

Subject: RE: FOIA Request, Levy/BMC Review Meetings
Date: Friday, May 22, 2026 at 12:37:12 PM Eastern Daylight Time
From: Sean Miller <smiller@springfield-twp.us>
To: Kara Okonewski <kara@okoenv.com>
Attachments: image002.png, image003.png

Dear Ms. Okonewski:

This email is in response to your Freedom of Information request received by my office on May 18, 2026. Your request is granted as to existing, non-exempt records in the possession of Springfield Township that fall within the scope of your request. The requested records can be found at this link: [5.18.26 K. Okonewski FOIA - Levy Meetings](#). Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

FOIA POLICY: The Springfield Township Freedom of Information Act Procedures and Guidelines and a Public Summary of the policy is available on the Springfield Township website at www.Springfield-twp.us.

Notice of requestor's right to seek judicial review: You are entitled under Section 10 of the Freedom of Information Act to commence an action in the Circuit Court to compel disclosure of the requested records if you believe they were wrongfully withheld from disclosure. If you are successful in asserting the right to inspect or to receive a copy of a public record or a portion thereof, the court will award reasonable attorney fees, costs, and disbursements. If you prevail in part of your action, the court may, in its discretion, award reasonable attorney fees, costs, and disbursements or an appropriate portion thereof.

Very truly yours,
Sean R. Miller, Esq., MiPMC
Township Clerk/FOIA Coordinator



Sean R. Miller, MiPMC
Township Clerk
Springfield Township
12000 Davisburg Road
Davisburg, MI 48350
248-846-6510
www.springfield-twp.us

SPRINGFIELD
CHARTER TOWNSHIP

From: Kara Okonewski <kara@okoenv.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 16, 2026 10:09 AM

To: Clerk's Office <clerk@springfield-twp.us>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] FOIA Request, Levy/BMC Review Meetings

Caution: This email originated from outside of Springfield Township's email system. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Clerk Miller,

Pursuant to the Michigan Freedom of Information Act, MCL 15.231 et seq., I am requesting copies of public records related to any meetings held from November 15, 2025 through the date this request is fulfilled involving the Springfield Township Fact-Finding Committee and/or individuals participating in the review of the Ormond Road Levy/BMC sand and gravel mining proposal.

For clarity, I am not requesting records from regular evening public meetings of the Township Board, Planning Commission, Zoning Board of Appeals, or other publicly noticed meetings where minutes are already posted or publicly available. This request is intended to cover the other meetings and discussions related to the Levy/BMC proposal and review process.

This request includes, but is not limited to, records of any meetings involving one or more of the following individuals or entities:

- Supervisor Ric Davis
- Residents Chris Todd and/or Amanda Gruzin
- Planning Commission Chair Brian Galley
- Trustee Kevin Sclesky
- Giffels Webster
- Carlisle/Wortman Associates
- Brian O'Mara, Agate Harbor Advisors
- Ramboll Consultants
- Mike Wilczynski, Pangea Environmental
- Reuben Maxbauer, Levy/BMC
- Any other independent expert, consultant, engineer, planner, hydrogeologist, environmental reviewer, or technical reviewer involved in the Levy/BMC mining proposal review process

I am specifically requesting the following records for any such meetings related to the Ormond Road Levy/BMC mining proposal:

- Meeting dates
- Meeting minutes
- Agendas
- Notes
- Handouts
- Presentations

- Reports or draft reports discussed
- Sign-in sheets or attendance lists
- Meeting summaries
- Written materials distributed before, during, or after the meetings
- Any related attachments or supporting materials

This request is limited to the time period of November 14, 2025 through the date this request is fulfilled.

Please provide the records electronically by email if possible. If any portion of this request is denied, please provide the specific statutory exemption relied upon and release all reasonably segregable non-exempt portions of the records.

Thank you!

Sincerely,

Kara Okonewski

Certified Environmental Interpreter & Founder

Oko Environmental, LLC

Okoenv.com

kara@okoenv.com

(248) 483-0183

Science Within Reach - Providing Clear Environmental Science for Communities and Leaders



Oko Environmental, LLC

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

Kickoff Environmental Proposals

Springfield Township
12000 Davisburg Road, Davisburg, MI 48350
January 15, 2026
10:00 AM

PRESENT: Richard L. Davis, Township Supervisor
 Sarah Richmond, Township Parks Director
 Greg Need, Township Council
 Kevin Sclesky, Trustee
 Amanda Gruzin, Resident
 Chris Todd, Resident
 Danielle Sink, Supervisor's Assistant/Recording Secretary

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Township Supervisor Richard L. Davis, who explained that the purpose of the meeting was to formally initiate a fair, unbiased, and independent evaluation process for the environmental proposals submitted to the Township. Supervisor Davis emphasized that the process was intentionally structured to allow each participant to review materials independently and to ensure that subsequent discussions would be informed, candid, and defensible. He noted that establishing a clear record of due process was critical to protecting the Township and maintaining the integrity of the review.

Supervisor Davis reviewed the scope of work that had previously been presented to and approved by the Township Board as part of the Township's legal strategy. He explained that the scope of work outlined the expectations placed on applicants and served as the baseline against which submitted proposals would be evaluated. He further stated that, based on a review of comparable cases, a consistency review and concurrence statement, reviewed by legal counsel Greg Need, would be added to all review documents moving forward to ensure uniformity and transparency throughout the process.



Supervisor Davis then explained the evaluation worksheet developed for the review. He stated that the worksheet was designed to address specific evaluation areas and parameters identified in the scope of work and to allow reviewers to identify the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal. He clarified that the Township was not seeking to select a single firm for all review components but instead intended to assign elements of the review to firms demonstrating the strongest credentials, experience, or expertise in each evaluation area. He noted that this approach was developed collaboratively with special legal counsel Gerald Fisher and Township Attorney Greg Need, with the goal of avoiding placement of critical review components with firms lacking depth in a particular area.

Supervisor Davis explained that reviewers were asked to identify which firm they believed was strongest in each evaluation category and to document their reasoning in the notes section provided. He emphasized that these notes would form the basis of a future committee discussion, during which individual perspectives would be compared and discussed before final decisions were made by legal counsel and the Supervisor, with significant reliance on committee input.

Trustee Sclesky asked whether a follow-up meeting could be scheduled promptly after individual reviews were completed, noting that the evaluations were due by Friday, January 13.

Supervisor Davis responded that he, Attorney Fisher, and Attorney Need would first review the completed worksheets as part of their responsibility in the selection process, after which a meeting would be scheduled to allow full committee discussion and open dialogue among participants.

Resident Amanda Gruzin asked why Atwell declined to submit a proposal and whether the reason could be shared.

Supervisor Davis explained that Atwell indicated they did not feel they had sufficient information to prepare a proposal, whereas Ramboll and Fleis & Vandenbrink were able to do so. Supervisor Davis stated that, in his view, the ability to understand the Township's expectations based on the interview process was itself an important consideration, as the Township needed reviewers who could work independently without guidance that could be perceived as influencing outcomes. He

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

emphasized the Township's commitment to avoiding any appearance of impropriety and ensuring decisions were driven by facts, science, and professional expertise.

Attorney Need commented that under technical expertise evaluation areas, it would be appropriate to note where specific firms demonstrated particular strengths, such as geology or traffic, recognizing that no single firm may be strongest across all disciplines.

Supervisor Davis agreed and reiterated that the Township's approach was intended to be comprehensive and potentially serve as a model for other municipalities, noting that no other community to his knowledge was conducting a review in this manner.

Mrs. Gruzin raised a question regarding traffic analysis, and Supervisor Davis clarified that roadway use and routing determinations would rely on agencies with jurisdiction over the roads, with prior discussions involving Fishbeck addressing use rather than safety. He explained that additional studies, including property value analysis, would be conducted separately and that the current review represented a focused component of a broader, phased evaluation process. He emphasized that the Township was not operating under any artificial timeline and would proceed deliberately to ensure the process was done correctly.

Parks Director Sarah Richmond asked whether the evaluation worksheet could be distributed electronically to allow typed comments.

Supervisor Davis confirmed that electronic distribution would be provided. He then proposed the idea of making the review materials publicly available on the Township website, including the scope of work, evaluation worksheet, and submitted proposals, to allow interested residents to review and provide input. He emphasized that while public submissions would not alter the established process, any feedback received would be acknowledged and discussed in an open meeting, with the minutes reflecting that public input was considered.

Attorney Need noted that from a legal standpoint, the materials constituted recommendations and that while public input may be limited, transparency would be maintained. Mrs. Gruzin expressed strong support for public engagement and stated that opening the process could help residents better understand the depth and rigor of the Township's review.

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

Trustee Sclesky echoed this sentiment, stating that the opportunity for public participation reinforced transparent government and demonstrated that residents were given the chance to be involved.

Supervisor Davis clarified that all review materials would be provided consistently and that the process itself would not be modified based on public input, noting the substantial amount of time already invested. He reiterated that the Township's objective was to encourage fact-based engagement rather than misinformation or speculation.

Further discussion occurred regarding public communication and recent community discourse. Supervisor Davis emphasized that the Township was committed to impartiality, openness, and transparency, and that the structured process was designed to withstand scrutiny.

Mrs. Gruzin and others expressed agreement and reiterated the importance of educating residents on the process and maintaining focus on facts rather than emotion.

Supervisor Davis summarized the legal strategy underpinning the process, noting that tasks had been clearly assigned among legal counsel and Township leadership to ensure a defensible approach and to manage costs responsibly, as discussed at a prior Township Board meeting.

By consensus of the committee, there was general agreement to proceed with making the review materials available to the public in a structured manner.

The meeting concluded with Supervisor Davis inviting any final comments and reiterating the Township's commitment to conducting the review thoughtfully, transparently, and in the best interest of the community.

The meeting adjourned 3:45 PM.

Fact-Finding Committee Evaluation Worksheet

Prepared by
Ric Davis
Township Supervisor

Reviewed for Form and Process by

Greg Need
Township Counsel

Gerry Fisher
Special Counsel

Review and Concurrence Statement

This document has been reviewed by Township Counsel and Special Counsel. Counsel approved the process outlined herein and concur that the process described is legally sufficient and consistent with applicable law and Township procedures.

Such review does not alter the supervisory authorship of this document but reflects counsel's agreement as to the legal validity of the process described.

Instructions to Committee Member

This worksheet is to be completed independently following the Review Kickoff Meeting. Committee members shall not discuss the proposals or their evaluations with other committee members prior to submission.

The purpose of this worksheet is to document individual observations regarding the qualifications, experience, and suitability of consulting firms relative to the Township's Scope of Work. Completion of this worksheet does not constitute a recommendation or decision.

Evaluation Area 1 Independence and Objectivity

Which firm appears to be better positioned to provide an independent and objective review for the Township?

- Ramboll Americas
- Fleis & VandenBrink
- Appear generally equivalent
- Insufficient information to determine

Notes for Committee Discussion

Evaluation Area 2

Experience with Comparable Mining or Extractive Operations

Which firm demonstrates stronger experience reviewing mining, aggregate, or extractive operations similar in scale, complexity, or public sensitivity?

