand mine to operate right on the river, without any sort of buffer. I gather that the decision lies with your committee. I've signed a petition, and am contacting you directly to encourage a "no" vote on this, or a vote that will require creating a reasonable buffer so that the mine cannot be seen from the river. Thanks for your consideration.Tom Garver  |
| **From:** Andrea [mailto:akaminski842@gmail.com] **Sent:** Wednesday, August 14, 2013 2:42 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Protect Lower Wisconsin Riverway from sand miningDear Mr. Cupp,My husband and I have paddled the lower Wisconsin River almost every year since we moved to Wisconsin in 1977. Our three adult children loved our annual canoe-camping trips while they were growing up, and my husband and I have continued the tradition most years since they have moved away. Last weekend two of them joined the "old folks" for this year's trip! Our kids gained much of their love and respect for nature from our Wisconsin River trips, and we have been happy to rent our canoes each year from area businesses.Now the lower Wisconsin River is threatened by sand mining. We urge the Lower Wisconsin Riverway Board to reject any sand mining permit that allows mining structures or materials to be visible from the river or compromises the natural beauty and vitality of the river. We intend to keep paddling the Wisconsin River for as many years as we are able to do so. We also want future generations of children to be able to enjoy it.Thank you,Andrea Kaminski842 Woodrow StMadison, WI  53711 |
| **From:** Kerry Schumann - WI League of Conservation Voters [mailto:info@conservationvoters.org] **Sent:** Thursday, August 15, 2013 10:02 AM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Rubbing sand in our faces

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| http://www3.thedatabank.com/hm/273/image/wlcv_logo.jpg | **Rubbing sand in our faces** |

Dear Mark,

|  |
| --- |
| http://www3.thedatabank.com/hm/273/image/WIRiver2AnneSayers.jpg http://www3.thedatabank.com/hm/273/image/fairmount2.jpg |
| Don’t let the beauty of the Wisconsin River be spoiled by agreedy mining company. [*Donate today.*](http://out02.thedatabank.com/?r=MTAwMw0KSjk1Mzk0LUMyNzMtTTEzNjM2Mi04OTUtd2xjdnN0YWZmDQozNzU1NjI3Mzk5NDMxNjYxMTEyNDQ0NzcyMTM2MzYyMTMwDQo3ZTAwMDAwMDIwYjFkMA0KaHR0cDovL2NvbnNlcnZhdGlvbnZvdGVycy5vcmcvZG9uYXRldG9kYXkvP3RkYnVybD1odHRwcyUzQSUyRiUyRnd3dyUyRXRoZWRhdGFiYW5rJTJFY29tJTJGZHBnJTJGMjczJTJGc3BkZiUyRWFzcCUzRmZvcm1pZCUzRERvbmF0ZVRvZGF5V1AmdXRtX3NvdXJjZT1GdW5kMDgxNTEzJnV0bV9tZWRpdW09UG93ZXJtYWlsJnV0bV9jYW1wYWlnbj1Eb25hdGVDYXB0aW9uDQpEb25hdGVDYXB0aW9uDQptYXJrLmN1cHBAd2lzY29uc2luLmdvdg%3d%3d) |

An out-of-state mining company with a bad environmental record wants to change the face of our state without letting us have our say. Sound familiar? **Pattison Sand Company, an out-of-state mining company with a history of environmental violations, is proposing a large frac sand mine that would change the face of the Lower Wisconsin River** - one of the most scenic areas in the state! It's where we canoe, camp on sandbars, kayak, and fish.On August 22nd, the Board of the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway is holding a meeting to decide what to do about Pattison's proposal and the mine. Wisconsin League of Conservation Voters is helping to make sure the room is packed.  **We aren't going to stand by and let Pattison rub sand in our faces by changing the face of the Lower Wisconsin Riverway** - one of our most cherished places. **Want to help?** [**Donate to Wisconsin League of Conservation Voters today.**](http://out02.thedatabank.com/?r=MTAwMw0KSjk1Mzk0LUMyNzMtTTEzNjM2Mi04OTUtd2xjdnN0YWZmDQozNzU1NjI3Mzk5NDMxNjYxMTEyNDQ0NzcyMTM2MzYyMTMwDQo3ZTAwMDAwMDIwYjFkMA0KaHR0cDovL2NvbnNlcnZhdGlvbnZvdGVycy5vcmcvZG9uYXRldG9kYXkvP3RkYnVybD1odHRwcyUzQSUyRiUyRnd3dyUyRXRoZWRhdGFiYW5rJTJFY29tJTJGZHBnJTJGMjczJTJGc3BkZiUyRWFzcCUzRmZvcm1pZCUzRERvbmF0ZVRvZGF5V1AmdXRtX3NvdXJjZT1GdW5kMDgxNTEzJnV0bV9tZWRpdW09UG93ZXJtYWlsJnV0bV9jYW1wYWlnbj1Eb25hdGUxDQpEb25hdGUxDQptYXJrLmN1cHBAd2lzY29uc2luLmdvdg%3d%3d)We've already started taking action - asking citizens, like you, to reject any sand mining permit that compromises the scenic beauty and natural characteristics of the Wisconsin River or prevents people from enjoying the Riverway.Next, we'll get the word out to the media, mobilize citizens around the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway for public comment, and make sure they turn out on August 22nd. **We have only a week left** to let Pattison know that they can't rub sand in our faces and change the face of the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway. Help us **protect the scenic beauty of one of Wisconsin's most cherished natural places** - for you and your family and for future generations. [**Pitch in whatever you can and support Wisconsin League of Conservation Voters today!**](http://out02.thedatabank.com/?r=MTAwMw0KSjk1Mzk0LUMyNzMtTTEzNjM2Mi04OTUtd2xjdnN0YWZmDQozNzU1NjI3Mzk5NDMxNjYxMTEyNDQ0NzcyMTM2MzYyMTMwDQo3ZTAwMDAwMDIwYjFkMA0KaHR0cDovL2NvbnNlcnZhdGlvbnZvdGVycy5vcmcvZG9uYXRldG9kYXkvP3RkYnVybD1odHRwcyUzQSUyRiUyRnd3dyUyRXRoZWRhdGFiYW5rJTJFY29tJTJGZHBnJTJGMjczJTJGc3BkZiUyRWFzcCUzRmZvcm1pZCUzRERvbmF0ZVRvZGF5V1AmdXRtX3NvdXJjZT1GdW5kMDgxNTEzJnV0bV9tZWRpdW09UG93ZXJtYWlsJnV0bV9jYW1wYWlnbj1Eb25hdGUyDQpEb25hdGUyDQptYXJrLmN1cHBAd2lzY29uc2luLmdvdg%3d%3d) Thank you for your generous and much-needed support,http://www3.thedatabank.com/hm/273/image/Kerry-First-Name-Only.gifKerry SchumannExecutive DirectorWisconsin League of Conservation VotersP.S. Pattison Sand Company doesn't want to hear what you and I have to say about the large frac sand mine they're proposing for the Lower Wisconsin River. With your support, we won't let them rub sand in our faces and destroy the scenic beauty of one of Wisconsin's most cherished natural places. [**There's only one week left before a decision on the mine is made, so, please…donate to Wisconsin League of Conservation Voters today and help us protect the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway!**](http://out02.thedatabank.com/?r=MTAwMw0KSjk1Mzk0LUMyNzMtTTEzNjM2Mi04OTUtd2xjdnN0YWZmDQozNzU1NjI3Mzk5NDMxNjYxMTEyNDQ0NzcyMTM2MzYyMTMwDQo3ZTAwMDAwMDIwYjFkMA0KaHR0cDovL2NvbnNlcnZhdGlvbnZvdGVycy5vcmcvZG9uYXRldG9kYXkvP3RkYnVybD1odHRwcyUzQSUyRiUyRnd3dyUyRXRoZWRhdGFiYW5rJTJFY29tJTJGZHBnJTJGMjczJTJGc3BkZiUyRWFzcCUzRmZvcm1pZCUzRERvbmF0ZVRvZGF5V1AmdXRtX3NvdXJjZT1GdW5kMDgxNTEzJnV0bV9tZWRpdW09UG93ZXJtYWlsJnV0bV9jYW1wYWlnbj1Eb25hdGVQUw0KRG9uYXRlUFMNCm1hcmsuY3VwcEB3aXNjb25zaW4uZ292) |
| **From:** Trudy Martin [mailto:martinhs40285@yahoo.com] **Sent:** Thursday, August 15, 2013 9:44 AM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Frac Sand MiningDear Mr. CuppPlease vote "NO" on frac sand mining!  This industry will ruin the beautiful Wisconsin Riverway and cause many other problems including water pollution potential, extreme noise and night lighting and threat to tourism..Thank you.Warren and Trudy MartinCrawford County residents |
| **From:** kerry beheler [mailto:kerry.beheler@gmail.com] **Sent:** Thursday, August 15, 2013 2:25 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Lower WI Riverway; decide NO for sand mining permitHello again Mark. Please include my statements into the public record when the Lower WI State Riverway Board meets on 22 August 2013 to decide about permitting a frac sand mine. The Pattison Sand Company, an out-of-state mining company with a history of environmental violations, is proposing a large industrial mine that would alter the natural character of the Lower WI Riverway. The company has rejected the many efforts to work out a compromise that would allow them to mine the roughly 250 acres in the Town of Bridgeport, for which it has already received a permit, but keep the 40 acres within the scenic corridor of the Lower Wisconsin River free from the sand mine. Please have the Board of the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway deny this permit to Pattison Sand Company as the mining will negatively impact the scenic beauty of the River.  Please reject this sand mining permit as it will allow mine-related structures or stockpiled materials to be visible from the Wisconsin River; compromises the natural characteristics of the Wisconsin River; and undermines the ability of people to recreate and enjoy the Riverway.  Thank you for your consideration. Kerry Beheler Mt Horeb |
| **From:** Katie Garrity [mailto:garritykatie@hotmail.com] **Sent:** Thursday, August 15, 2013 1:59 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Frac Sand Mine IssuesDear Mark,I know the Lower Wisconsin Riverway Board is contemplating approval of Pattison Sand's application for mining in the Bridgeport area on 22 August, 2013.  This must be a very difficult issue for the Board.  I know the potential harmful impact of this planned sand mining operation is in stark contrast with basic tenets of the Board:  the preservation and protection of our beautiful natural resources.  I write to you today to express my own concern with the potential harm and lasting devastation of sand mining and transport, and my own personal experience with Pattison Sand.  I lived (past) in a quiet, well-established neighborhood on Beaumont Road in Prairie du Chien. My home has been owned by my family since 1923. Without prior notice or knowledge, Pattison Sand set up industrial loading facilities, and began 24 hour sand loading operations in my neighborhood.  The area of operation is zoned as riverfront, open space.  They pay no taxes or fees for this operation, and enjoy no oversight, regulation, or accountability for their actions.  For the past two years the neighborhood, our homes, our children, and our elderly residents have been blanketed and poisoned by constant silica dust release, as well as negatively impacted by industrial vibrations, truck traffic, and train car noise at all hours of the day and night.  You can drive by my neighborhood at 2:00 AM and see lights on in houses owned by elderly (80+) persons awakened and vibrated out of their beds.  You can see high intensity industrial lighting where there was once riverfront scenery.  You can see semi trucks parked and waiting for off-loading.  You can see plumes of silica dust in the air as a result of conveyor activities, truck off-loading, and loading into train cars.  All of these changes are a direct result of Pattison's sand loading operations.  Pattison's blatant disregard for people, quality of life, and health and safety can be witnessed daily in my neighborhood.  Promises made publicly by Pattison to diminish stated, observed, and recorded negative impacts on neighborhoods are simply rehearsed sound bites:  they are spun, short-lived, hollow statements. An example of this can be seen with the DNR notice of non-compliance of a fugitive dust plan given to Pattison in January 2013, and Pattison's allegation of compliance with a submitted improvement plan.  