

David Emerson, Comments Draft Mining Ordinance November 3, 2025

Overall, I appreciate that a great deal of work has been put into developing this ordinance and find it be comprehensive.

In terms of points of contention, I do not see any sun-setting clauses of existing operations, this was a major sticking point of the previous mining ordinance. I very much appreciate the language around expansion of existing operations. As I interpret it, this will require Crooker (or any other existing operation) to apply for a permit to expand beyond existing operations covered in their permit, or a large percentage increase within the current area being mined. The expansion will to meet all requirements of the ordinance, and that such expansion can be denied.

Regarding comments that the document is too long, the length is a function of detail not substance, and does not make for easy reading. Perhaps much of the detail is covered in state regulations and can simply be referred too? In any case, it's my opinion that for a town vote it would be important to provide an executive summary that in one page summarizes the important points.

I may have missed it, but I did not see reference to the blasting ordinance that currently exists, but is germane to a mining ordinance. Of course, in my opinion, a blasting ordinance without a mining ordinance also does not follow a logical progression.

Specific comments:

Article 1, section 3: Personally, and in lieu of current of operations, I would make points C, D, & E the top priorities.

V.3: add commercial building

Section 2.d: I believe Crooker's current hours of operation, at least for loading, are 6am - 4pm, so a compromise might be 7am rather than 8am

Section 2.e: In terms of annoyance, operational noise is the main thing, and 8AM seems reasonable.