- Ramboll Americas
- Fleis & VandenBrink
- Appear generally equivalent
- Insufficient information to determine

Notes for Committee Discussion

Evaluation Area 3

Technical Expertise Across Required Disciplines

Which firm appears better able to provide or coordinate the range of technical expertise required under the Township Scope of Work, including environmental, hydrogeological, engineering, and regulatory review?

- Ramboll Americas
- Fleis & VandenBrink
- Appear generally equivalent
- Insufficient information to determine

Notes for Committee Discussion

Evaluation Area 4

Assigned Personnel and Qualifications

Based on the personnel proposed to perform the work, which firm appears to offer stronger individual qualifications, depth of experience, and appropriateness of assigned roles?

- Ramboll Americas
- Fleis & VandenBrink
- Appear generally equivalent
- Insufficient information to determine

Notes for Committee Discussion

Evaluation Area 5
Alignment with Township Scope of Work

Which proposal more clearly aligns with the Township’s Scope of Work and demonstrates an understanding of the Township’s review needs?

- Ramboll Americas
- Fleis & VandenBrink
- Appear generally equivalent
- Insufficient information to determine

Notes for Committee Discussion

Evaluation Area 6
Quality and Defensibility of Deliverables

Which firm appears better positioned to produce written analyses, reports, and findings that are thorough, well-documented, and defensible for Township decision-making?

- Ramboll Americas
- Fleis & VandenBrink
- Appear generally equivalent
- Insufficient information to determine

Notes for Committee Discussion

Evaluation Area 7
Ordinance and Regulatory Familiarity

Which firm demonstrates stronger familiarity with local ordinances, zoning considerations, and regulatory frameworks relevant to the Township’s review?

- Ramboll Americas
- Fleis & VandenBrink
- Appear generally equivalent
- Insufficient information to determine

Notes for Committee Discussion

Evaluation Area 8
Monitoring and Ongoing Support Capability

Which firm appears better suited to provide ongoing monitoring, follow-up analysis, or support beyond an initial report, if required by the Township?

- Ramboll Americas
- Fleis & VandenBrink
- Appear generally equivalent
- Insufficient information to determine

Notes for Committee Discussion

Evaluation Area 9
Cost Structure and Scope Control

Which proposal demonstrates a clearer, more manageable cost structure and approach to scope control consistent with Township oversight?

- Ramboll Americas
- Fleis & VandenBrink
- Appear generally equivalent
- Insufficient information to determine

Notes for Committee Discussion

Evaluation Area 10
Credibility and Professional Standing

Based on experience, reputation, and prior work, which firm appears likely to bring the highest level of professional credibility to this review?

- Ramboll Americas
- Fleis & VandenBrink
- Appear generally equivalent
- Insufficient information to determine

Notes for Committee Discussion

Evaluation Area 11
Ability to Clearly Present Complex Technical Information

Which firm appears better able to present complex and scientific information in a clear, understandable manner for Township officials and residents without technical backgrounds?

- Ramboll Americas
- Fleis & VandenBrink
- Appear generally equivalent
- Insufficient information to determine

Notes for Committee Discussion

Overall Observations

Please summarize any overarching observations, concerns, or strengths not captured above.

Committee Member Certification

I certify that this evaluation was completed independently and without discussion with other committee members prior to submission.

Signature

Date

Springfield Township
Fact-Finding Committee
Review Kickoff Meeting Packet
Independent Consultant Review
Levy / Burroughs Mining Application

Prepared by
Ric Davis
Township Supervisor

Reviewed for Form and Process by

Greg Need
Township Counsel

Gerry Fisher
Special Counsel

Review and Concurrence Statement

This document has been reviewed by Township Counsel and Special Counsel. Counsel approved the process outlined herein and concur that the process described is legally sufficient and consistent with applicable law and Township procedures.

Such review does not alter the supervisory authorship of this document but reflects counsel's agreement as to the legal validity of the process described.

Contact
Rdavis@springfield-twp.us

Meeting Date
January 15, 2026

Meeting Time
2:00 PM

Meeting Location
Lower-Level Conference Room
Civic Center Building

Table of Contents

1. Meeting Purpose and Supervisor Overview
2. Supervisor Opening Remarks
3. Overview of the Independent Review Process
4. Overview of the Township Scope of Work

5. Independent Review Materials Provided
6. Fact-Finding Committee Evaluation Worksheet Instructions
7. Independent Review Instructions and Submission Requirements
8. Process Discussion Guidelines
9. Next Steps Following Independent Review
10. Follow-Up Meeting Purpose

Section 1

Meeting Purpose and Supervisor Overview

This meeting serves as the formal kickoff for the Fact-Finding Committee's work related to the independent consultant review of the Levy / Burroughs mining application.

The purpose of this meeting is procedural and preparatory. It is intended to establish the process, expectations, and structure for independent review by each committee member.

This meeting is not intended for discussion, comparison, evaluation, or selection of consultants. No opinions, preferences, or conclusions regarding the proposals will be shared or debated.

Any discussion during this meeting is limited strictly to process, logistics, and procedure.

Section 2

Supervisor Opening Remarks

Good afternoon. Before we begin, I want to clearly state the purpose of today's meeting and how it fits into the Township's overall process.

This meeting is not for discussion, comparison, or evaluation of the consultant proposals. It is not a meeting where opinions are shared, preferences expressed, or conclusions drawn. No consultant selection, task assignment, or recommendation will occur today.

The sole purpose of this meeting is to set the stage for independent review by each committee member. Each of you will review the materials on your own, using the evaluation worksheet provided, and form your own assessments without influence from group discussion.

This structure is intentional. Independent review first ensures that when we come back together, our discussion is informed, disciplined, and fair. There will be time for discussion at a later meeting, after all independent reviews are completed.

Any questions today should be limited to process, materials, or logistics.

Section 3

Overview of the Independent Review Process

Springfield Township is using a phased and deliberate process to evaluate independent consultants for the review of the Levy / Burroughs mining application.

The first phase focuses on orientation and process setup. Materials are distributed, expectations are explained, and deadlines are established. No evaluation occurs during this phase.

The second phase is independent review. Each committee member reviews the consultant proposals and the Township Scope of Work independently and completes the evaluation worksheet without consultation with other members.

The third phase is structured discussion. After all independent reviews are submitted, the committee reconvenes to discuss findings, identify strengths and weaknesses, and begin developing a task-based approach to consultant selection.

The fourth phase involves development of the selection approach. Based on committee discussion and legal guidance, the Township determines appropriate consultant roles, scopes, and next steps.

Section 4 Overview of the Township Scope of Work

The Township Scope of Work establishes what must be reviewed, not who should perform the work.

It includes environmental review, technical analysis, regulatory and ordinance compliance, infrastructure impacts, public communication, and long-term oversight considerations.

The Scope of Work serves as the foundation for evaluating consultant qualifications and determining which firm is best suited for particular review tasks.

Section 5 Independent Review Materials Provided

Each committee member has been provided with the following materials for independent review:

- Consultant proposal submitted by Ramboll Americas
- Consultant proposal submitted by Fleis & VandenBrink
- Township Scope of Work for Independent Environmental Review
- Fact-Finding Committee Evaluation Worksheet

Committee members are expected to review all materials thoroughly as part of the independent review phase.

Section 6 Fact-Finding Committee Evaluation Worksheet Instructions

The Fact-Finding Committee Evaluation Worksheet is the primary tool for documenting independent review.

Each committee member is required to complete the worksheet independently, without discussion or collaboration with other committee members.

Completed worksheets will be used to inform later committee discussion and do not represent a final recommendation or decision.

Section 7 Independent Review Instructions and Submission Requirements

Each committee member shall independently review the consultant proposals and related materials following the kickoff meeting.

Each committee member shall complete the Fact-Finding Committee Evaluation Worksheet independently.

Completed evaluation worksheets must be submitted no later than 5:00 PM on February 13, 2026.

Completed worksheets shall be submitted to:

Danielle Sink
Assistant to the Township Supervisor
Rdavis@springfield-twp.us

Copies shall be provided to:

Greg Need
Township Counsel
gneed@anafirm.com

Gerry Fisher
Special Counsel
fisherg@cooley.edu

All submissions must clearly identify the committee member and date of completion. Submitted materials will be treated as committee working documents.

Section 8 Process Discussion Guidelines

Limited discussion is permitted during the kickoff meeting, but only on matters related to process.

Permitted discussion topics include review timelines, use of evaluation worksheets, submission procedures, confidentiality, legal roles, and scheduling of future meetings.

Discussion of proposal content, consultant qualifications, strengths, weaknesses, preferences, or comparisons is not permitted at this meeting. The Supervisor will redirect discussion if it moves beyond process.

Section 9

Next Steps Following Independent Review

After independent reviews are completed and submitted, the Supervisor will compile common themes and identify areas requiring discussion.

The committee will reconvene for a structured discussion meeting focused on comparing findings, identifying strengths and gaps, and beginning development of a task-based selection approach.

No consultant selection will occur until after this discussion phase and review by legal counsel.

Section 10

Follow-Up Meeting Purpose

The purpose of the follow-up meeting is to begin substantive discussion after all independent reviews have been completed.

This meeting will focus on reviewing evaluation themes, identifying task categories, discussing firm suitability by task area, and outlining next steps in the consultant selection process.

This meeting marks the transition from independent analysis to structured committee deliberation.

Process Discussion Invitation

The Supervisor will invite any questions or discussion limited to the review process as outlined in this packet.

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

Springfield Township
Scope of Work (SOW)
Prepared for: Dr. Monfils
Prepared by: Ric Davis

Subject: Ecological Considerations of Aquifer Changes on Prairie Fens – Supporting Context for Environmental Review

Guiding Principle

Springfield Township will commission an independent, science-based review of the environmental studies submitted by Burroughs Mining, as part of their gravel mine Special Land Use request.

This review is a proactive measure to ensure decisions are informed by verified facts, expert analysis, and community interests, not assumptions or outside pressure. The purpose is not to oppose or endorse the application prematurely, but to create the conditions for sound, lawful, and community-conscious governance

Purpose

Springfield Township is requesting a science-based, professionally prepared report from you to outline how changes in aquifer systems including shifts in groundwater levels, flow, connectivity, and temperature may affect prairie fen ecosystems within the Township.

This report will serve as supporting scientific context for environmental consultants currently tasked with reviewing gravel mining applications submitted by the Levy Company and the Burroughs Mining Company. The intent is not to make conclusions about the potential impact of those projects, but rather to provide factual ecological background that may help inform the formal review process already underway.

You should understand that the Township places strong emphasis on ensuring this process remains objective, neutral, and grounded entirely in scientific fact. This document will help ensure that our environmental experts have access to up-to-date information about prairie fens as part of their broader evaluation of environmental risks and responsibilities.

Role and Expectations

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

You are being asked to provide his expertise as a prairie fen ecologist to explain the structure and function of these sensitive wetland systems, with a focus on how they interact with surrounding aquifer systems. He is not being asked to determine or speculate on whether gravel mining will cause harm to these areas. That responsibility lies entirely with the Township's environmental experts.