This plan included pictures of shrouds and conveyor coverings, a scheduled watering truck, and a schedule checklist for filter cleaning of the conveyor attachment.  Currently, there are no shrouds being used (on the trucks, the conveyor, or the train car entry point), the water truck is absent, and the dust release is obvious and ever-present.   Should the Lower Riverway Board grant Pattison Sand their requested mining operations permit, the town of Bridgeport and the surrounding area will be impacted exponentially.  The area will be devastated by vibrations from explosions, chemical exposure, constant truck traffic, high-intensity lighting, and constant dust released.  The fugitive dust will be accumulated in homes, constantly inhaled by people, livestock and wildlife, and be a constant reminder of choices made between profit and irreplaceable natural resources.  The wildlife and scenery now enjoyed, maintained, and respected by residents and the public will be decimated and eliminated for future generations. There is no reclamation plan that will bring back the beautiful bluffs and natural resources being threatened by this predatory operation.  I have been at many meetings over the past two years where representatives from Pattison Sand, and Kyle Pattison himself have explained away and dismissed the dangers of exposure and inhalation of silica dust.  I have seen the alleged plans put into place to eliminate silica dust release. They are intentionally vague and short-lived for purposes of the illusion of compliance and concern for others.  I have heard Pattison beat the "jobs" drum, recite safety plans, dismiss violations with the DNR, and have even heard the preposterous "it's steam, not dust"  argument in response to photographic evidence to the contrary; dust released into the atmosphere.   I have voiced my concerns to my own local representatives, legislators, the DNR, OSHA, and public health officials.  I have written letters to newspapers pleading for protection.  I have been interviewed by national publications advocating for oversight and regulation on silica sand operations.  By profession I am a Master's prepared Geriatric Clinical Nurse Specialist and know the repercussions of exposure to known carcinogens.  I have researched the process, the impact, and the health risks associated with silica dust, and they are frightening.  On a personal note, I have also had nose bleeds, respiratory issues, and loss of personal freedoms in my own home in order to minimize risk and protect myself from further harm. The City Manager told me to get a doctor's note to prove cause.  I cannot open windows in my house that face the Pattison operation.  I change my furnace and AC filters bi-weekly.  I have an air purifier, fan, and white-noise machine in my bedroom.  I continue to advocate for my elderly neighbors who are constantly exposed to silica dust, yet have no voice to reduce health risks and improve conditions.  Rather, seemingly they are seen as  acceptable collateral damage, and have been ignored by those in our community entrusted to protect and serve.   Mark, I make a plea to the Board to deny Pattison's permit to mine silica sand in Bridgeport and along the Wisconsin Riverway.  The destruction and negative impact of sand mining and transport will far outweigh any conceivable benefit to the area.  Evidence of Pattison's destructive footprint and practices can be seen along the bluffs near Clayton, Iowa and can currently be viewed along the Mississippi River near Bagley.   Pattison mining will alter natural habitats and resources beyond repair by the creation of artificial high-intensity lighting, industrial noise, traffic, and dust permeating what are now  protected, sacred, irreplaceable resources:  our bluffs and riverway.   The Board has the opportunity to do the right thing.  The Board has the opportunity to stop the planned destruction of our precious resources.  The Board has the right to say "no" to a company focused on profit at the expense of the small community of Bridgeport and its residents, our natural resources, and the environment.  I ask that the Board exercise its right to protect the riverway and ensure its availability for future generations to enjoy as we have enjoyed. I am most happy to speak with you at any time, Mark.  Thank you for the opportunity to write to you on this very important issue. Best regards,Katie Garrity  |
| **From:** CLD [mailto:cld@mwt.net] **Sent:** Saturday, August 17, 2013 11:54 AM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Pattison sand mineAugust 17, 2013Mark Cupp, Executive DirectorLower Wisconsin State Riverway BoardDear Mr. Cupp,I'm writing to encourage the Riverway Board to deny permits to Pattison Sand for mining in the Riverway corridor.  An industrial frac sand mine in the Riverway corridor specifically contradicts the mission of the Board ("to protect and preserve").  As far as visibility from the river, there are **no** guarantees that the mining activities could not be seen from the river.   Pattison "says" that the excavation scars, piles of mined materials, and equipment would be hidden by vegetation during the summer, but who monitors this, and what are the consequences for noncompliance?  This is a performance standard that must be met for a permit, yet there is scant evidence that it will, in fact, be met.   And there is no doubt that the massive dust generated by mining, and the intense lighting from a 24-7 operation would be highly visible from the river, regardless of the leaves on the trees.Wisconsin taxpayers have spent tens of millions of dollars on creating and maintaining this special area.  Now an out-of-state mining company can come in and significantly impact it for its own profit?  If these permits are approved, what kind of precedent does it set for more of the same on other parts of the Riverway?  It would open the door to the creation of an industrial channel, and the destruction of a scenic and natural river corridor, which is what the Board is charged with protecting and preserving.  In sum, I urge you to resist this profiteering at the expense of the Wisconsin Riverway and the Wisconsin taxpayers.  The scale of this type of mining doesn't just harm the environment; it obliterates the environment, "remediation" efforts notwithstanding. Thank you.Carol DagnonTown of FreemanCrawford County |
| **From:** lindaeisele tds.net [mailto:lindaeisele@tds.net] **Sent:** Saturday, August 17, 2013 12:08 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Cc:** csp.county@gmail.com**Subject:** frac sand miningDear Mr. CuppMy husband and I own property in Crawford County and are strongly opposed to the proposed frac sand mining proposals along the Lower Wisconsin Riverway.There is only one Driftless Area in the state and only one Mississippi River that influences a fragile ecosystem from here down to the Gulf of Mexico.  Once lost, it can never be reclaimed and for what? Corporate greed.Out-of-state corporations do not have any vested interest in the future of Wisconsin.  They will take what they want and leave.  Leaving us poorer, with much wildlife habitat destroyed and our water polluted.  Their operations will tear down bluffs, remove the soil that sustains many endangered and threatened plants, fill our air with dust containing dangerous silica, take water from our rivers and return it with heavy metals and other pollutants, These same metals will seep into our groundwater and affect our drinking water.  It is the responsibility of our State leaders to preserve and protect the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway.  Rules are in place for landowners, shouldn’t they be even more stringent for corporations?We do not believe that frac sand mining should be allowed in the Lower Wisconsin Riverway.  It violates the rules of the Riverway,(as mining was to be local with rock used for local roads), will result in excessive dust particulates in the atmosphere, and eventually use more water from the river for frac sand mining operations resulting in a loss of river water for public use.Wisconsin’s past legislators and natural resources committees used to take a stand against unsound use of our natural resources which made this state a leader.  Please take a stand that shows you believe that our natural resources need to be protected and used wisely for future generations by NOT allowing frac sand mining anywhere in Crawford County.Linda and Tim EiseleOak Grove Ridge RoadEastman, WI   (Seneca Township) |
| **From:** Barbara Jenkin [mailto:baj1@tds.net] **Sent:** Friday, August 16, 2013 4:34 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Vote "No" on Frac Sand Mine PermitMark,I am writing to implore the LWSR Board at their upcoming meeting on 8/22/13 to NOT approve the Pattison Sand Company's request for a Frack Sand Mining Permit inside the LWSR in the Town of Bridgeport, Crawford County. The scenic beauty of the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway is PRICELESS!  It needs to be kept that way now and for future generations! Barbara JenkinErik Marquess417 N. 7th St.Madison, WI  53704 |
| -----Original Message-----From: memdrg@mwt.net [mailto:memdrg@mwt.net] Sent: Friday, August 16, 2013 3:30 PMTo: Cupp, Mark E - LWRSubject: please vote NOAs a member of the crawford stewardship project I urge you to vote NO on the lower WI Riverway. MaryEllyn |
| **From:** Donna Schmitz [mailto:sdonna@charter.net] **Sent:** Saturday, August 17, 2013 5:32 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Fw: Position Statement Frac MiningHello Mark, Could this please be read at the August 22 meeting? I am out of the area so this would really be helpful.     "CSWAB (Citizens for Safe Water Around Badger) strongly supports a moratorium and discontinuation on all frac sand mining operations and processing plants until the EPA, state regulators, and health officials have evaluated and have fully adopted protective regulations and standards to address any and all implications on human health, air qualities, noise, lighting, ground water, surface water, wetlands, run-off, soil contaminants, all wildlife - including but not limited to threatened and endangered species – all impacts on cultural, economic, recreational resources, homes, businesses, buildings and road infrastructure. The frac sand mining and processing plants, townships, and counties must show action plans and procedures for all frac mining and processing plants now in progress."  DM Schmitz  PresidentCSWAB - Citizens for Safe Water Around BadgerE12629 Weigand's Bay SOuthMerrimac, WI 53561 |
| **From:** Diana Setzke [mailto:diana@merr.com] **Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 3:11 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Protect our River!**Attn:   Lower Wisconsin State Riverway Board:**Please reject any sand mining permit that:* Allows mine-related structures or stockpiled materials to be visible from the Wisconsin River;
* Compromises the natural characteristics of the Wisconsin River;
* Undermines the ability of people to recreate and enjoy the Riverway.