The tone and content of this report should be science-based and free of advocacy. It should provide insight, not opinion, and must avoid any conclusions related to project approval or denial. The purpose is to give environmental reviewers a clear understanding of the importance of fen systems and what must be considered to protect them.

Scope of Work

The final report should include the following sections:

1. **Overview of Prairie Fens**
A description of prairie fens, including how they are formed, their dependence on groundwater-fed systems, and their ecological significance in the region.
2. **Aquifer Dependency**
A detailed explanation of how fen health depends on stable and clean groundwater input. This should include discussion of aquifer connectivity, recharge dynamics, water level sensitivity, flow patterns, and the influence of water temperature on ecological balance.
3. **Species at Risk**
A summary of rare and sensitive species that rely on prairie fens for habitat, including the Poweshiek Skipperling, Blanding's turtle, Eastern Massasauga rattlesnake, and native mussels and fish. This section should include how these species are linked to specific hydrologic or ecological conditions within the fen.
4. **Conditions for a Healthy Fen**
A summary of the specific ecological and hydrological conditions that are necessary to maintain a stable and functioning prairie fen. This should include measurable indicators or thresholds for environmental professionals to monitor.
5. **Scientific Sources and Supporting Data**
The report should be supported by peer-reviewed studies, data from state or federal agencies, and other scientifically credible sources. All references should be clearly cited using a consistent format.

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

6. Considerations for Environmental Review

A practical section listing science-based concerns, observations, or questions that the Township's environmental consultants may wish to consider during their formal review. This is not meant to draw conclusions, but to provide a useful framework for asking the right questions.

Deliverables

One written report, between five and ten pages in length

Delivered in both PDF and Word format

A one-to-two-page executive summary may be included upon request

The final report will be included in the documentation reviewed by the Township's environmental consultants as supporting information within their official scope of work

All content must be objective, science-based, and free of advocacy or bias

Deadline: May 1, 2026

Presentation of Findings

You should be prepared to present the report in a public setting if requested, such as a Township Board or Planning Commission meeting. This presentation should be limited to explaining the scientific information included in the report and should not include any conclusions about whether the mining projects should be approved or denied. The presentation is meant to help the Township's environmental consultants and the public understand the ecological context and importance of prairie fen systems.

Supporting Information

Along with the final report, Dr. Monfils you are being asked to submit the following:

A current curriculum vitae or résumé outlining relevant academic background and field experience

A short narrative summarizing his experience working with prairie fen ecosystems, including any research, monitoring, or restoration work

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

Any technical data or documentation that supports the report, including information about:

- Conditions required to maintain a healthy prairie fen
- Ecological thresholds that must be maintained to protect these systems
- Environmental disruptions that should be avoided
- The link between groundwater health and the protection of rare and endangered species
- Best practices for protecting water systems and sustaining sensitive natural habitats over time

This supporting material will assist the Township's environmental experts in evaluating the science, understanding the risks, and guiding responsible decision-making.

Budget and Timeline

We will need you to submit a proposed budget that includes time for research, writing, document preparation, and public presentation if required

An estimated completion timeline should be provided

A general description of the anticipated level of effort should be included

Final compensation will be confirmed following review and approval of the proposal. Payment will be issued upon submission of the final deliverables and invoice.

Board Review and Authorization

Before any work begins, this Scope of Work and the associated budget proposal must be submitted to the Springfield Township Board for review and approval. This ensures alignment with the Board's directive for a neutral, fact-based, and transparent process. No work should proceed until formal approval has been granted by the Board.

Point of Contact

Ric Davis

Supervisor, Springfield Charter Township

Summary of Process: Supporting a Fair, Defensible Environmental Review

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

Prepared by: Ric Davis

Date: January 16, 2026

Springfield Township is committed to ensuring a transparent and scientifically credible review process regarding the gravel mining applications submitted by the Levy Company and the Burroughs Mining Company.

As part of that effort, the Township is requesting a supporting scientific report from Dr. Monfils, who has relevant expertise in prairie fen ecology. His report will help explain how changes in aquifer systems may impact fen ecosystems and the rare species that depend on them. This document will serve as a factual reference only and is not intended to replace or pre-judge the findings of the Township's environmental consultants.

This report will not express support or opposition to the proposed mining operations. It will not evaluate whether impacts will occur. Instead, it will explain what ecological conditions must be maintained to support a healthy fen and what disruptions may put those systems at risk.

To maintain a neutral and defensible process, the Township has established the following expectations:

The report must be based entirely on science and free of advocacy

All findings must be supported by credible sources, with clear citations

Any public presentation must remain factual and avoid offering conclusions about project approval

This approach reflects the Township's commitment to making responsible, evidence-based decisions that protect our community's natural resources while honoring a fair and transparent review process.

By relying on professional input, verifiable data, and clear role boundaries, Springfield Township is reinforcing its dedication to thoughtful land use, environmental stewardship, and public accountability.



Dr. Monfils Meeting
Springfield Township
12000 Davisburg Road, Davisburg, MI 48350
January 16, 2026
11:30 AM

PRESENT:

Richard L. Davis, Township Supervisor
Sean Miller, Township Clerk
Sarah Richmond, Township Parks Director
Dr. Michael Monfils, Director of Michigan Natural Features Inventory
Danielle Sink, Supervisor's Assistant/Recording Secretary

Supervisor Davis opened the meeting by thanking Parks Director Sarah Richmond for coordinating the discussion and acknowledged prior correspondence with Dr. Monfils. He emphasized the Township's commitment to openness and transparency, noting that the Township has made extensive materials available publicly and has worked diligently to address community concerns related to the proposed gravel mining application. Supervisor Davis explained that the Township conducted a competitive selection process to identify qualified, independent environmental consultants without conflicts of interest. After screening multiple firms, the Township interviewed three companies and advanced two, Ramboll and Fleis & Vandenbrink, based on expertise and independence. A third firm, Atwell, declined participation due to the complexity of the review.

Supervisor Davis outlined the Township's strategy to evaluate both proposals collaboratively rather than selecting a single firm outright. He stated that the goal is to identify strengths and weaknesses across each proposal to ensure no critical environmental discipline is underrepresented. He underscored that potential impacts to natural resources, particularly those that are irreversible, are being elevated as the highest priority, and that decisions will be driven by facts and science rather than public pressure. To reinforce transparency, the Township intends to publish an evaluation worksheet online so the public can understand the criteria and provide informed input.

Supervisor Davis described the role of special counsel Gerald Fisher, noting his extensive background in Michigan zoning law and experience with similar applications. With Board authorization, Supervisor Davis, Attorney Fisher, and Township Counsel Greg Need have been empowered to interview and engage

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

environmental firms. The Township recently met to initiate the comparative evaluation process and anticipates that the selected consultants' work will subsequently be reviewed by an additional layer of experts. Supervisor Davis invited MNFI to participate in this secondary review, citing MNFI's credentials, institutional knowledge, and deep familiarity with sensitive natural systems within Springfield Township.

Supervisor Davis explained that the Township negotiated a \$150,000 escrow from the applicant to fund independent environmental review, ensuring the process does not burden taxpayers. Any engagement with MNFI would be subject to Board approval and coordination with the applicant under the escrow terms. He reiterated his appreciation for MNFI's potential involvement and emphasized the value of incorporating diverse, expert perspectives to protect Springfield Township's unique natural resources.

Dr. Monfils expressed appreciation for the invitation and explained MNFI's conservation-driven mission and commitment to objective, data-informed analysis. He noted that MNFI's role would focus on reviewing consultant findings, assessing whether sufficient information exists to evaluate potential impacts, and identifying gaps or uncertainties, particularly where complex systems do not yield definitive predictions. He asked clarifying questions regarding scope, including whether MNFI would review consultant analyses rather than re-evaluating applicant submissions directly.

Supervisor Davis confirmed that the Township does not intend to duplicate consultant work. Instead, MNFI would serve as a second-level review to assess completeness, defensibility, and relevance to Springfield's unique conditions. He invited MNFI to participate in the fact-finding process and reiterated that all meetings, materials, and records are being documented and posted publicly to ensure accountability and defensibility under applicable law, including Public Act 113 governing gravel mining.

The discussion focused extensively on Springfield Township's exceptional environmental features, including high-quality fen systems, protected wetlands, and proximity to a nearby Superfund site. Supervisor Davis and Parks Director Richmond highlighted concerns regarding groundwater drawdown, aquifer temperature changes, impacts on plant and mussel species, and the interaction of mining activities with existing contamination containment efforts. The Township emphasized that while gravel mining exists elsewhere in the region, Springfield's ecological conditions are unusually sensitive and warrant heightened scrutiny.

Supervisor Davis noted that certain hydrogeologic studies require active drawdown testing and that the applicant is in the process of installing a high capacity well. He stressed the importance of proper well placement and methodology to ensure accurate data and avoid skewed results. He reiterated the

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

Township's intention to subject all technical work to rigorous, multi-disciplinary review and to require additional studies where necessary.

Dr. Monfils acknowledged the complexity and uncertainty inherent in environmental impact analysis and stated that MNFI may rely on peer-reviewed scientific literature to inform its assessments where appropriate. Supervisor Davis affirmed that such recommendations would be discussed collaboratively and, where necessary, brought forward for consultant consideration and Board approval. He emphasized that the process would remain flexible and adaptive to ensure no relevant data is overlooked.

Supervisor Davis stated that the Township has negotiated a pause in the application timeline and is not constrained by deadlines. He emphasized that the Township will not be rushed and is prepared to take the time necessary, even multiple years, to complete a thorough, science-based review. He affirmed his role as a steward of the process and reiterated that decisions will proceed only when the Planning Commission and Board are confident, they have all necessary information.

Dr. Monfils indicated he would confer with MNFI staff to assess capacity, expertise alignment, and potential costs, noting that MNFI operates largely on grants and contracts.

Parks Director Richmond requested that MNFI outline potential scope, comfort areas, hourly rates, and administrative considerations.

Dr. Monfils confirmed MNFI could prepare a service outline and cost estimate, recognizing that scope may evolve.

Supervisor Davis concluded by reiterating his appreciation for MNFI's consideration and emphasized that excluding such expertise would be negligent given the stakes and uniqueness of Springfield Township's natural resources. He invited continued dialogue, provided contact information, and noted that extensive application materials are available on the Township website under the gravel mining application page for review. The meeting concluded with mutual understanding that there is no urgency and that follow-up will occur after MNFI's internal discussions.

SPRINGFIELD
CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

Craig Fuller Appraiser Interview
Springfield Township
12000 Davisburg Road, Davisburg, MI 48350
February 16, 2026
1:00 PM

PRESENT: Ric Davis, Township Supervisor
Greg Need, Township Attorney
Gerald Fisher, Special Counsel
Kevin Sclesky, Township Trustee
Lori Beatty, Township Trustee
Amanda Gruzin, FFC/Resident
Chris Todd, FFC/Resident
Danielle Sink, Supervisor's Assistant/Recording Secretary

Prior to the interview with Craig Fuller, the group discussed issues related to setbacks and haul routes for the proposed mining operation. Special Counsel Gerald Fisher noted that certain locations have short setbacks and hilly terrain, which could influence potential impacts.