We love this River, every inch of it!  Thank you,  Diana Setzke7319 Loper Road,Sauk City, WI  53583 & 12040 County Road X Bagley, WI  53801   643-3558  963-3646 |
| -----Original Message-----From: jane furchgott [mailto:jfurchgott@yahoo.ca] Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 9:27 AMTo: Cupp, Mark E - LWRSubject: frac sand miningDear Mark, I know I have already written to the Riverway Board a while back, but would like to reiterate that I would support whatever you and the Board can do to deny the permit or prevent the sand mining operation on Riverway lands in Bridgeport. Please share my thoughts with the other Board members.  Thank you for all your work in support of the River, and I am thinking of you this week when you have to make a difficult decision. Yours, Jane Furchgott I am including a letter just sent to the Richland Observer:Dear editor: Nature is renewal. Trees are cut, seedlings sprout. Even a forest clearcut will regenerate in time, a long time. A hundred years.  The dramatic form of our southwest Wisconsin earth was shaped by natural forces, internal fire and flood, over aeons. We have the tools to remove the bluffs and hills, but they won’t spring up again. Not in the lifetimes of our grandchildren, nor for the seventh generation. Never. Frac sand mining doesn’t just mean big holes underground, but the destruction of these beautiful and sheltering natural forms we know as our landscape. Hill eradication on a vast scale, dwarfing our local gravel pits. Last week’s Letters described many of the long-term hazards of industrial frac sand mining, which I believe few people would welcome to our area. What may bring profit to the mining company and a few individual landowners would not be for the benefit of our citizens. Please let your local officials know your thoughts on this threat.Sincerely, Jane FurchgottLone Rock |
| **From:** Forest Jahnke [mailto:jahnkefm@eckerd.edu] **Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 11:56 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Concerns on the proposed mine in BridgeportExecutive Director Mark Cupp,My name is Forest Jahnke and I am a concerned citizen of Crawford County and co-coordinator of Crawford Stewardship Project.  I have been told by Lower Wisconsin Riverway Board members that they feel legally confined in what they can do, but would be able to decline the permits on the grounds that Pattison's mining operation will be visible from the river.The fact of the matter is that sand mining operations create dust.  When they blast, they create great plumes of dust.  If the other silica sand mines in the state are any indication, and having viewed images of blasting and detailed images and video of the properties in question I have no doubts that at times (even when the leaves are on the trees) this mining operation will be clearly visible from the river.  How can the Board guarantee that this will not be the case?  How does the Board intend to monitor and enforce violations?  How can citizens report violations?  What is the penalty?  Does the Board even have the resources or the authority to halt operations once they have started?  I don't want to be told that because of some legalistic loophole equating large scale industrial silica sand mining for export with small-town quarries for local use, that the Board feels as though they are somehow legally bound to approve the mine.  I beg the Board to follow the intent and spirit of the law and their stated mission to "protect and preserve the scenic beauty and natural character of the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway" and to deny these permits until all questions have been answered and we can rest assured that our riverway is safe from harm.  Thank you for your time and careful consideration.Forest Jahnke |
| -----Original Message-----From: Larry Craig [mailto:larrycraig@usa.net] Sent: Monday, August 19, 2013 8:21 PMTo: Cupp, Mark E - LWRSubject: lower Wisconsin riverDear Board MemberPlease do what you can to protect this treasure. Nature makes this a great state. Please don's sell out Mother Nature!ThanksLarry CraigLower WI River Way |
| **From:** Karen Craig [mailto:kcraig1224@gmail.com] **Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 4:19 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** The Beautiful Wisconsin RiverDear Board Member,I am so glad to learn that there is an entity whose mission is to protect the Lower WI State Riverway.  I trust that you will do your best to keep Pattison Sand Company from ruining this treasure.  Please do your very best to protect water quality and views in this area.  We love canoeing and swimming in the river and it is an important part of what makes Wisconsin a great state.  We need to protect it for our future.Thank you for your hard work and attention to this matter.Sincerely,Karen Craig-- Karen CraigKCraig1224@gmail.com  |
| **From:** Jim Schmechel [mailto:jimschmechel@gmail.com] **Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 1:25 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Vote 'no' on ThursdayHi Mark,I will not be able to attend your riverway board meeting on Thursday.I do want the Riverway Board to vote 'No' on the sand mine.  As a riverway citizen, I want the board to protect and preserve the scenic beauty and natrual character of the Lower Wisconsin Riverway.  I do not think an industrial mine fits with the mission of the Riverway.Thank you,Jim Schmechel322 South StArena Wisconsin |
| **From:** Ellis Felker [mailto:redoak@mwt.net] **Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 11:29 AM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Ellis Felker @ Red Oak Publishers (sand fracing-please forward to WI Riverway Board members- thankyou)Dear Riverway Board Member:I am writing to ask you to not allow sand frac mining anywhere near the Wisconsin River. We must save our hills, our clean water and dark night skies. All of these would be taken away from all of us if we allow sand frac mining to come into the Wisconsin Riverway area.Please join me in saying “no” to sand frac mining.Thank you.Ellis Felker, OwnerRed Oak PublishersMuscoda, WI |
| **From:** Kathleen Aaker [mailto:riverweave@earthlink.net] **Sent:** Monday, August 19, 2013 8:47 AM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Vote NOPlease vote NO on the frac sand mining proposal that would take place near Bridgeport.  Mining in that areawill disturb and ruin the beautiful, wild, pristine lower Wisconsin Riverway.  It will cause air, noise and lightpollution for the animals and the people of that area.  Keep what little wildness is left in Wisconsin, vote yourconscience and save the river and land.Sincerely, Kathleen Aaker |
| -----Original Message-----From: M'Lou Wilkie [mailto:sunbead@mwt.net] Sent: Sunday, August 18, 2013 5:21 PMTo: Cupp, Mark E - LWRSubject: No to Frac Sand MiningHello-I have been a resident of this area for 25 years. I've canoed many times down the Wisconsin River in my kayak and canoe. Please vote NO on the frac sand mining that would take place near Bridgeport. The mining operation will ruin the beautiful and wild, pristine, Lower Wisconsin Riverway. It will be awful for the residents and cause air pollution, noise pollution, light pollution and lower property values. Please vote your conscience and think of the quality of our beautiful river. Thank you.~M'Lou WilkieE7539 Hinkst Hollow RdViroqua, WI 54665 |
| **From:** Ron Malzer [mailto:ronsaturday@gmail.com] **Sent:** Sunday, August 18, 2013 1:57 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Cc:** Larry Sleznikow; JenkinsCarolyn&Glenn**Subject:** The Destructiveness of Frac Sand Miningre: Aug. 22nd Lower Wisconsin State Riverway Board MeetingMr. Cupp,Moving ahead with Frac Sand Mining in our area would be an example of short-term gain, long-term disaster. Dust and debris are bad enough. Even more important:  since 2005, the National Academy of Science has been telling us the  impact of ever-increasing fossil fuel burning will be devastating to our planet. You have a responsibility to protect riverways. I urge you to support a moratorium on frac sand mining.Thank you,Ron Malzer |
| **From:** Mike Mossman [mailto:mikemossman@wildblue.net] **Sent:** Sunday, August 18, 2013 11:09 AM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Proposed Pattison Frac Sand MineDear Riverway Board:Our letter to you pasted below and attached.  Thank you for all you do.Mike Mossman familyDate: 18 Aug 2013 To: Lower Wisconsin State Riverway Board Subject: Proposed Pattison Frac Sand Mine We are a family from Sauk County WI, writing in opposition to the proposed frac sand mine within the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway (LWSR), Crawford County. We have spent considerable time over the past 50 years, studying its ecology and history, working for its conservation, and enjoying and learning from the river, canoeing, camping, fishing, swimming and exploring. We have camped and explored much along the stretch near the proposed mine. The river has been important to us, not only as a place in which to recreate, but also to regenerate, learn, and bond as a family.  We want this to continue, not only for us but for others now and long into the future.  This, we feel is what the Riverway is about.  What happens here makes a difference to us, to others and importantly to the myriad plants and animals that increasingly rely on it as habitat. We oppose the sand mine for several reasons: 1.       We anticipate that there will indeed be visual impacts on Riverway users—if not actual visibility of the mine itself, certainly of the increased truck traffic and dust.2.       Noise from the mine and its truck traffic will have a significant effect on the ability of users to enjoy the Riverway, its peacefulness, and the ability to hear natural sounds (e.g.,  birds) that are such an integral part of the Riverway and our experience of it.3.       There are air and water quality issues.  Runoff will impact the river and the adjacent wetlands. Even if regulations are followed, but especially if “accidents happen”.  The Pattison Co. does not have an exemplary record in this regard.  Air quality issues among the many new frac sand operations in the Driftless Area  are disturbingly common. 4.       Permitting the mine would set a dangerous precedent, as much of the Riverway has sandstone suitable for frac sand mining.5.       Regulations and monitoring of frac sand mines are in a state of flux.  It is prudent not to rush ahead with permitting a new mine that may have especially serious consequences.6.       The LWSR is one of the most important ecological landscapes in the Midwest, especially with regard to the variety, quality and continuity of its floodplain communities and its transitions to adjacent, high-quality uplands. Considering the value of this landscape, the hard` work and vision that has gone into its protection and management, and the many factors working against it, we should be doing all we can to advance its ecological integrity, rather than allowing it to be continually whittled away. Thanks for considering our views and for your commitment to the Riverway.  We rely on your judgment and action on its behalf. Sincerely, Mike Mossman, Lisa Hartman, Angus MossmanS8440A Hemlock Rd, North Freedom WI 53951608-544-5501/370-1208, mikemossman@wildblue.net  |
| **From:** latkins chorus.net [mailto:latkins@chorus.net] **Sent:** Sunday, August 18, 2013 8:30 AM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Frac Sand MineLiving near a river, near a place of eagles, hawks and vultures, I know how vital the river is to our natural life, and how it benefits so many people..tourism is big on the river in the summer, and how would that sand mine affect tourism? I don't see it helping. I do not see it as a benefit to anyone except the owners of the land and the fracking industry. What we are doing to our country is destroying it for the benefit of a few wealthy people in the oil industry. We need to protect this land, this country, and this is the wrong way to go. Linda Accola Atkins, Prairie du Sac, Wis. 53578 |

|  |
| --- |
| Mark—Gene Unger, another Ferry Bluff Board member and Habitat Committee chair, and I plan to attend the LWRB meeting on Thursday.  I would like to address the Board during the public comment period.  Per your suggestion, I have attached a more detailed memo with our comments which you said you could distribute to Board members beforehand.  The essence of our comments will be that eagle habitat is not secure and that we have extensive data that we can make available to you to assist in making your decisions.  By the way, we also are joined in the letter by Eagle Valley Nature Preserve, in Grant County, in offering the eagle data.Thank you.   See you Thursday.John Keefe, Ferry Bluff Eagle CouncilAug. 19, 2013TO: Lower Wisconsin Riverway BoardFROM: Ferry Bluff Eagle Council, Sauk Prairie Contacts: John Keefe, President, 608-643-3376 Gene Unger, Habitat Committee Chair, 608-963-98381. Introduction

Thank you for the opportunity to make available information and data that is relevant to development issues along the Lower Wisconsin Riverway, including current and future applications for frac sand mining. Ferry Bluff Eagle Council has collected data on bald eagles in the Sauk Prairie area, extending down to Lone Rock, for more than 25 years. Some of our data from telemetered eagles include Minnesota, Iowa, Michigan, and Illinois. Our mission has been and remains habitat protection and habitat development for bald eagles. We are joined in this offer by the Eagle Valley Nature Preserve in Grant County, which has satellite-based as well as ground level data collected since 1987.The recovery of the bald eagle population throughout Wisconsin and the Wisconsin River is a success story of the highest magnitude. Bald eagles have been removed from the endangered species list, a sign of that success. But the removal in no way eliminates the need for continued vigilance to threats to the eagle habitat, both existing and emerging. DDT may have been the threat 50-60 years ago, but DDT-like threats can emerge in many guises, even today.The challenge for decision-makers at all levels is the collection of appropriate information and data from affected parties, and then crafting decisions that balance the interests of divergent groups, including the resources of the Lower Wisconsin Riverway. Basic issues include, but need not be limited, to: * What are the benefits?