Trustee Kevin Sclesky emphasized the importance of truck traffic exposure and suggested analyzing properties using concentric rings at half-mile and one-mile distances. He observed that the Big Lake area falls within a quarter-mile band and expressed the view that property values there were unlikely to be affected due to distance.

Supervisor Ric Davis agreed that impacts in that area seemed unlikely but stressed that the reviewer should determine where the threshold lies between impact and non-impact.

Trustee Sclesky raised the possibility that the area may not remain agricultural forever and questioned how subdivision development and increased traffic flow might affect property values.

Trustee Lori Beatty responded that it is nearly impossible to predict exact long-term effects and suggested that comparative scenarios across different land uses, such as subdivisions, farms, apartments, and commercial properties, would be the most practical approach.

SPRINGFIELD
CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

Supervisor Davis noted that many studies had already been reviewed and asked for input on refining the scope of work.

Special Counsel Fisher proposed matched comparisons for homes and properties near mines versus those located elsewhere as one possible approach.

Supervisor Davis expressed concern that the applicant's study appeared skewed, citing an 8 to 13 percent variance across phases and criticizing the Oxford comparison because it involved an established mine with a subdivision built later across the street, making it a different context.

Trustee Sclesky asked whether there was a relatively new comparable mine under construction nearby.

Supervisor Davis said that determining such comparables was part of the requested scope for the reviewer, including assessing whether impacts were driven by truck routes or other factors.

Trustee Beatty emphasized that a significant portion of market studies is subjective, noting that buyer perceptions, such as attitudes toward power lines or living on main roads, can vary widely and complicate conclusions. She added that interest rates and market conditions further increase uncertainty.

Appraiser Craig Fuller was then invited into the room. Supervisor Davis explained that Mr. Fuller had been referred by resident Amanda Gruzin and described the formation of a committee, including residents Gruzin and Chris Todd, to review the process. Supervisor Davis stated that the township had reviewed Mr. Fuller's resume and the applicant's market value submission and sought Mr. Fuller's expertise to review it. Supervisor Davis said the interview would proceed through a list of questions prepared by counsel, special counsel, and trustees.

Supervisor Davis began by asking what appraisal credentials Mr. Fuller held and in which state.

Mr. Fuller responded that he is Certified General in Michigan.

Supervisor Davis asked whether Mr. Fuller had reviewed or produced market impact studies using matched pairs similar to the applicant's study.

SPRINGFIELD
CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

Mr. Fuller replied yes and no, explaining that matched pairs are a basic appraisal technique, although he had not done a study exactly like this. When asked for examples, Mr. Fuller explained that matched pairs involve finding sales of two properties that are identical except for one attribute.

Supervisor Davis asked whether Mr. Fuller had reviewed or produced analyses of externalities comparable to aggregate mining quarries or heavy truck impacts on surrounding properties.

Mr. Fuller replied not with respect to surrounding properties.

Supervisor Davis asked about completing USPAP Standard 3 review assignments when the underlying document is not an appraisal but makes value impact claims, and how he structures opinions.

Mr. Fuller explained that he certifies adherence to the standard, noting that Standard 4 governs reporting and Standard 3 governs development.

Supervisor Davis asked if Mr. Fuller was willing and qualified to present and defend his review in a public hearing.

Mr. Fuller said yes.

Attorney Need asked if Mr. Fuller had ever done work for the Levy company, Burroughs Mining, or related entities.

Mr. Fuller said not as far as he knows.

Attorney Need asked if Mr. Fuller had worked with Andrew Reed and Associates.

Mr. Fuller said he had, clarifying that the client was ITC.

Attorney Need confirmed that Mr. Fuller does not do contingent fee work for this type of assignment and referenced the flat-fee proposal.

Mr. Fuller said correct.

Attorney Need asked if Mr. Fuller would provide written conflict disclosures.

SPRINGFIELD
CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

Mr. Fuller said yes.

Attorney Need asked whether Mr. Fuller would agree to maintain a written communications protocol and keep a record of all materials reviewed, given the unique approach where the county board delegated authority to retain and supervise experts.

Mr. Fuller said he could do that, noting that discussions often happen over the phone and his record is typically his notes.

Special Counsel Fisher asked about milestones of value impacts, such as announcements, permitting, and the start of operations, and what timing carries the most impact.

Mr. Fuller said the data tells you if there is an impact, noting the township is early relative to operations. He paralleled eminent domain cases where announcements affect markets and said these analyses are difficult; temporary effects are hard to determine and often not realized until the marketplace shows the impact.

Counsel Fisher referenced Sharon Township's experience where people began moving based on expectations of approval during the township process.

Mr. Fuller said in eminent domain contexts you often disregard speculative actions when appraising for a taking, and that this scenario is different; he was unsure if the Reed study addressed announcement impacts.

Supervisor Davis asked whether Mr. Fuller had done work for Springfield Township.

Mr. Fuller confirmed he has done work regarding parcels in the Shiawassee Reserve Basin.

Attorney Need asked what data sources Mr. Fuller would use to validate sales used in the Levy report.

Mr. Fuller said he would go directly to the MLS and, if necessary, contact agents.

Attorney Need asked how he identifies arms-length sales.

Mr. Fuller said agent discussions are most important; ideally, you would talk to both parties.



Attorney Need asked how he would account for seller concessions or atypical financing.

Mr. Fuller said he would compare interest rates and terms to commonly available lending, citing land contracts at 11 percent versus typical rates and noting that such differences can signal above arms-length pricing.

Attorney Need asked whether Mr. Fuller creates a log of all sales considered.

Mr. Fuller said typically no, unless necessary, but confirmed he would be willing to in this situation.

Supervisor Davis asked how Mr. Fuller would determine whether the applicant's matched pairs are sufficiently similar and whether adjustments or matching logic are supported and consistent.

Mr. Fuller said he would place comparisons on a grid similar to a residential grid so mismatches would show.

Supervisor Davis raised the applicant's use of "statistically insignificant" and asked what exact test assumptions and reporting must be present, citing confidence intervals, p-values, sample size, adequacy, power, and detectability.

Mr. Fuller stated p-values are important and he has used them in past analyses. He gave an example involving gas station site zoning influences and said he had loaded data into a multiple regression model, finding high p-values for certain statistics that suggested direct influence. He cautioned against overconfidence with statistics and emphasized reliability improves with larger samples. S

Supervisor Davis asked how Mr. Fuller would characterize claims of statistical insignificance if the report does not disclose necessary tests.

Mr. Fuller said he might go further and load the data into a model to test the claim.

Attorney Need agreed and suggested loading the data to see if the claim holds.

Counsel Fisher asked about selected comparison areas like haul route impact and mine adjacency, and whether Mr. Fuller has criteria to determine whether controls truly match housing stock and baseline markets, considering price levels, school districts, and sensitivity.

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

Mr. Fuller said yes, adding that downwind exposure is generally east and north of the property most of the year and it would be interesting to assess whether the study's comparisons are consistent with such factors.

Counsel Fisher asked how Mr. Fuller would test whether selected areas and time windows bias outcomes, and whether he would be able to do that.

Mr. Fuller said he did not know if there was enough data, noting his limited review and the presence of three areas. He said his father is well experienced with statistical questions and may be able to assist. Mr. Fuller reiterated that temporary impacts are difficult to address and prove, and that impacts may change when pits are played out.

Supervisor Davis noted that Waterstone was built across from the mine subsequent to the mine's opening, making it an unfair comparison to the township's situation.

Counsel Fisher referenced the Ray Road plant and asked whether the study adequately separates general market movement, interest rates, macro trends, neighborhood changes, and mine haul route externalities.

Mr. Fuller cautioned not to expect too much, noting data with multiple variables has a lot of noise.

Counsel Fisher asked if Mr. Fuller would separate properties adversely impacted based on mine and haul route connections versus those impacted for other reasons.

Mr. Fuller replied he could review the proposal and give preliminary thoughts but cautioned that the analysis would be interesting and may become costly.

Supervisor Davis explained there are properties abutting the proposed mine, on the proposed haul route, and with dual exposure, and asked if Mr. Fuller would differentiate.

Mr. Fuller agreed that a generic approach would not work and said specifics are more difficult due to gradations and transition areas where clear lines are absent.

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

Counsel Fisher mentioned very short setbacks along Ormond Road and suggested analyzing impacts there.

Mr. Fuller said typical finance appraisals do not dig into setback problems and that standard appraisal forms do not include adjustments for setbacks.

Counsel Fisher described specific impacts such as noise from trucks rumbling close to roads, potential house vibration depending on soil and age, and noted foundation weaknesses in older homes.

Attorney Need asked how Mr. Fuller would analyze assumptions about haul routes near intersections, climate sensitivity, and mine effects in the applicant report.

Mr. Fuller said he would first check for errors but suggested starting with an automated valuation model like those found in real sources to see whether such models predict different results from Reed's model.

Attorney Need asked how properties with dual exposure to haul route and mine proximity would be addressed.

Mr. Fuller said with true paired comparisons the impact should be observable to the extent it exists and cautioned that combined factors are not necessarily additive; for example, a 5 percent haul route effect and a 10 percent mine effect could combine to 12 percent rather than 15 percent.

Attorney Need asked whether Mr. Fuller would develop GIS-based exposure maps to test property classification accuracy.

Mr. Fuller said if deeper analysis is needed, either clearly refuting or confirming the study's findings through modeling, then they would look more closely at individual property aspects but advised against spending heavily to search for a needle in a haystack without reason.

Supervisor Davis asked about evaluating incremental outcomes versus distance gradients, including outcomes by distance from the mine boundary versus excavation and processing boundaries, and key operational points like entrances and loadouts.

SPRINGFIELD
CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

Mr. Fuller said if relevant, but noted boundaries are often not known to market participants and such information is rarely accessed in studies.

Supervisor Davis asked what distance bands Mr. Fuller would use and whether alternate banding would be tested.

Mr. Fuller said he would test whether different conclusions arise from the given pairs and noted that conclusions may change over time.

Supervisor Davis cited the 477-acre property with roughly 200 acres to be mined and expected durations around five years to remove material and an overall twenty-year operation.

Mr. Fuller said timing of mining depends partly on market demand for gravel and is a difficult question for firm answers, suggesting probabilities rather than absolutes. He said if mining will operate for twenty years and active mining near a given property will not occur for fifteen years, the comparative context and timing relative to study properties become important.

Supervisor Davis asked whether Mr. Fuller would test for a threshold distance beyond which effects are not detectable and report detectability limits, such as at two miles.

Mr. Fuller said he would like to do that but did not know if sufficient data would be available and noted he might run a regression model that includes distances and directions from active mining. He warned that once many variables are included, forty or fifty, the combinations and probabilities become astronomical, limiting practical conclusions.

Counsel Fisher asked about signals or indicators of marketability showing reduced marketability due to mining and whether Mr. Fuller would look for such signals.

Mr. Fuller recommended first seeing whether models predict outcomes different from matched pairs and said beyond that they might look further at variables and individual circumstances of affected properties, such as distance and direction from active mining. He reiterated the importance of location, noting three location variables are already present, and said probabilities multiply as variables increase. He confirmed that those indicators would be sought in the field and suggested an efficient approach that starts with model results and then focuses where cost efficiency suggests.

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

Counsel Fisher asked whether contextual property differences, like subdivision lots versus acreage and ranch versus colonial styles, would be relevant.

Mr. Fuller agreed and noted the study's use of price per square foot, which is appropriate within residential contexts, but cautioned that comparing subdivision lots to ten-acre parcels on price per square foot is not valid and is an obvious issue to address.

Attorney Need asked how clustering multiple sales in the same subdivision would be interpreted.

Mr. Fuller said that would be a good direction.

Attorney Need asked whether sensitivity tests such as alternate time breakpoints, distance bands, and controls would be used.

Mr. Fuller reminded that he is reviewing a study, not conducting a new one, and said he would look for weaknesses in the model but could not answer specifics without basic groundwork.

Attorney Need asked whether Mr. Fuller would provide a reproducible workflow narrative and a clear list of proprietary inputs.

Mr. Fuller said MLS is proprietary but public facing; recent lawsuits changed commission structures, but he typically has no difficulty expressing MLS results in reports and that it is in realtors' interest to present accurate data.

Supervisor Davis asked whether the final report would clearly separate the credibility of the applicant's study from any additional independent analysis Mr. Fuller performs.

Mr. Fuller said he could make a statement regarding whether he found the conclusions credible.

Supervisor Davis asked whether Mr. Fuller would provide an executive summary suitable for the public record and a technical appendix with methods, assumptions, registers, and exclusion logs.

Mr. Fuller said he could. Supervisor Davis asked whether Mr. Fuller would avoid absolute statements where data is limited and instead report ranges, detectability limits, and uncertainty. Mr. Fuller said that could be expected.

SPRINGFIELD
CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

Supervisor Davis asked whether Mr. Fuller was willing to present findings and answer questions in a public setting.

Mr. Fuller said yes.

Supervisor Davis asked who would perform the work, noting Mr. Fuller had mentioned his father and asking whether his father would be part of it and whether qualifications could be provided.

Mr. Fuller said he could provide those.

Supervisor Davis asked about proposed scheduling and key milestones over the next few months.

Mr. Fuller said schedules are unpredictable. He noted a series of review appraisals and said he is pretty available in the next month, but from the next month through June he will be tied up, possibly through the end of June.

Supervisor Davis asked if Mr. Fuller was aware the application is on pause, and Mr. Fuller said yes and that he had been told timing was flexible.

Supervisor Davis concluded that they would develop a scope of work with back-and-forth among special counsel, township counsel, and himself.

Trustee Beatty asked, if given a study without looking at anyone else's, whether the analysis should show differences under the ordinance among potential uses, mine, farm, subdivision, apartments, or commercial, since any allowable use could change perceptions, and questioned how one can compare when you will never find an exact match, stressing zoning context.

Mr. Fuller said he did not know the zoning in Oxford or Highland and noted that properties abutting industrial zoning might show differences from residential values.

Trustee Beatty pressed on how the area is zoned specifically.

Mr. Fuller asked what the zoning is and was told R-1 and acknowledged the issue.

Trustee Beatty observed that laypersons will rely on perception, which is highly subjective.

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

Mr. Fuller agreed and noted limitations in what appraisers can convey compared to the past.

Trustee Beatty asked how one can conclude “no value impact” with so much subjectivity.

Mr. Fuller replied that with a large number of alternatives and variance, it is difficult to say one variable alone cause or does not cause problems.

Trustee Beatty contrasted rural contexts against built-up contexts like Novi, suggesting that rural areas lack deep layers of objective data and asked how to assign weights among limited factors.

Mr. Fuller said statistical study might help depending on variables present and offered classroom analogies about combinatorics to illustrate how quickly variables create enormous arrangement possibilities, concluding that variables should be kept to a minimum due to limits on what can be found or known.

Trustee Sclesky asked whether Mr. Fuller had done work in mining or equivalently close industries.

Mr. Fuller said he had worked on one pit in Berrien County, which was mined for gravel and then used for landfill, but that it would not be a good comparison.

Trustee Sclesky asked whether Mr. Fuller would look for a newly developing gravel pit just ahead of the township to get statistical data.

Mr. Fuller recommended first reviewing the study and seeing what the AVMs say, and recounted an example of a large gravel mine near I-75 and West Branch where MDOT paid for gravel under the road, explaining how court rulings involved gravel-in-place valuations and that casual analyses looked out fifty years, noting interest rate changes make long-horizon comparisons difficult and intervening variables complicate matched pairs.

Supervisor Davis said more questions would follow and that the applicant’s submission would be sent for Mr. Fuller’s review, noting this would take time to assemble.

Trustee Beatty asked about a reference to “Zillow” being used as a data source.

Mr. Fuller clarified he had mentioned an automated valuation model example, not Zillow as a source.

SPRINGFIELD
CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

Trustee Beatty asked whether title work is reviewed when verifying transactions through agents.

Mr. Fuller said title work is rarely seen and seldom supplied, and he did not think Realcomp provides title policy access because it belongs to the buyer.

Trustee Beatty noted title is public record and can show arms-length aspects; Mr. Fuller agreed title records are public but said the title policy itself lists permitted exceptions and many items' appraisers do not usually see.

Trustee Beatty noted that in rural appraisals with limited data, reports often weight house types like tri-level, ranch, and colonial, and suggested that in this case, geographically specific areas may be more important than residence types due to limited properties.

Mr. Fuller said location is a huge potential problem for reaching concrete conclusions and was unsure he followed entirely but agreed location is critical.

Trustee Beatty said that for Oxford mines, it would be relevant to see sales before and after the subdivision across the road.

Mr. Fuller asked whether the study lacked before-and-after spacing.

Trustee Beatty said the study did present before and after.

Supervisor Davis pointed out homes just north on Stony Lake and said he did not see that data factored when the mine started, which concerned him.

Mr. Fuller noted Stony Lake's sewer context and that sanitary sewers are a common issue in many areas.

Supervisor Davis summarized that the township has a long road to develop a feasible scope of work and based on the interview, they likely cannot model fully vetted data, but he believed they could produce a more realistic view than the applicant's skewed report.

Mr. Fuller said his letter had noted similar results, and that current AVM projections for those addresses indicate the same; if AVMs do not indicate the same, they could look deeper.

SPRINGFIELD
CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

Supervisor Davis invited comments from residents. Mr. Todd said no, sir. Mrs. Gruzin asked about the term temporary impact and the range considered temporary.

Mr. Fuller said temporary impact can be projected based on mine duration and end-state plans like residential development with utilities; for a property two years from the end of mining, impacts could be less than for one fifteen years away, and he cited eminent domain temporary takings where announced projects sometimes never occur, making prediction difficult. Mr. Fuller added he has appraised where roads go in the next year as well as situations where planned roads never materialize.

Supervisor Davis thanked everyone for coming and contributing and adjourned the meeting.

Danielle Sink, Recording Secretary/Supervisor's Assistant

Date

Approved By Ric Davis, Township Supervisor

Date

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

Dennis Stacherski Project Manager Interview

Springfield Township

12000 Davisburg Road, Davisburg, MI 48350

February 16, 2026

2:00 PM

PRESENT:

- Richard L. Davis, Township Supervisor
- Greg Need, Township Attorney
- Gerald Fisher, Township Special Council
- Dennis Stacherski, Resident
- Amanda Gruzin, Resident
- Chris Todd, Resident
- Kevin Sclesky, Township Trustee
- Lori Beatty, Township Trustee
- Danielle Sink, Supervisor's Assistant/Recording Secretary

Supervisor Davis opened the meeting by acknowledging Mr. Stacherski's earlier correspondence and explaining that the township is still in the early stages of the project.

Mr. Dennis Stacherski explained his background at General Motors in detail, describing decades of experience managing major industrial projects. He highlighted his involvement in large scale tooling installations, major plant conversions, and coordination with contractors and engineering firms. He also discussed his interactions with union leadership and the role of internal approvals within a corporate environment. His career history was extensive, and he provided several examples of working on long, complex projects requiring coordination across multiple teams.

As the discussion moved into how Mr. Stacherski would handle public sensitivity and the nature of township projects, Supervisor Davis began asking more situational questions.

Mr. Stacherski acknowledged that he had no direct experience working in the public sector. He stated that aspects of the role concerned him, including the level of public scrutiny, the likelihood of criticism, and the overall stress that comes with community involvement. He noted that at his age and stage of life, he takes these factors seriously. When asked about maintaining neutrality, he admitted that doing so would be difficult, as the Ormond Road project directly affects him. He explained that he sees the project as

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

having a negative personal impact, raising questions about whether he could separate his own perspective from the responsibilities of the role.

Throughout the interview, Supervisor Davis and other board members took time to clarify the township's obligations, explaining that unlike private companies, local governments must follow strict due process requirements. They emphasized that the township cannot take a predetermined position, guide a project toward a specific outcome, or shape decisions based on internal goals the way a corporation might. They also explained that public projects must remain open, transparent, and neutral, and that the board must allow information to develop before conclusions are drawn.

These explanations revealed gaps in Mr. Stacherski's understanding, particularly regarding how public sector projects differ from private industrial ones. Several times, Mr. Stacherski framed his responses around private sector decision making, suggesting that the township should establish an internal goal and work toward it, which board members explained was not legally permissible.

When asked about how he would establish schedules and manage project dependencies, Mr. Stacherski described general practices used in industrial project management. He outlined the need to identify an end date, list all required tasks, meet with the involved parties, and assign time frames. While his explanations covered the basics of schedule building, they did not address the complexities unique to working with regulatory agencies, public meetings, environmental reviews, or residents with differing views. When discussing early warning signs of schedule delays, he emphasized adherence to the schedule but did not provide examples relevant to the township's environment. In some areas, his responses remained vague, and he noted several times that he would need more information about the township's goals before determining whether he would even consider accepting the position.

During the interview, Supervisor Davis intervened when appropriate to guide the discussion back to relevant topics and to ensure that all remaining questions were addressed. His approach helped keep the interview grounded and moving efficiently, allowing other board members to raise their concerns as well.

Multiple members explained that Mr. Stacherski's experience, although significant, did not seem to align with the governmental setting of the project. They noted that his comments suggested misunderstandings about the township's process and about the stage the project is currently in. They also shared concerns that his private sector background had not prepared him for the legal, procedural, and public facing aspects of the role.

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

As these points became clearer, the board reached a general consensus that Mr. Stacherski did not demonstrate the fit needed for a public sector project manager. They acknowledged his decades of experience and thanked him for his honesty, but the discussion made it evident that he lacked familiarity with due process requirements, the need for complete neutrality, and the unique expectations of public sector project oversight.

Mr. Stacherski stated that he understood their position and expressed appreciation for the opportunity to interview.

Supervisor Davis concluded the meeting respectfully, with no further action taken regarding his candidacy.