* Are they offset by the risks?
* What protections, if supported by data and observation, need to be required?

These are reasonable questions, and you deserve the information and data to answer them. Asking questions and insisting on answers in a balanced manner before decisions are made is the heart of developing good public policy. It is not a bottleneck. Ferry Bluff Eagle Council and Eagle Valley Nature Preserve have access to data about the bald eagles and the habitiat they use along the Wisconsin River--critical variables in your equation. We can and are willing to make that data available to you.1. Eagles Along the Wisconsin River and the Lower Wisconsin Riverway

Back in 1973, nesting pairs of eagles throughout Wisconsin numbered 108. At that time and up until the last decade or two, the Lower Wisconsin Riverway provided ideal wintering eagle habitat—places to roost at night, fish by day, and perch along the river. Ferry Bluff and Eagle Valley have monitored many of those roosts and daytime habitats since the late 1980s. Now nesting pairs of eagles in Wisconsin have expanded more than 12 times, to 1,337 nesting pairs in 2012.A clear indication of the success of the eagle population growth has been a new trend since the turn of this century—the appearance of a growing number of breeding eagles, nesting eagles during the spring and summer months, along the Wisconsin River. Up and down the river, the story has been the same—as nesting territories are taken up north, the newer generations of eagles are nesting elsewhere, especially along the Wisconsin River. What once was only a winter phenomenon in the river valley is now a year-around reality. A key question is whether that growth trend will be encouraged or thwarted along the Wisconsin River by the introduction of new environmental risks.1. Eagles Today

Our main message today is that while the eagle populations have grown, **eagle habitat is not secure.** Threats to both their nesting and wintering habitat do and will continue to exist.Our message is that the eagles are a precious local and statewide resource, especially along the Lower Wisconsin Riverway, and we need to be constantly vigilant that their habitat remains free of threats. That habitat includes not only the trees for nesting and perching and the hollows in bluffs along the river, but also the fish in the water and the animal prey on the ground. Eagles and eagle habitat are factors that deserve to be considered in the decision-making process of any kind of new development. They are part of the risks of developments.1. Eagle Data Sources

As the Riverway Board proceeds with its deliberations on the impact of frac sand mining and applications related to this development, Ferry Bluff wants you to be aware of the eagle data we have access to and can make available to you and other local governments. The data can be an invaluable tool in assessing risks and making your decisions.The sources of these data are Ferry Bluff Eagle Council based in Sauk Prairie and the Eagle Valley Nature Preserve, based in Grant County. Together, their research and data collection of eagles and use of their habitat covers most of the Lower Wisconsin Riverway. These data can be supplemented by surveys from the Wisconsin Natural Resource Dept., which we can collect and organize for your purposes.Three primary kinds of data exist which we can make available to you:* Location of breeding eagle habitat (nests);
* Wintering communal roost habitat (night time) use along the River, and
* Daytime eagle foraging and perching activities, from Wisconsin Dells area south and west along the Wisconsin River to the confluence of the Mississippi River at Wyalusing.

Much of these data have the value of being collected and assessed over almost three decades, providing both time specific and evolving trends of eagles in and around the Lower Wisconsin Riverway. Ferry Bluff will be happy to work with you as Board members, with your Riverway staff, and with other governmental units that can use this information to assess issues and make a balanced decision reflecting both the benefits and risks of any environmental impact as well as economic development. |
| **From:** Jessica Lindner [mailto:jlindner8@gmail.com] **Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 1:22 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Frac Sand mining on the Lower Wi riverway -Mark,I am writing to add my voice to the numerous voices of protest against the plan to allow frac sand mining along the Lower WI Riverway (henceforth LWR) in Crawford county.We know that silicone sand dust causes cancer and other serious respiratory diseases in those with prolonged exposure.  This is precisely the kind of sand used for fracking and it is the type that will be mined in the proposed LWR mine. This will put the respiratory health of those who live in the vicinity and along the route at risk of great harm to their health, particularly the young - infants and children.  It is unconscionable that this mine be permitted simply based on the health risks.  There are many others, however, perhaps not as serious, but significant nonetheless: The LWR is renowned for its beauty and thus its draw of tourists.  This proposed mine seriously threatens tourism in SW Wisconsin. The ensuing water pollution threatens the health and lives of many non-human creatures who support and even drive the health of the environment.  It will, of necessity, be noisy.  Who wants to get up in the morning and trade the sound of birds for that of a dusty, dirty mine?  Finally, it will benefit big corporations but will do very little to support and encourage the local economy.This is a bad trade, an immoral trade, a dangerous trade.Please take to heart my urgent appeal to do what you can to stop this mine.I'd like your response and look forward to hearing from you soon.Sincerely,Jessica Lindner42860 Trout Creek Rd.Soldiers Grove, WI 54655 |
| -----Original Message-----From: Harry Harrison [mailto:wrharrison@icloud.com] Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 1:34 PMTo: Cupp, Mark E - LWRSubject: Bridgeport mine permitMark, This has to be one of the worst possible sites for sand mining in our state. For all of the environmental and human concerns which I know you are aware of, this proposed mine proposal should be permanently set aside. The potential, or rather unavoidable, conflicts, damages and long term as well as immediate impacts upon the waters that we all depend upon, the habitat, air and health safety of our citizens and our future itself re at stake. There are proven links now between the inhalation of silica particulates and cancer. Since this is one of the tradeoffs involved with such a mine, it would seem that we would be sacrificing the well- being of our people for the short term profit of a very few ( ie the owners and shareholders of this mine). Please include my voice with the many others in protest to the development of this project. Looking forward to your response on this important issue. William Harrison42860 Trout Creek RoadSoldiers Grove, WI. |
| **From:** 608 Community Supported Kitchen [mailto:608csk@gmail.com] **Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 2:52 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Please deny frac sand mineMr. Cupp, It is my hope as a Wisconsin citizen and Mazomanie Village resident that you and the board will vote to deny the frac sand mine permit up for a vote this Thursday.  I applaud the findings of Mr. Greenwood and Ms. Moore's position paper, most notably that the profiting of the few at the cost of the remainder and the likely impact of this and all following mining operations is incongruous "with the stated purpose of the River Way and the mission of the River Way board."I have visited, traveled, and fished in many places. Few are as much of a public asset as the River Way.  Please vote to keep it that way. Thank you, Ben Lubchansky |
| -----Original Message-----From: Virginia Zwickey [mailto:vmzwickey@yahoo.com] Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 12:02 PMTo: Cupp, Mark E - LWRSubject: SAND MINING? No, in the Wis State Riverway Dear Lower Wisconsin State Riverway Board,I was born in Wisconsin in 1930, and it's been a pleasure to spend most of my life in this beautiful state. Our natural resources are the most important attraction to those who live and visit here.So keep on doing the right thing and oppose harmful initiatives.Also, I appreciate that your mission is to protect the scenic beauty and natural character of the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway for all citizens. Pattison Sand Company's sand mine proposal could dramatically change the character of the River we love so much.Please reject any sand mining permit that:. Allows mine-related structures or stockpiled materials to be visible from the Wisconsin River; . Compromises the natural characteristics of the Wisconsin River; . Undermines the ability of people to recreate and enjoy the Riverway.Sincerely,Virginia Zwickey613 Anthony LaneMadison, WI 53711-1501608-231-1632  |
| -----Original Message-----From: Madelyn Leopold [mailto:madelyn.leopold@gmail.com] Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 12:02 PMTo: Cupp, Mark E - LWRSubject: August 22 meetingMr. Cupp:We will not be able to attend the August 22 meeting of the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway Board, so I want to email you regarding the vote on frac sand mining. So much effort, by local groups and state government, has gone into protecting the Lower Wisconsin Riverway, and the views from Pikes Peak State Park are now among the best ever. We take all our visitors from out of state to see the Riverway. It should be a source of enormous pride for Wisconsin and all of us who live here.Why, then, would anyone consider frac sand mining near the Riverway? It is incomprehensible. It is a huge step backward, with long-term negative effects, for short-term benefits. Haven't you also been reading that mining companies are closing mines around the country because of oversupply? Please vote "no" on frac sand mining.Thank you for your consideration.Sincerely,Madelyn Leopold6135 Green River Rd.Fennimore, WI 538092233 W. Lawn Ave.Madison, Wi 53711 |