Danielle Sink, Recording Secretary/Supervisor's Assistant

3/11/24

Date

Approved By Ric Davis, Township Supervisor

3/11/24

Date

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

Levy Kickoff Meeting

Springfield Township

12000 Davisburg Road, Davisburg, MI 48350

April 8, 2026

10:00 AM

TOWNSHIP PRESENT:

Richard L. Davis, Township Supervisor
Sarah Richmond, Parks and Rec Director
Greg Need, Township Attorney
Gerald Fisher, Township Special Council
Kevin Sclesky, Township Trustee
Megan Masson-Minock, Township Planner
Brian Galley, Planning Chairperson
Danielle Sink, Supervisor's Assistant/Recording Secretary

OTHER'S PRESENT:

Reuben Maxbauer, Levy
Tom Green, Levy
Stephen Estey, Zausmer
Irit Walters, Zausmer
Bob Doyle, Smithgroup
Danielle Amber, Ramboll
Scott Hayter, Ramboll
Amanda Gruzin, Resident
Chris Todd, Resident

Supervisor Davis opened the meeting at 10:00 AM on April 8, 2026, welcoming everyone and framing the purpose of the gathering: the formal kickoff of the review process for the Burroughs's mining application and the associated special land use permit. Supervisor Davis emphasized

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

structure, transparency, and the meticulous framework needed to move the township through a process as complex and sensitive as the proposed mining operation.

Supervisor Davis walked the group through the actions already completed, noting that the Township Board had approved bringing on Special Counsel Jerry Fisher to work with him and Township Counsel Greg Need to interview and hire the expert consultants required for the technical review. After an extensive vetting process, Ramboll had been selected, with their scope of work carefully outlined, approved, and thoroughly reviewed by counsel. Supervisor Davis explained that the Township had already analyzed the initial submission from the mining company, identified gaps, and requested additional information. Rather than sending material in small fragments, Levy chose to send the information in larger, more coherent groups over time, which Supervisor Davis suggested would aid in maintaining efficiency and clarity.

Supervisor Davis noted that during the upcoming Board meeting, approval would be sought to bring on senior planner Megan Masson-Minock as the Township's planning consultant for the project. He described how Planner Masson-Minock would serve as a project manager and primary coordinator moving forward. To ensure the integrity of the Planning Commission's role, he emphasized that decisions and evaluations would shift fully to the Planning Commission, with Chairperson Brian Galley and Planning Commissioner/Trustee Kevin Sclesky to begin preparing recommendations in coordination with Planner Masson-Minock, Ramboll, and legal counsel. Supervisor Davis stated he would be stepping back from any frontline involvement beyond coordination, allowing the Planning Commission to operate independently while still supported by necessary resources.

Ramboll's team, led by Scott Hayter and Danielle Amber, described their proposal and their technical team. Mr. Hayter noted that he would remain as project director, but that Ms. Amber would manage the review itself. The review would be comprehensive, with experts dedicated to groundwater, hydrogeology, stormwater and surface water, air emissions, noise and vibration, ecological and wildlife factors, traffic impacts, reclamation, and post-mining land use. Ms. Amber asked for conformation that additional data from the applicant was expected as early as May. She continued that once Ramboll reviewed the full set of documents, they would produce a technical memorandum summarizing findings, adequacy, and any recommended further action.

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

She also noted that Ramboll would be prepared to communicate their findings both to Township officials and the broader community in accessible formats.

Supervisor Davis emphasized that before any deliverables could be released publicly, they needed to be shared with the mining company for review and comment, as agreed under the escrow terms. He asked Attorney Need to restate this requirement, ensuring absolute clarity.

Attorney Need confirmed that while the Township was not obligated to modify documents based on the applicant's comments, the opportunity for the applicant to review drafts was required.

Supervisor Davis then committed to providing Ramboll with the escrow agreement to ensure everyone understood the expectations surrounding document handling. He then walked through the current communication channels, clarifying that information would flow directly to Chair Galley, Commissioner Sclesky, Planner Masson-Minock, and legal counsel.

Supervisor Davis returned to a guiding principle: the review must be driven by truth and fact, free from speculation or personal opinion. He noted that the Township must balance its obligation to protect property rights with its duty to the community's wellbeing, and said this in a way that conveyed both authority and earnest care for the community's trust in the process. Attorneys Need and Fisher agreed, and the Levy representatives affirmed their agreement with those values.

The discussion moved to the budget for Ramboll's proposal, approximately \$81,000, which would be presented to the Board for approval. Levy recommended waiting for their full submission before Ramboll invested heavily in review time, and Supervisor Davis agreed with that practical suggestion, while ensuring alignment with the Township's timeline. When discussing Ramboll's availability, Supervisor Davis confirmed that their projected late-summer and fall capacity matched the Township's anticipated schedule for receiving data.

The meeting shifted toward fieldwork plans, production well drilling, and coordination with regulatory agencies. Supervisor Davis referenced a letter from the Levy company confirming that EGLE and EPA had no concerns regarding proximity to the nearby Superfund site.

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

Supervisor Davis added that coordination was underway with Chief Covey and the Fire Department since the well would ultimately serve fire suppression needs.

Commissioner Sclesky and Chairperson Galley emphasized the importance of regular updates to the public, noting that residents had already responded positively to clear communication at recent meetings.

Supervisor Davis readily supported the idea of having Planner Masson-Minock to provide updates at each Planning Commission meeting.

When Chairperson Galley asked about placing updates as an agenda item, Attorney Need recommended doing so. Supervisor Davis noted that although the application had been paused for some time, the Township had always anticipated eventually moving into this structured, transparent communication phase.

As scheduling was discussed, Planner Masson-Minock suggested that the next meeting should take place roughly two weeks after the applicant's next major submission, ensuring consultants had adequate time to assess completeness first.

Supervisor Davis also confirmed that communications provided at Planning Commission meetings could be shared via the Supervisor's updates so the broader community would have access to the same information.

Supervisor Davis invited comments from residents, Chris Todd spoke briefly, saying they appreciated being able to observe the process and felt the Township was handling everything transparently and ethically.

Amanda Gruzin agreed and echoed Chris's remarks, confirming that from her perspective the Township was doing things the right way. She asked whether the office had received any calls about Ormond Road being reduced to one lane that morning, but otherwise said there was nothing more the Township needed to do to improve fairness or transparency.

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

Supervisor Davis reemphasized Springfield Township contains rare and sensitive natural assets, pristine prairie fens, complex hydrology, endangered species, and ecological systems that cannot be restored once disturbed.

With no further comments from staff, consultants, residents, or commissioners, Supervisor Davis closed the meeting at 10:42 AM.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Danielle Sink', is written over a horizontal line.

Danielle Sink, Recording Secretary/Supervisor's Assistant

4/17/26

Date

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ric Davis', is written over a horizontal line.

Approved By Ric Davis, Township Supervisor

4/17/26

Date

Meeting Agenda
Burroughs Mining Application and Special Land Use Permit Review Kickoff

Date: April 8, 2026 **Time:** 10 A.M.

Location: Civic Center

1. Call to Order

Supervisor Ric Davis.

2. Roll Call / Introductions

Introduction of attendees and participating representatives:

- Representative experts from Burroughs Mining Company
- Reuben Maxbauer
- Greg Need, Township Counsel
- Jerry Fisher, Special Counsel
- Brian Galley, Planning Commission Chair
- Kevin Sclesky, Planning Commissioner and Board Trustee
- Ric Davis, Township Supervisor
- Megan Masson-Minock, Senior Planner, Carlisle/Wortman
- Amanda Gruzin, Resident
- Chris Todd, Resident
- Representatives of Ramboll, Environmental Expert Review Firm
- Sarah Richmond

3. Purpose of Meeting

To formally initiate the review of the Burroughs Mining application and related special land use permit request, and to establish the structure, roles, review procedures, and project management framework for the process moving forward.

4. Review of Actions Completed to Date

- Summary of application submission and status
- Review of Township actions completed to date
- Summary of consultant selection and engagement
- Overview of preparatory legal, planning, and administrative steps already undertaken

5. Establishment of Review Structure

Discussion regarding the overall framework for the review process, including:

- Process organization and sequence of review

- Coordination among Township staff, consultants, legal counsel, Planning Commission leadership, and applicant representatives
- Expectations for communication, reporting, and procedural transparency
- Development of a clear structure for moving forward with a thorough review of the application

6. Project Leadership and Coordination

Discussion and confirmation of Megan Masson-Minock as Project Director for the review process.

Responsibilities to include:

- Working directly with Brian Galley and Kevin Sclesky
- Assisting in development of review materials and deliverables for the Planning Commission
- Coordinating planning, consultant, and procedural review tasks
- Helping organize timelines, milestones, and reporting expectations

7. Scope of Review and Deliverables

Discussion of the expected scope of review, including:

- Planning and zoning considerations
- Special land use standards
- Environmental and technical review components
- Legal and procedural considerations
- Identification of key deliverables to be prepared for the Planning Commission
- Establishment of review milestones and anticipated next phases

8. Environmental Expert Review

Presentation and discussion with representatives of Ramboll concerning:

- Their role as the Township's selected environmental expert review firm
- Proposed approach to technical and environmental review
- Coordination with Township leadership, planning staff, and legal counsel
- Preliminary identification of issues requiring further expert evaluation

9. Legal and Procedural Considerations

Discussion led by Township Counsel Greg Need and Special Counsel Jerry Fisher regarding:

- Applicable legal standards
- Special land use permitting procedures
- Due process requirements

- Hearing process considerations
- Maintenance of a fair, defensible, and transparent review record

10. Budget and Escrow Fund Discussion

Review and discussion of:

- Project budget considerations
- Escrow fund structure and administration
- Consultant and expert review costs
- Financial management procedures related to application review
- Process for tracking and authorizing review expenditures

11. Public Process and Community Considerations

Discussion regarding:

- Public transparency throughout the review process
- Role of resident input
- Communication expectations with the community
- Commitment to a careful, fact-based, and orderly process

12. Next Steps

- Identification of immediate action items
- Assignment of responsibilities
- Preliminary schedule for future meetings and review milestones
- Confirmation of anticipated deliverables for the Planning Commission

13. Closing Remarks

Closing comments by Supervisor Ric Davis and acknowledgment of participating attendees and consultants.

14. Adjournment

Sign-In Sheet

Event/Meeting Name: Levy Transition Meeting

Date: 4/8/26 Location: Springfield Township Conference Room

Name	Organization / Department	Phone Number	Email
REUBEN MAXBAUER	Levy	313 405 4255	RMAXBAUER@ LEVYNET.COM
Tom Green	Levy	313 690 0139	TGreen@ EDWILLEVY.NET
KEVIN Sulesky	Trustee	410-240-5107	LAKE8989 @COMCAST.NET
BRIAN OATLEY	P.C. Chairman	248-421-5266	brian@bairdbella.com
Amanda Grozin	Committee		
JERRY FISHER	Temp Spec. Legal Council	(248) 514-9814	Fisherj@ cooley.edu
Megan Masson-Minock	Parlisle Wortman	(734) 602-2200, ext 115	mumasson-minock@ cwa-plan.com
Danielle SINK RIC DAVIS			
Steven It			
irit Walters			
Bob Doyle			
Sarah Richmond	parks		

blue
shaved
head

Dark
(man-blue)
Sincere
(women)
(man
blue)

Resident Fact-Finding Committee Update

As part of our ongoing effort to ensure a transparent and thorough review of the Levy Burroughs Mining Application, I have organized a Resident Fact-Finding Group comprised of individuals with relevant knowledge, experience, and a shared commitment to the well-being of Springfield Township.