| -----Original Message-----From: Dawn Kiefer [mailto:richlandreporter@mwt.net]Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 2:53 PMTo: Cupp, Mark E - LWRSubject: frac mining Dear Mr. Cupp, as editor of The Richland Observer I have refrained from personally expressing in print my opposition to the frac sand mining proposal in the Riverway area. However, numerous opinion letters in opposition to the frac mine proposal have been in the Observer. I have not received a single letter in favor of the frac mine proposal. I urge you and your fellow board members to find the courage to oppose the frac mining proposal in the Riverway area. It seems as though wealthy individuals and concerns are steamrolling over the will of the masses and reverting our nation to an oligarchy. As I'm sure you're aware, armed guards from out-of-state are in place at the huge mine site in the northern part of our state. So much for claims of mines providing jobs for local people. Is that a preview of what would happen here, at our beloved Riverway? A contingent of camouflage-clad henchmen ensuring that the landscape is destroyed? Please do what you can to prevent the decimation of the Riverway area. Sincerely, Dawn Kiefer, Cazenovia, Wis. |
| **From:** Sharon Swiggum [mailto:sgswiggum@mwt.net] **Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 4:12 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Frac Sand Mine PermitDear Mr. Cupp—please share this email with all board members.----------------------Dear Lower Wisconsin State Riverway Board Members, Please deny the Pattison Sand Company’s application seeking permission to mine for frac sand in the riverway! You all are well aware of the numerous areas of concern associated with frac sand mining! I realize that mining on the Bridgeport Township lands cannot be stopped by the riverway board’s decision, but please do what is right so that the riverway does not directly contribute to the destruction and mayhem associated with a frac sand mine. These areas are so important to me that I wouldn’t even know where to start to address them.  We can’t even begin to comprehend the short and long term effects of frac sand mining!  My concerns include:          Health hazardsChoosing to deny riverway mining will put the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway board in a position that they are free from contributing to a person’s poor health. Serious illnesses attributed to silica dust are likely to materialize. Also, mental health issues may be associated with the constant noise pollution.         Wildlife habitat On June 1st during our day on the river to assess the visibility with leaf on conditions, my thoughts repeatedly returned to the many, many wildlife homes that would be destroyed due to mining. Please preserve the mammals and birds’ riverway homes.         This vote will set precedence for our grand, pristine Wisconsin RiverwayIf mining is approved in one area of the riverway, venture a guess to how soon the board will be approached with more permit applications.         Storm Water Drainage and Run-off Earlier this summer, Wisconsin frac sand mines and processing facilities had many violations and run-off issues. Who will do the monitoring or will the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway board just trust Pattison Sand Company?         Loss of tourismMining in this region will make a difference about how many people use this section of the Wisconsin River and whether their travel plans will include southwest Wisconsin. With the convening of the Bridgeport mine, we know this statement, “andfortheuserwishingsolitude,thestretch [of the Wisconsin River] belowBoscobelisthemostsecluded”,  will no longer be factual.  So, let’s at least keep the riverway land mine-free.         Light pollutionThe lighting from the existing mine will penetrate the river, but please vote “NO” to prevent bright lights from being used even closer to the Wisconsin River.         Noise pollution creates loss of peaceArea people and tourists will hear the continuous mine sounds. Sounds travel quite far on summer evenings, so I can’t even imagine a night camping on a sandbar or even at the Wisconsin Ridge Campgroup at Wyalusing State Park in future years.            Water source and aquifer The act of mining disrupts our water source and the aquifer. It is a major concern of mine.  Before you vote, please once again take into consideration that the riverway board and citizens have asked Pattison Sand Company representatives specific questions when concerns arose.  The representatives have often used phrases that are vague and noncommittal answers. Has Pattison Sand Company put these ‘intentions’ and ‘answers’ in writing and have written statements been developed about procedures? If not, will it really happen?  You as a board member of The Lower Wisconsin State Riverway are entrusted to protect the Riverway for all Wisconsin citizens. Please take this responsibility seriously and vote against frac sand mining within the Riverway lands. Support the health of the riverway for the long term. I encourage you to vote “NO” on Thursday, August 22, 2013.Sincerely,Sharon SwiggumRichland Center, Wisconsin |
| **From:** Darlene Severson [mailto:dcrseverson@gmail.com] **Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 3:47 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** NO MINING ON WI RIVERWAYMr. Cupp, Please vote NO on frac sand mining on the Wisconsin River.  It is the board's mission to protect our Wisconsin River, to preserve it's beautify, to keep it for ALL the public.  Do not let the IOWA businessman and a FEW landowners in Bridgeport destroy a natural resource for ALL Wisconsin citizens.Please keep our Wisconsin River free from frac sand mining. Darlene SeversonScott TownshipCrawford County, WI. |
| **From:** Lenore Sydnor [mailto:sydnor.lore@gmail.com] **Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 2:55 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** frac sand miningHi Mark,My husband, Hal, and I wanted to comment on the Wisconsin Riverway meeting coming up on Thursday. We are not against all frac mining, but feel that the proposed location for the one in Bridgeport is too visible and too near a very scenic area of our state. If the Lower Riverway Board lets it go through, their credibility is gone. When you have strict rules about what color we can paint a cabin which is only visible from one spot out in the river, but then let a big frac mine open for business, adding dust, big trucks, and explosions to the area, there is no sense in having the rules. Thanks for the chance to voice our opinions! Sincerely,Hal and Lenore Sydnorcabin on Sprosty Hill, Wauzeka |
| **From:** Edie Ehlert [mailto:edieehlert@centurytel.net] **Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 10:55 AM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Cc:** kathy Byrne; Forest Jahnke**Subject:** Lawsuit filedHi Mark and the Riverway Board,We want to let you know about this action. Crawford Stewardship Project, along with Bridgeport Township plaintiffs Arnold Steele, Mark Fishler, Loren Fishler, and Dan LInder filed a lawsuit this morning with the Crawford County Circuit Court. It is in the process of being served to the Bridgeport Township.Our news release is attached.And we are looking forward to your meeting tomorrow night, to hear the comments from others and your decision on frac sand mining on the Riverway. I was driving to a meeting in Muscoda last night, and 3 sandhill cranes flew just ahead of the car, reminding me that it is the creatures and habitat that makes this place so special to all of us.Edie EhlertAugust 21, 2013RE: **Legal Challenge Announced**Crawford Stewardship Project (CSP) along with plaintiffs Arnie Steele, Loren Fishler, Mark Fishler, and Dan Linder have brought a legal challenge against the Town of Bridgeport on their decisions to issue permits and allow commencement of mining connected to a frac sand mine in the Township with virtually no conditions. “The egregious decision making process and resulting permit, amid over-riding objections and challenge by the Bridgeport neighbors, was unacceptable to us,” states Edie Ehlert, Co-coordinator of CSP. “The Lower Wisconsin Riverway, Hwy 60 Scenic Byway and resulting Scenic Easements with the federal government by landowners (including those mining) speaks to the wonderful value of this area for all of Wisconsin residents.”“Our zoning says that an activity must ‘not be injurious of use of other property nor substantially diminish and impair the property value,’” states Arnie Steele, “This permit certainly affects the use of my and my neighbor’s property and ability to sell.”“We brought in about 250 petitions in opposition to the mine to our township officials. We brought our questions. We brought our concerns on misuse of agricultural land, our own farm and livestock and well concerns. The officials answered none of our questions. If allowed, this mine will have a negative impact on our lives, every day, for generations,” remarks Loren Fishler.“We are hopeful that the Lower Wisconsin Riverway Board will reject frac sand mining at this site on the LWSR lands at their Aug. 22nd meeting in Prairie du Chien. There, too, everyone will lose, except the landowners and an out of state mining company. This entire application will substantially diminish the natural character of the Riverway and negatively impact local tourism,” concludes Edie Ehlert.The case was filed on August 21, 2014 at the Crawford County Circuit Court.The mine is to be operated by Pattison Sand of Clayton, IA on leased land of Bridgeport land owners Rodney and Sandra Marfilius, Lee and Joan Pulda, and Earl and Amber Pulda. edieehlert_signature_240dpi-1.bmpEdie Ehlert, Crawford Stewardship Project Co-Coordinator |
| -----Original Message-----From: Jim & Cheryl Congdon [mailto:cjcongdon@att.net] Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2013 10:17 AMTo: Cupp, Mark E - LWRSubject: Bridgeport Frac Sand MinePlease add our name to the list of those opposing the approval of the sand mine within the Lower Wisconsin Riverway boundaries. We are asking that the Riverway Board deny approval of any mining activity that will degrade the scenic and recreational quality of the Lower Wisconsin River. We are asking that they take a strong stand to enforce all possible authority to restrict the mining activity within the Riverway.Thank youJames and Cheryl CongdonN7991 Schwarze RoadHoricon, WI 53032 |
| **From:** JIM.SPREDEMANN@usbank.com [mailto:JIM.SPREDEMANN@usbank.com] **Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 10:11 AM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Cc:** csp.county@gmail.comcsp.county**Subject:** Frac Sand MineMr. Cupp, As a land owner who lives just north of the river in Spring Green, I am very concerned about the proposed mine in Bridgeport.  There is no doubt that a mine that close to the river will have a negative impact on our precious resource, the Lower Wisconsin Riverway.  The noise, the dust and the mine site itself will drastically diminish the riverway experience for generations to come.  One of the most beautiful views in Wisconsin is from the bluff in Wyalusing State Park looking east up the river valley.  I can't imagine that view being spoiled by a sand mine. I encourage the Board to deny the construction of the mine in the protected riverway.  **The Board's mission is to protect the scenic beauty and natural character of the riverway.**  Please share this email with other board members. Thank you for all you and the Board do to protect our this treasure. Jim Spredemann12040 Hilton Dr Spring Green WI 608-588-3660  |