This group has been assembled to assist in evaluating the proposed mining activity from a community-based perspective, guided by science, local insight, and a strong sense of stewardship. I'd like to introduce two residents who have graciously volunteered their time and expertise:

Kara Okonewski, Oko Environmental, LLC

Kara brings more than 14 years of experience in environmental education, scientific research, and public outreach. Her professional background includes wildlife surveys, habitat restoration, native species assessments, and project work in ecologically sensitive environments.

Kara has chosen to participate on a volunteer basis and will not accept any township funds. Her decision to remain fully independent ensures her contributions are based solely on scientific integrity and free from outside influence. We appreciate her dedication to supporting this process in a transparent and impartial manner.

Chris Todd, Springfield Township Resident

Chris has lived in Springfield Township for over a decade and currently resides on Ormond Road near the entrance to the proposed mining site. His family has owned the property since 1971, and it holds significant generational value as his grandparents previously lived there.

In addition to his long-standing connection to the area, Chris serves as Pastor of Oxbow Lake Baptist Church in White Lake Township. He brings a thoughtful, community-minded perspective to the group, grounded in both local history and leadership experience. Chris is also volunteering his time and has declined any compensation from the township.

Both Kara and Chris will assist in asking the hard questions of our experts, ensuring that the review process is not only technically sound but also well grounded in resident participation. Their involvement helps guarantee that this review reflects the concerns and priorities of those who live here.

Call for Additional Volunteers

We are continuing to seek residents who are willing to contribute their time and experience to assist in this fact-finding process. If you have a relevant background or simply a strong interest in contributing to an informed and balanced review, please reach out. Community participation is essential to maintaining a fair and transparent process.

This group is not designed to promote any specific agenda. Its purpose is to gather information, ask critical questions, and ensure residents are well-informed as we move forward.

Thank you, as always, for your ongoing support and positive involvement in shaping the future of Springfield Township.

Dear Committee Members,

I hope this message finds you well.

This is confirmation of our upcoming Fact-Finding Committee Meeting scheduled for Thursday, September 25, 2025, and a warm thank you to each of you for your willingness to participate in this important process. Your time and insights are genuinely appreciated as we work together to gather accurate information and develop thoughtful recommendations for the benefit of our Springfield Township community.

Invited Members Only:

Mike Wilzenski

Brian O'Mara

Amanda Gruzin

Kara Okonewski

Chris Todd

Kevin Sclesky

We'll use this meeting to review current materials, clarify any outstanding questions, and determine next steps to ensure transparency, accountability, and community input throughout the process.

I've attached the agenda for the meeting tomorrow for your review. Please feel free to reach out if you have any questions or if there's anything you'd like to add.

Thank you again for your commitment to community service and thoughtful governance.

Best regards,
Ric Davis

AGENDA

FACT FINDING COMMITTEE

September 25, 2025

1. Call to Order

- a) Welcome and Opening Remarks
- b) Roll Call and Introductions

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- a) Overview of the Fact-Finding Committee's role in the land use review process
- b) Statement of intent to uphold transparency, objectivity, and public trust
- c) **Meeting Objective:**
These initial meetings are focused on gathering verified data and expert findings that will inform a future review by the **Planning Commission**. The materials developed, including technical analysis, committee discussions, and resident input—will be provided to the Planning Commission along with a formal response from the **Levy Company**. This work is intended to support the continuation of the **open public hearing**, where the Planning Commission, the applicant, and our experts will engage in a transparent, fact-based exchange of questions and answers from a full public view.
- d) **Role of the Committee:**
It is critical that all committee members understand that this process is designed to **provide technical expertise, talking points, and a factual foundation** for the Planning Commission. The authority to approve or deny the application lies with the **Township Board**, which will weigh the **Planning Commission's recommendation** as part of its final decision. The best way to protect our community is to **follow the process**, remain **fact-driven**, and ensure that we have done our best to provide the Planning Commission with a complete, accurate, and unbiased work product.

3. Instructions to the Fact-Finding Committee

- a) **Review of Committee Responsibilities**
The committee is responsible for conducting a neutral, evidence-based review of the materials, expert input, and community concerns associated with the application. The authority to make a final decision lies with the **Township Board**, which will weigh the **Planning Commission's recommendation** as part of its deliberation. The best way to protect our community is to follow the process with integrity and ensure that we remain fully **fact-driven** throughout. Our responsibility is to assemble and present **verifiable, unbiased information** to support a transparent, well-informed review and help the Planning Commission carry out its duties with confidence and clarity.
- b) **Participation and Conduct Guidelines**
All members are expected to engage professionally, respectfully, and without bias. The committee must not enter this process with any predetermined outcome in mind—either

for or against the application. Personal opinions, outside pressure, and emotional arguments must not interfere with the **fact-finding mission**. The credibility of this process, and ultimately any decision made by the Township Board, depends on our collective commitment to **truth, transparency, and fairness**.

c) **Timeline and Expectations for Current and Future Work**

This meeting is one in a series of sessions aimed at building the factual foundation necessary for a well-informed public hearing. The committee will continue to meet to review expert findings, resident input, and documentation submitted by the applicant. The goal is to deliver a full set of facts, questions, and recommendations that the Planning Commission can use as a basis for continuing the public hearing in a structured and transparent way.

4. Expert Assignments and Presentations

a) **Overview of Expert Tasks**

Technical consultants **Brian O'Mara** and **Mike Wilzenski** were assigned to review the **property owner's application** and the **Planning Consultant's evaluation**, with a specific focus on identifying any **missing, incomplete, or deficient testing results** within the submitted materials.

b) **Expert Presentations**

Each expert will present their findings and explain in detail:

- a. What deficiencies were identified
- b. Why these items are important and necessary
- c. How these findings protect the community and our natural environment
- d. How the findings support the legal review process

These presentations are intended to assist **Township Counsel and Special Counsel** in determining whether the identified deficiencies represent **legal requirements** within the application process.

c) **Supervisor-Led Discussion with Experts**

The Township Supervisor will facilitate a structured discussion with the experts to clarify findings, explore key issues, and highlight any areas that require further review.

5. Resident Questions and Comments

- a) Resident members of the Fact-Finding Committee will be invited to ask questions and provide comments following the expert presentations and Supervisor's discussion.
- b) All input will be recorded for the formal record and considered in future work and recommendations.

6. Group Discussion: Ideas for Moving Forward

- a) The Supervisor will open the floor for a collaborative discussion among **experts, resident participants, and the Supervisor** to explore ideas and feedback on next steps.
- b) This session will help shape the committee's direction and ensure that community concerns are integrated into the process moving forward.

7. Direction for Next Tasks

- a) Based on the content of the group discussion, the **Supervisor will provide Brian O'Mara and Mike Wilzenski** with specific directions on their **next assignments**.
- b) These tasks will be used to prepare for the next committee meeting and to continue developing a complete and accurate record for Planning Commission review.

8. Summary and Next Steps

- a) Recap of findings, input, and discussion points
- b) Review of follow-up assignments and action items
- c) Confirmation of next meeting date and timeline for deliverables

9. Adjournment

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP

SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX



FACT-FINDING COMMITTEE

SPRINGFIELD TOWNSHIP

12000 Davisburg Road, Davisburg, MI 48350

Thursday, September 25, 2025

11:00 A.M.

The meeting was called to order at 11:00 A.M. by Supervisor Davis

MEMBERS PRESENT: Richard L. Davis, Township Supervisor
Kevin Sclesky, Township Trustee/Planning Commissioner

RESIDENTS PRESENT: Amanda Gruzin
Kara Okonewski
Chris Todd

OTHERS PRESENT: Mike Wilczynski, Pangea Environmental LLC
Joelle Talerico, Clerk's Assistant/Recording Secretary

ABSENT: Brian O'Mara, Pangea Environmental LLC

Supervisor Davis stated that this is a follow-up to the task that was given to Mike and Brian of the review of the Levy application and review Giffels Webster review of the Levy application. Their job was to investigate what was missed in both reports, what needs further evaluation, and what needs further testing. The township will provide all of the information provided by Mike and Brian to the township attorney's to see if the township can legally compel Levy to provide the missing data. If they are not legally obligated, then it will be negotiated to see if they are willing to supply any missing data. In the township's escrow agreement with Levy, it stipulates that none of the information provided by Mike or Brian can be released to the public until Levy reviews it. However, the township is under no obligation to respond to what they say or any changes that they want to make to the report. The township's goal is to prepare and provide the Planning Commission with all information in order to continue the Public Hearing and make a best decision.

Mike Wilczynski started with his review of the Levy application and Giffels Webster's review of the application by stating that the Zausmer PC application did not contain much information so they review HLA's Geological evaluation, FISHBEKs traffic impact study, alternate route studies, tech memos, Giffels Websters plan review and Smith Group's supplemental information and federal level standards of dust control from an unknown source. They fact checked with EGLE wetland viewer, water well viewer, water withdrawal assessment tool, and geo web face. This are all public domain websites from the state of Michigan. Based on their review they came up with a tentative list of things that need to be addressed by the township to follow the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act for the extraction of non-metallic minerals. They also drove the proposed haul route to witness real life traffic. The extraction of non-metallic minerals are permitted by local government and there are very specific reasons that a mine can be denied. Their review focused on these very serious consequences.

Supervisor Davis asked if he has a list of reasons that the township can't deny a mine for.

Mike stated that there are many reasons that the township couldn't deny a mine.

Supervisor Davis asked if having 200 signs throughout the community could justify a denial.

Mike stated this would fall under community involvement and interest with the community either supporting the mine or the community not wanting a mine because it doesn't fall in the character of the community, which could be included as a very serious consequence. He continued with his review by stating that the way the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act works is to take the need of the material and potential value and weigh that against the very serious consequences. The more valuable and need the material are, the more you are willing to put up with to get those. The value is hard to dispute because there is gravel everywhere in this area. The need only showed the 2016 MDOT study, which has since potentially been pulled. Therefore, they haven't addressed a legitimate need. He feels a needs analysis could be done, which could fall under a market analysis also. He stated that property values were not addressed along the mine or the haul route, where property values are considered a very serious consequence.

Supervisor Davis asked where to get these studies.

Mike stated that he can supply them. There have been studies done for Richland Township. He noted that there are studies done by Fenix Group by the aggregate group that's going to show that there is no devaluation. But sites are set up for a Midwest residential area and common sense will say that property values will go down which in turn will effect tax revenues and development.

Supervisor Davis reminded him that opinions need to be based on studies.

Mike stated that all of his opinions are based on studies that can be provided .

Supervisor Davis wanted to ensure that the studies can also be vetted.

Mike stated that he believes the Richland Township study has gone through court, but he will confirm with Special Counsel Fisher. He stated that a 2,000 acre mine was denied in Richland Township.