| **From:** Ann V [mailto:annmvetter@gmail.com] **Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 10:03 AM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Pattison Sand CompanyThe riverway is vital to our state.  We could never reproduce such a valuable natural, economic and enjoyable Wisconsin resource.  Please reject any proposals that would jeopardize this beautiful part of our beautiful state.Thank you, Ann Vetter 608-212-3231 10542 Laws Drive, Mazomanie, WI  53560 |
| **From:** Dennis Weiss [mailto:dweiss@co.juneau.wi.us] **Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 6:43 AM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** RE: Frac mining3Good morning Mark, I am in agreement with not allowing the Frac mining along the river way.  For one, it would seem for the most part that in the areas that the sand may be at, there is no rail to cover the transportation issues related, let alone the environmental issues.  There are plenty of other areas in the state that the mining could be done.  Thanks,Dennis WeissHighway CommissionerJuneau County608-847-5874608-547-4575 (c)608-847-5106 (f) |
| **From:** BOB WEISS [mailto:weissins@live.com] **Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 11:37 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Cc:** Rick Chamberlin**Subject:** NO to Frac MiningDear Mark, Since I will not be able to attend the meeting at Prairie du Chien on Thursday, I stongly urge the Lower Wisconsin Riverway Board to vote "NO" to frac mining all along the Riverway.  This board has the responsibility to maintain the scenic beauty and natural character of the Riverway.  I can't even imagine the potential for air & water contamination, visual pollution from the River, tremendous noise & light pollution, and overall permanent damage to the Riverway environment. Abrahan Lincoln once said "To sin by silence when they should protest makes cowards of men". And Bishop Desmond Tutu told us "If you are neutral in situations of injustice, you have chosen the side of the oppressor.  If an elephant has its foot on the tail of a mouse and you say that you are neutral, the mouse will not appreciate your neutrality". Silence in the face of abuse, eg. destroying the Riverway environment, is complicity regardless of the chances for success for speaking out. I'm not neutral on this issue!  I protest!  I'm speaking out!  Bob Weiss, Prairie du Sac, landowner in the Lower Wisconsin Riverway |
| **From:** Dan Johnson [mailto:midwestearthbuilders@yahoo.com] **Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 10:17 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Lower Wisconsin Meeting on Frac Sand MineDear Mark Cupp,I ask that the following email be forwarded to all board members regarding the proposed frac sand mine in Bridgeport.  As a resident of Crawford County and a residential building contractor in the area I think it is very important for me to voice my opposition to this mine due to its direct impacts upon my quality of life and my livelihood. First and foremost of my concerns is the impact upon both the scenic view shed and ecological integrity of the lower Wisconsin. Beautiful large rivers like this are only becoming more and more developed across the nation.  We are not making any more. The impacts of the mining will change this area for generations to come.  The natural beauty of the Wisconsin River is what has and will to a greater extent in the future help drive the local economy.  One of my current building projects, just a few miles from the proposed mine, is for a customer who bought their land and is building on it because of their attraction to the local landscape and natural/rural setting.  They are not spending their money in the local community because of mines.  I obviously in turn am financially benefiting from their love of the Lower Wisconsin and of course living, paying taxes, restoring an old farm and prairie, etc. because of the living I make from people who enjoy and care about this area.  In other words the natural beauty of the Lower Wisconsin fuels my economy.I could go on and on about the wonders of the Lower Wisconsin from sand bars to turtles and the recreational opportunities from swimming to boating but what is most important is that we protect this river and I ask that you deny any permits for mining.  Please make this email part of the official public record because I want to be counted as one who is in opposition of this mine.Thank You,Dan JohnsonMidwest Earth Builders  [www.midwestearthbuilders.com](http://www.midwestearthbuilders.com)51420 Johnstown Rd. Soldiers Grove, WI 54655 |
| **From:** Linda Atkins [mailto:accolaatkins@gmail.com] **Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 9:03 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Frac sand mine along the Wisconsin RiverAs a resident of Sauk County, living a short distance from the river, I am saddened and frustrated by the lack of integrity of those people who would sell their land for this destructive practice. No amount of money is worth destroying the environment and sickening neighbors, ruining the great waterway that runs through to the Mississippi. This company is NOT one that we want to trust to protect the rights of people to have a clean environment to live in. I have seen damage done in Iowa and it is NOT what we want in this state..Linda Accola Atkins, S8397 Swiss Valley Rd, Prairie du Sac, Wi. 53578 |
| **From:** Rick Gibbs [mailto:rogibbs123@yahoo.com] **Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 8:18 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Dear MarkI write to you and all the the Board Members to express my concern with the proposed siting of the Bridgeport Frac Sand Mine. Of particular note frac sand mining at this location is incompatible with the mission statement, “*to protect and preserve the scenic beauty and natural character of the LowerWisconsinState Riverway.”** Intent of the Law: Frac Sand Mining is combined with all nonmetallic mining in the Riverway law. The intent was to allow local use quarrying for roads. Industrialization of the Riverway was never the intent. The board should ask for change to clarify the law.
* Visibility from the River is the major criteria: How will the Board guarantee that none of the mine within the Riverway will ever be visible? Does the Board have the resources to monitor and enforce? Those responsibilities should be clearly set-up prior to making a decision.
* Dust visibility: Dust comes from all frac sand mines. While the most dangerous silica particles are not visible, the dust will be. Will visible dust be allowed? Who will monitor? What will be the process for citizens to report visibility violations?
* Aesthetic Impacts: The board previously advocated for enforcement of state law regarding noise levels from watercraft in recognition of the adverse impacts that extreme noise has on the Riverway experience. Will the Board monitor and enforce noise from 24/7 mining/trucking/blasting?
* Run-off: There have been numerous breaches and run-off issues in the latest rains and in the past from frac sand mines and processing facilities. The DNR stormwater permit calls for both holding ponds and external drainage into the River, with quarterly visual checks required by Pattison Sand. Will the Riverway Board plan to do independent monitoring to be sure there is no sediment visible? Permit can be viewed at:<http://lwr.state.wi.us/docview.asp?docid=24715>
* Endangered Species: The stormwater permit lists Endangered species and requirements to “avoid impacting”.  No independent monitoring is provided. Will the Riverway Board be monitoring the habitat of the Cerulean Warbler, Little Brown Bat, the Gray Rattlesnake or the other four Threatened or Endangered species?
* Public Investment: Millions of dollars of public money and resources have been invested in the LWSR over the years. This frac sand mine is likely to undo much of the efforts of the public, the Board, WDNR, and legislature who invested countless hours in the Riverway. Who is responsible for protecting our investment?
* Biotic Diversity: The “Biotic Inventory and Analysis of the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway” completed in June 2011, available at<http://dnr.wi.gov/files/PDF/pubs/er/ER0830_ext.pdf> is an impressive WDNR document that assesses the complexity and rich resource we have in the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway. One of the threats listed is forest fragmentation and its effects on wildlife. Introducing open pit frac sand mines to the Riverway is a direct and intense fragmentation of forest and wildlife habitat. The Board is entrusted to protect the Riverway from these threats.
* Setting Precedence: This is a first frac sand mine proposal in the Riverway. Voting for this proposal would give the industry the go ahead to turn this most precious resource into an industrialized frac sand mining wasteland. Does the Board want to promote this disintegration of the Riverway?
* Landowner Rules: The Riverway has many relatively small rules that landowners have to abide by in the Riverway, such as color to paint their buildings and visibility from the River. Forestry projects require Board approval. It is insulting to these fine citizens to have their land so closely scrutinized, only to watch as a huge industrial frac sand mining project is seriously considered.
* Cultural Resources: The Riverway is a wealth of cultural and historical sites. Pattison Sand is being given the authority to mine “around” sites acknowledged or found with no independent monitoring. Is the Board willing to chance losing irreplaceable site protection to a sand mining company?
* Tourism: The LWSR is promoted by the Board as well as the WDNR as a beautiful destination for recreational activities. The WDNR website talks about being on the River,“….and for the user wishing solitude, the stretch below Boscobel is the most secluded.” Frac sand mining will destroy that solitude. How will frac sand mining impact Riverway tourism?
* The Board is entrusted to protect the Riverway for all Wisconsincitizens for now and in the future. We ask that they take that responsibility seriously and vote against frac sand mining within the Riverway lands and in support of the long-term Riverway health.

SincerelyRichard O GibbsLandowner in Crawford County |
| From: bluewinggarden tds.net [mailto:bluewinggarden@tds.net] Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 7:12 PMTo: Cupp, Mark E - LWRSubject: Frac Sand Mining and Lower Wi RiverwayDear Mr. Cupp, I find it hard to wrap my head around the concept of setting aside thousand's of acres at cost of millions of dollars of tax payers money to provide a wilderness experience down the Wisc.River and the climax will be a frac sand mine, only 50 feet from the river? I think for our children and future generations this is a great idea. I am a supervisor for the Town of Millville and our citizens are experiencing restrictions and greater expense to provide this for our children and future generations, then to give this buisness free reign to destroy the experience and the concept of wilderness.Millville provides the citizens of Wisc. with 3000 acres with taxes of just 50 cents-1.00 per acre in taxes to our town and another 1,000 acres with less taxes than anyone living here. It takes 1,000's of dollars from the economy in this area. PLEASE EXPLAIN TO ME HOW THIS IS FAIR. I would like an explaination. Judy Carlson, Supervisor Town of Millville. |
| **From:** Amy Baker [mailto:amybaker@tds.net] **Sent:** Tuesday, August 20, 2013 6:07 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Sand MiningI am writing in strong opposition to sand mining in Wisconisin.   It seems prudent to slow down and study the situation and its implications, creating legislation that protects our lands and our citizens.   Among other things, such mining endangers productive soils, damages surface waters, draws down groundwater reserves, exposes families to toxic chemicals and exposes communities to airborn particulate matter damaging to lungs.Thank you,Amy BakerBlue Mounds, WI |
| **From:** Lee & Cathy Van Landuyt [mailto:foxridge@mwt.net] **Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 11:07 AM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Disallow Frac sand Mining along the beautiful Wisconsin River...Dear Mr. Cupp, It is my strong belief after reading much about all phases of frac sand mining, that it is a terrible thing to do to God's green earth in the name of a little more energy that might be produced by raping the fragile planet we call earth. Renewable energy systems need to be developed and supported throughout the nation to replace our insatiable desire for the dwindling supply of fossil fuels left in the earth.  In the Bible, it says that we are to be "stewards of the earth". Allowing this rape of the earth is not doing what we are commanded to do. Look to the devistation anywhere this or other sorts of strip mining have taken place to see the true devistating results of these operations fueled by greed. Places in northern Wisconsin are already a good example of this! A few people getting rich and the rest of humanity left to pay the price of this greed is **not** what we should be about.  Please, raise your voice in protest against frac sand mining along the lower Wisconsin River and the short term, profit driven rape of our state by big oil representatives. Sincerely, Lee Van LanduytClerk of SessionTown and Country Presbyterian ChurchRichland Center,WI |
| **From:** Stacy Harbaugh [mailto:sharbaugh@midwestadvocates.org] **Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 2:10 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Letter from Midwest Environmental AdvocatesMark:Below is a letter from Midwest Environmental Advocates regarding the Pattison Mine discussion. Please share it with the board. StacyCommunications and Outreach CoordinatorSent from my Android phone using TouchDown ([www.nitrodesk.com](http://www.nitrodesk.com))-----Original Message----- **From:** Stacy Harbaugh [stacyrharbaugh@gmail.com]**Received:** Wednesday, 21 Aug 2013, 12:34pm**To:** Stacy Harbaugh [sharbaugh@midwestadvocates.org]**Subject:** Open letterOpen letter to the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway BoardAn important decision is facing the Lower Wisconsin Riverway Board this week: whether to approve a permit application for Pattison Sand to begin operating a frac sand mine within the Riverway. Midwest Environmental Advocates urges the Board to reject this permit application in order to fulfill its responsibility to protect and preserve the scenic beauty and natural character of the Riverway. By rejecting this frac sand mine application, the Board will be honoring the deep concerns held by local citizens and Wisconsinites statewide that frac sand mining threatens our health with respirable silica dust, creates landscape-scale destruction, and, despite some existing regulation, is the source of groundwater depletion and runoff into area surface waters and wetlands. Most of the calls to our office this year have been from citizens who are deeply concerned about frac sand mining in their community. Many of the individuals who live near or downwind of a frac sand mine have concerns about mining’s impact on air quality. The federal government recognizes silica dust as a known carcinogen. And while mine workers might have respirators and other protections while working near visible dust and invisible silica particles created in the process of frac sand mining, there are few protections for people who live near and downwind of frac sand mines. To avoid these air impacts, people in frac sand country keep their windows closed in the summer and are afraid to let their livestock out to pasture. The Board cannot compromise the air quality of the residents and visitors of the Riverway by approving this frac sand mine permit.Traveling through places like Trempealeau County, Wisconsin, anyone can see how an imbalance between frac sand mining a lack of intentional land use planning has created an explosion of landscape-scale destruction. It always starts with one mine. But when local governments and regulatory bodies like the Riverway Board change or interpret their rules to include the industrial use of land in an area that is largely rural, scenic, agricultural or residential, it sets a precedent that removes the protection of the land for future generations. The Board must protect the value of the Riverway by not allowing the industrialization of this scenic area.But of all the factors the Board must consider in this decision, protecting the water of the Lower Wisconsin Riverway should be the top priority. The frac sand industry in Wisconsin has been responsible for damage to the waters of Wisconsin in two ways: ground and surface water depletion and runoff into area lakes, streams and rivers. Whether the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources must consider citizen challenges based on the cumulative impact of high-capacity wells used in frac sand mining and processing continues to be controversial in our state budget policies and in the courts. But we know that the high-capacity wells that come with frac sand mining could have an impact on depleting the water levels of the environmentally sensitive Lower Wisconsin River. The Board must consider the ramification of its decision to permit this mine if high-capacity wells will follow. And though the frac sand industry is permitted through the DNR to manage stormwater problems with holding ponds and berms, the combination of heavy rains and towering piles of loose sand have caused damage for nearby waters and property owners alike. The DNR has too-few staff to adequately regulate and monitor frac sand mining in Wisconsin. The millions of dollars and countless hours of investment into restoring and preserving the Lower Wisconsin River cannot be gambled on a limited stormwater management plan with a quarterly self-monitoring of waste water discharge directly into the river’s delicate ecosystem.Statewide, the frac sand industry has boomed and it has railroaded over local democracy and the concerns of local residents. But citizen voices matter. The Board’s vote to reject this mine permit matters and it will send a clear message that the Lower Wisconsin Riverway’s value increases as we all continue to work to protect and preserve its scenic beauty.Please protect our water. Reject the frac sand mining permit application from Pattison Sand.  |
| **From:** . . [mailto:frme959@hotmail.com] **Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 2:33 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Frack Sand MiningDear Mr. Cupp,   I'm a member of the Wisconsin League of Conservation Voters and Ned from that group called me last night and wanted me to send you an e-mail in opposition to frack sand mining which was the view I favored before he called but I didn't know who to contact and he said you were with the Riverway Board and I feel that this mine should not be allowed to go forward.  I feel it will be very bad on the environment, particularly with regard to water quality and also on the animals that live in that area.  I also understand that the Indian people that live in that area are also against it and it will hurt tourism for the state of Wisconsin.   I'd appreciate an answer from you.LaVern Isely, Overtaxed Independent Middle Class Taxpayer & Public Citizen & AARP Members |
| -----Original Message-----From: Shane Gurno [mailto:sgurno@humanhead.com] Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2013 12:07 PMTo: Cupp, Mark E - LWRSubject: Frac sand mine permitHello Lower Wisconsin State Riverway Boardmembers,I am writing because I am extremely concerned about the frac sand mine that is going to be operating right next to the Lower WI River.You should NOT give a special permit to the mine to operate on 50 acres of protected riverway. It is protected for a reason and the Boardmembers should make a decision based on stewardship of the resources we will destroy for a very short-term "gain" that a mine would provide. Ruining resources permanently for these "gains" is foolish.I am an angler and hunter. I do not wish to see our natural resources destroyed so some mining company can come and make some money. Not many jobs are created from the mine, and they are temporary. Tourism and recreation dollars will be forever destroyed with destruction of the natural resources. Who comes to recreate at a mine? No one, of course. That money will disappear from your local economy forever.I didn't even address the health concerns, but I think you get the picture. I fully oppose this mine, especially a special permit to operate on protected Riverway land!!Thank you,Shane Gurno4147 School Rd.Madison, WI 53704608-444-4761 |
| \*\*\*Please note…we have received approximately 2,500 “form” emails from members of the Conservation League and also additional distribution lists which consisted of the following text:Dear Lower Wisconsin State Riverway Board,I appreciate that your mission is to protect the scenic beauty and natural character of the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway for all citizens. Pattison Sand Company's sand mine proposal could dramatically change the character of the River we love so much.Please reject any sand mining permit that:\*Allows mine-related structures or stockpiled materials to be visible from the Wisconsin River;\*Compromises the natural characteristics of the Wisconsin River;\*Undermines the ability of people to recreate and enjoy the Riverway. |
| **From:** Mike [mailto:hedemarkm@gmail.com] **Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 4:31 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Bridgeport SandmineGreetings MarkI am concerned that the Patterson Mine has not adequately prepared itself for possible unintended consequences of the Bridgeport Sand Mine.  Mining operations have many moving parts and each step in the process has risk.  It is understood that the mine has submitted Environmental Impact Assessments and Mitigation plans and that these have met State standards.  I am perplexed however that the mine had NOT put forward a large Performance Bond to cover costs associated with unplanned mishaps.   That will most certainly happen.   For example the ‘view shed’ of the Wisconsin River could be affected by weather events that could be caused by ‘nature’, but have been exacerbated/ faciliated by the mine.  I’m thinking of wind shear or wind funneling from the removal of the forest to the south of the river for the mine.  There could also be issues of wind and water erosion resulting from the changed landuse in the neighboring area.  In short, the possibilities for habitat and township infrastructure destruction / degradation in the vicinity of the mine  are too numerous to innumerate in a Plan and the mine must be willing to work with the River Board to mitigate these damages.  A show of good faith would be for Patterson to put forward a real commitment to mitigation in the form of a performance bond.  A million dollars should be the minimum for an operation of this size and duration. Please share this with other board membersWith kind regardsMike  |
| **From:** Nancy Kelley [mailto:ntk@sbcglobal.net] **Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 5:02 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Lower WI River ProtectionThe Lower WI River must be protected! I am shocked at the idea of an industrial sandmine fracking process being allowed anywhere near and particularily visible from the riverway. The scenic beauty and natural character of the river must be protected for future generations. Once it has been abused there is no way to regain the beauty and peaceful silence. We cannot allow such an operation to gain a foothold on our rivers.The Bridgeport Planning Commison was out of line in granting a conditional permit! Please STOP this now! SAVE our waterways. Nancy KelleyConcerned Citizen |
| **From:** Barbara Jenkin [mailto:baj1@tds.net] **Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 5:32 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Vote "NO" on Permit for Frac Sand Mine in LWSRDear LWSR Board,I am writing to you again before your meeting on 8/22/13 to decide on the Pattison Sand Company's request for approval on their Permit for a Frac Sand Mine within the LWSR in the Town of Bridgeport, Crawford County, Wisconsin.  A frac sand mine and processing operation is totally different than a sand/gravel pit used for road maintenance/construction.  The frac sand mine will impact the Riverway forever and set a precedent for approval of other frac sand mine permit requests within the LWSR.  Please, please, please vote "NO" against issuing this permit!   The scenic beauty of the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway is PRICELESS!  It needs to be kept that way now and for future generations!Barbara Jenkin & Erik Marquess |
| **From:** mfishler@centurytel.net [mailto:mfishler@centurytel.net] **Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 8:47 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Cc:** mfishler@centurytel.net**Subject:** Lower River Way Board This is Mark Fishler and I wanted to share my thoughts of tomorrow nights meeting in regards to the sand mining in Brigeport.I know many people are counting on you all to make the right descion by turning down the sand mining permit.I want people to understand that I live adjacent to the mine and will be greatly affected in many ways.If we continue to give up quality farm land and for housing development and sand mining in which is out of control,we lose on producing and providing of food in the future for many people,wildlife are more confined to small wood areas . This land is sacred and can never be replaced again because of selfishness and greed of those interested parties.The board of Bridgeport should be in my place and should come and rent my 5th wheel camper out just to get a taste of there incompetent descion they made.I am concerned about many issues such as dust ,health, lighting,wells,polution and noise.People whom worked hard in life tend to want to retire with enjoyment of there land and there home.I have only 12 years left before retiring and this really yerks my chain because of greed.I hope that you can all understand and put yourself in our shoes when you make your descion. Note ; my work schedule does not allow me to be free for tommrow nights meeting but will do my best to try and be there. Mark Fishler     |
| **From:** Bruce Moffat [mailto:moffat.bruce@gmail.com] **Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 11:19 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Cc:** Ben Moffat**Subject:** TIME-SENSITIVE: 8/22 Riverway Board MeetingDear Mark,We wrote you back in December 2012 expressing our concerns about the proposed Pattison Sand Co. mining operation in Crawford County. As the issue comes to a head at the level of the Lower WI Riverway Board, we want to reiterate our strenuous objection to this proposal as it now stands. Our major concern is the precedent that allowing mining within the Riverway would set. While we appreciate that area landowners want, and in many cases, need to utilize their landholdings for their long-term financial security, there must be other land use options that don't have the potential health impacts, noise pollution, and scenic damage entailed by this project. Why should local communities that rely on the tourism leveraged by the Riverway to the tune of 100s and 100s of jobs sacrifice for the benefit of one company and four landowners who promise just 10s of local jobs. That seems to be a negative cost/benefit ratio, and a high cost to pay for the successful - until now - Riverway experiment launched 20+ years ago, ironically under a Republican governor.We hope the Riverway Board members will not allow a legal gray area to obscure their good judgement to hold fast to its mission to "protect and preserve the scenic beauty and natural character of the Lower Wisconsin Riverway through administration of a program to control land use and development." Approving industrial sand operations on 300 acres within the Riverway will only subvert that mission, for this generation and future generations.Appreciatively,Bruce, Ben and Mary MoffatOwners, Tippesaukee FarmBlue River, Wisconsin |
| **From:** Dave Mezera [mailto:dfmezera@countryspeed.com] **Sent:** Wednesday, August 21, 2013 7:35 PM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Frac Sand Mining PermitMark-This brief message is to add my support for a "NO" vote on the frac sand mining permit at the Wisconsin State Riverway Board meeting on August 22nd. Please forward my comments to the members of the Riverway Board.I'm a resident of Crawford County and recently served on a non-metallic mining committee for the Town of Scott. The committee developed, and the Town recently enacted, a licensing ordinance intended to protect our Town's citizens from the worst effects of any future frac sand mining operations (to the extent possible under existing laws and regulations). One of the first things we learned was that Wisconsin's non-metallic mining laws were developed primarily to regulate sand and gravel quarries used (mostly) for local road construction. The laws were never intended to apply to the industrial-scale operations involved in present-day frac sand mining and processing.Similarly, the Riverway law was never intended to permit such industrial operations within the boundaries of the Riverway, regardless of whether or not the operations are "visible" from the river. Such industrialization is incompatible with the mission statement of the Riverway Board. The law should be changed to clarify that point. In the interim, while advocating for the law to be revised, a decision to permit a huge industrial operation within the Riverway boundaries would risk permanent damage to the *scenic beauty and natural character* that I hope can be protected and preserved.       Dave Mezera     24265 Shady Lane     Boscobel, WI   53805 |
| -----Original Message-----From: annie@redcloverranchwisconsin.com [mailto:annie@redcloverranchwisconsin.com] Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2013 11:37 PMTo: Cupp, Mark E - LWRSubject: Tomorrows Wisconsin Riverway VoteDear Mr Cupp,I am writing you today to ask you to please advise the board against allowing the sand frac mining company permit to mine close to the Wisconsin River. I own a cabin rental business in Crawford County and almost every guest paddles the Wisconsin River when they visit our area. They come back awe inspired and moved by their experience on the river. Each one a bit different, but always the same, they had an unencumbered moment with nature. The sand frac mining will negatively effect my local business. That is very important to me. More important then that, the Wisconsin River is one of Crawford Counties treasures and we need to protect it's pristine and quiet beauty. I know they are saying that it won't be visible when the leafs are on, but we live in Wisconsin and there is a lot of the year where the leafs aren't on. Also, part of the treasure is the quiet on the river and that no doubt will be effected. I was heartened when I read the excerpt from your speech on the Riverway board website. It's true 'the valley is a place worth protecting and preserving for future generations'. I know you are in a tough position and to do your job correctly you have have to go from the big picture of that speech on the website to looking into all the nuances and imperfections of any law made by man. When you step back, you know, we all know, this is not good, this is not right. Please do what's right and protect the sacred beauty of the Wisconsin River. We will get by in Crawford County just fine without that extra sand being mined and we will leave a legacy more important then temporary gain. We are counting on you!Sincerely,Annie ColemanRed Clover RanchClayton, WI |
| -----Original Message-----From: Sherry Caves [mailto:shercaves@tds.net] Sent: Thursday, August 22, 2013 7:54 AMTo: Cupp, Mark E - LWRSubject: remarks to forward to LWS Riverway Board Members re frac sand miningDear Board Members--before there was a LWS Riverway Board hearing our family attended in Sauk City or Spring Green--can't remember which--to show our support for the protection and preservation of the lovely Wisconsin River Valley. We had spent memorable weekends on the Wisconsin, sandbar camping with our boys. They were 13 and 11 or so at the time of the hearing.They are 35 and 37 now. We were back on the river with them and a grand child this week. Without the attention of the LWRB over these past 24 years, what a difference in the river we would have experienced! The development and polluted water--it wasn't there! Please continue to protect this unique and precious resource. Protect it from mining for sand for hydraulic fracking. Our granddaughter loved the sand bar! She is 3.Sherry and Doug Cavesland owners in the River ValleyLovers of the Riverway |
| **From:** ethel drengberg [mailto:etdrengberg@yahoo.com] **Sent:** Thursday, August 22, 2013 8:37 AM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Delay the voteMark,Please forward this to the board before the meeting tonight, Aug 22.In view of the recent news of the lawsuit filed against the Bridgeport Township board and Planning Commission, I am asking the Lower Wisconsin River Board to make a motion to delay the vote tonight regarding the mine along the Wisconsin River.I also feel there should be a moratorium until this legal matter is settled.Thank you.Ethel Drengberg |
| **From:** Selena Fox [mailto:selenacircle@gmail.com] **Sent:** Thursday, August 22, 2013 10:04 AM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Re: Input about frac sand mining for Thursday Board meetingHere is my letterTo: Lower Wisconsin Riverway BoardFrom: Selena FoxDate: Wednesday, August 21, 2013RE: Frac Sand Mining IssuesI am writing to request that the Board vote NO to having Frac Sand Mining along the Lower Wisconsin Riverway.The Lower Wisconsin Riverway is a valuable and precious treasure that needs to be preserved.  Preservation is not only important to those of us who live in this area now but for future generations.Ecotourism is a growth industry and the Lower Wisconsin Riverway has been, is now, and hopefully will continue to be |
| **From:** MaLenna Smith [mailto:malenna.smith@gmail.com] **Sent:** Thursday, August 22, 2013 10:08 AM**To:** Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Subject:** Bridgeport Frac Sand Mine PermitDear Lower Wisconsin State Riverway Board,The Lower Wisconsin Riverway is a phenomenal public resource that should not be compromised in any way by an out of state business that only has economic gain in mind.  Allowing a frac sand mine in Bridgeport would not only be environmentally devastating, it would open the door to further mines within the river corridor.Right now, the political climate is "jobs at any cost," and Wisconsin is paying a high price.  There are some states (out west) that have no trees, no grass, no water--yet we have all these priceless commodities and incredible beauty, and people are willing to sell it!!For the sake of this riverway, for the sake of this state, for the sake of its citizens and for future generations, DO NOT give this company a permit to mine in the Bridgeport area.  Someone has got to say NO because the consequences of not doing so are irreversible.Sincerely,MaLenna SmithSauk County resident/biologist/teacher/kayaker |
| **From:** Timothy De Bruin [mailto:tdbscot@gmail.com] **Sent:** Thursday, August 22, 2013 9:53 AM**To:** Matt Dannenberg - WI League of Conservation Voters; Cupp, Mark E - LWR**Cc:** Mark Fishler; edieehlert@centurytel.net; Heather DeBruin; afs\_dc@yahoo.com; kathybyrne@hotmail.com**Subject:** Re: (copy) Please Protect the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway from the Impacts of Sand MiningHello Matt and Mark, I was hoping to attend the meeting tonight to speak out about my concerns; however, I will not be able to get out of work in time.  If at all posible, please pass along my sentiments, or feel free to read my e-mail from yesterday in my abscense. Thank you,Tim De Bruin  On Wed, Aug 21, 2013 at 7:38 PM, Matt Dannenberg - WI League of Conservation Voters <matt@conservationvoters.org> wrote:Dear Tim,Thank you for taking action on this issue.  Your message is copied below.Wisconsin Conservation Voters Action Network |
| From: Paul T. O'Leary [mailto:ptoleary@chorus.net] Sent: Thursday, August 22, 2013 7:58 AMTo: Cupp, Mark E - LWRSubject: Frac Sand mining in the Lower Wisconsin RiverwayDear Director Cupp,I am a landowner and future resident of Crawford County in Wisconsin's Driftless area. I oppose any industrial operation within the jurisdiction of the Lower Wisconsin Riverway Board that involves mining sand for the purpose of fracturing for resource extraction. I request that all members of the Board vote NO on the proposed frac sand mine Bridgeport township at tonight's meeting. The sand under our feet is critical to the unique environmental quality of the Driftless area and the Wisconsin River watershed. Not only is the sand a natural filter for the area's ground water, the aesthetic and environmental impacts of the mining operation itself are unacceptable; it would clearly violate the Riverway Board's mission.Please enter this communication into the public record, and distribute it to all members of the Board for tonight's meeting.Thank you,--Paul T. O'LearyMadison, WI USA |