Supervisor Davis asked if this was the devaluation study was the deciding factor in the denial.

Mike stated no, there were other factors also.

Supervisor Davis stated he would like to know the other factors in the denial to see if there is a common denominator with the factual data.

Mike stated that Levy did not provide a property study and he considers this to be an essential study to deem a very serious consequences. He stated that it would be helpful to have a meeting with Levy to answer questions that he has about their mining operations.

Supervisor Davis stated that a meeting will be held with Levy's representative to have questions answered.

Mike continued with his review by stating that the traffic study submitted only includes volumes. It doesn't include line of sight or stopping distances, which needs to be included considering the haul route consists of hills, curves, at least one school, a youth camp, multiple hidden drive signs, and school bus routes. He stated that he followed a school bus and noticed that there are little to no shoulders on the road with the speed limit at 55mph. He stated that Levy needs to complete a traffic safety study.he continued by saying that dust is not properly addressed. He stated the EGLE permit does not require any air monitoring, this is why they stated they are going to mine under 2 million tons per year. If this is exceeded, an individual permit is needed, which would then require air monitoring.

Supervisor Davis asked if because EGLE doesn't require air monitoring for that amount, could this amount to a very serious consequence or does he feel this needs to be different. And is air monitoring something the township can legally compel them to do even if EGLE doesn't require it.

Mike stated he feels it needs to be different . he stated if a voluntary air monitoring could be negotiated, that would be in the best interest.

Supervisor Davis wants to ensure that only topics that the township can legally compelled of Levy be discussed right now, all other topics can be discussed at another time as a back-up option.

Mike reminded Supervisor Davis that the burden of proof falls on the applicant, not on the township.the township needs to come up with a potential concern that there will be a very serious consequence, the burden of proof falls on the applicant to address that concern and prove there will be no serious consequence.

Supervisor Davis stated this can be discussed with Special Counsel Fisher.

Mike continued by saying that the township may want to consider asking Levy if they will submit dust or air quality data from their other mines, as they may do their own independent air monitoring. Another issue he say in the application is that it's stated as wet mining, but it isn't, as the first several years are going to be dry mining until they hit the water table. The noise and vibration study that Levy submitted only studied noise from traffic. He feels there needs to be data regarding gravel trains and the noise they will produce. The data that he has reviewed has shown between 80-85 decibels, which he feels is high.

Mike highlighted which studies need to be provided by Levy:

1. Property devaluation study – none provided
2. Traffic safety study – none provided
3. Noise and vibration study – Levy only noted noise from cars; need noise produced by gravel trains and noise produced by mine. Vibration and energy produced by gravel trains that would transfer through the soil and effect foundation of homes
4. Geologic cross sections of mine – none provided
5. Water records for surrounding wells (approx. ½ mile) – none provided
6. Water samples from current test wells – none provided; need to test for arsenic and nitrates. Samples needed from wells of various depths

He summarized what a cross section is by stating the ground is an intermix of sand, gravel, and clays in layers. A boring log is used to determine what each layer consists of. He stated that there have been drillings done on this property by HLA and Barr, but none have put together a geologic cross section. Once a cross section is done and the data is analyzed, it needs to be tied in to surface water to see the relationship between the surface water and the ground water.

Trustee Sclesky asked is this could be determined by the test wells.

Mike stated yes, but he wouldn't want to use all of the wells to determine that data. He suggested using the wells from the HLA study to see what aquifers may be impacted. Once this is done, ground water testing should be done. A ground water test consists of taking a sample of the ground water from a well and sending it to a lab to be analyzed. He suggested testing the ground water for Arsenic; pumping of water from the mine could then distribute it to surrounding ground water. It is illegal to move contaminated ground water so you would need to know the concentration of arsenic to determine if this could be an area of concern.

Supervisor Davis asked how would the township know if the ground water sample that Levy provides is unbiased data.

Mike stated they would need to be trusted or there would need to be oversite from the EPA. He suggested going out to the property to watch them pull a sample from the well.

Supervisor Davis asked if the sample would then be tested at an independent company.

Mike stated yes and there would be a chain of custody throughout the whole testing process.

Mike continued by saying that he also suggests testing the ground water for Nitrates; agricultural lands use fertilizer which are nitrates, which can cause elevated levels in shallow ground water and therefore causing nitrate contamination to the aquafer.

Supervisor Davis asked if the cross section study would also show the porosity of the soil, which could then determine if contaminants are reaching the aquafer.

Mike stated yes, cross sections would be helpful with showing this data. The cross section study will also help them determine which well to test based on the amount of clay versus sand and the depth of each well.

Supervisor Davis stated that Oakland County keeps records of arsenic in the county and asked if this would be sufficient data.

Mike stated no, site specific data is needed.

Supervisor Davis asked if there would be a benefit to getting Oakland County's data for the wells that are already there and in the surrounding area.

Mike stated yes. He suggested Levy be tasked with doing this. He continued by saying that cross sections need to be provided before doing a pumping test (draw-down test). This would help to determine whether tapping into an aquafer will effect another aquafer in a different area and also help to determine if it will drain any wetlands. Draining any regulated wetlands is illegal. He stated that Levy may already have a cross section study but hasn't submitted it. He highlighted that when sand and gravel is present by glacial outwash, it is the prime location for a mine. It is also what creates aquifers, wetlands, and lakes. Therefore, ground water and surface water are related and connect. In Michigan ground water typically discharges to surface water, an example would be surface water flowing into a lake. Spring water is different because there is pressure from a confining layer below. An opening would then allow the spring to come to the surface because it is under a higher pressure than the surface.

Mike continued by saying that a cross section study is also important because boring data needs to be analyzed at the proposed depth of the mine. He stated that he did not see in his review what the total depth of the mine would be.

Supervisor Davis asked him if there is any data available that shows the consequence of a mine on the geology in an area.

Mike stated yes. He was involved with a mine review in Ann Arbor Township that shows similar data.

Trustee Sclesky asked if the mine in Ann Arbor was similar to the proposed Springfield Township mine.

Mike stated yes, but he doesn't see much concern for the amount of water they are proposing to be pumping and having affects on wells running dry. He stated that 30 gallons per minute is not much of a concern to him. But it all depends on the mine, for an example he stated that a different mine used ground water as a carriage material to carry the material around so they don't have to use a truck. Water can also be run throughout the mine to minimize the dust. He highlighted that this isn't a close-looped system as Levy states, because they will be moving water from one aquafer and discharging it into another aquafer. This would be especially concerning if there was arsenic present. Levy stated their production well will be beneath the clay layer, but he is unsure how deep that is. If there is contaminated surface water, they would then be discharging it into a deeper aquafer. This is why testing for arsenic will be critical. If testing shows no arsenic levels, then this concern doesn't need to be explored further. But if arsenic is detected, then further analysis will be needed.

Trustee Sclesky asked if the decades use of that property for farming and agriculture will have an impact on the ground water.

Mike stated yes, it could prove there are nitrates present. This is why a cross section study will be crucial.

Supervisor Davis asked Mike if he is familiar with any instance where Levy provided false data or studies.

Mike stated he has not worked with Levy close enough to know that but is aware of a lawsuit in Detroit regarding air quality and EGLE permitting. He stated that he did not find anything misleading with their application here in Springfield and noted that Barr is a reputable company. He continued his review with Levy's reclamation plan stating that they are proposing around \$1,500 per acre, he feels this is not accurate and they need to provide a true cost estimate and a site specific reclamation plan. He stated that he is concerned their lake is no big enough for all the homes they are proposing unless they are planning on having a waste water managing plant or community plant.

Supervisor Davis asked about the high-capacity well for the draw-down. They are proposed 500 gallons per minute.

Mike stated that a well that is able to pump 500 gpm then an EGLE process will need to be done.

Supervisor asked if for their reclamation plan, would it be better to have 80 wells for the proposed number of houses, or to have a high-capacity well that serves as a community well.

Mike stated that either would work and all depends on the site specific aquifer. He is more concerned about the septic systems.

Supervisor Davis stated that a community waste water system would then be needed.

Mike stated yes, especially for homes around a lake. He continued his review by noting that an expert will be needed for Flora and Fauna, as this could prove to be a very serious consequence. He stated that he can look into the wetland delineation, but suggested bringing in an ecologist to review what Levy has submitted. As activity on the property could impact the flora and fauna of adjacent properties. He continued by saying that more information is needed from Levy on how they are going to process the sand and gravel, the management of the overburden, and how they are going to operate. The material that cannot be processed, also known as slim, is left behind. He wants to know what their plan is for the slim and how they are planning on managing it. He stated that a meeting with Levy will be very beneficial to resolve questions and get answers.

Supervisor Davis invited the residents to ask questions.

Amanda stated that the review from Giffels Webster states that they did request a property value study and asked if this was already in the works.

Supervisor Davis stated that he was given a property value study but was told to not release it to the public yet.

Amanda asked if the township uses a third party for a property devaluation study, would the Levy escrow money cover the cost.

Supervisor Davis stated It depends on the expert. They are reluctant to provide compensation out of the escrow account to individual experts. They want to utilize larger companies.

Amanda asked what the difference is between air quality monitoring and dust control and asked for clarification on if Levy is exempt from dust control because they are under the 2 million mark.

Mike stated that they are stating they will not be exceeding the amount that would otherwise require an air quality permit. The general permit states that there will not be an increase to the opacity of the air by a certain percentage. A fugitive dust control plan is being used and this will be how they control the dust. He has suggested in other communities that they install their own air quality monitors through the purple air monitoring network. There is a standard for silica in Michigan, but the gravel industry is exempt.

Supervisor Davis stated that this item could potentially be a negotiated item with Levy.

Trustee Sclesky asked how the gravel mining industry is exempt from silica dust.

Mike stated that they worked it into the law. Silica is not the only concern in dust, it's any particulate, including diesel particulates from the gravel trains.

Supervisor Davis stated that this must be proven and studies must be credible.

Mike stated that the EPA just lowered the amount of air particulates in the air from 12 micrograms per cubic meter to 9 micrograms per cubic meter.

Kara Okonewski stated that in the Zausmer report, it was stated that their primary customer (their need) is Ace Asphalt, which is owned by Levy. She feels it is a conflict that their customer and supplier are one of the same.

Supervisor Davis stated that they are not determining need, the need is the market.

Kara stated that in their application they specifically stated their need is Ace Asphalt. She also noted that she believes that Levy didn't supply a more comprehensive and complete application is because they already have a gravel mine here, in which Springfield Township doesn't have much involvement in. She also noted that in real estate concerns, offers have already been pulled. She has proof of this, but stated that the people involved don't want that information public because it may hurt more of the potential resale.

Supervisor Davis stated that the signs could have been that deciding factor. He summarized his plans for the signs as he feels the signs are hurting people in the community.

Trustee Sclesky agreed and stated that he has clients that won't consider looking in this area because of the signs.

Amanda stated that she has discussed this with STEP and noted that she is trying to pivot the energy to other potential developments that could come to Springfield Township in the future.

Mike stated that in the Zoning Enabling Act, in non-metallic minerals, it clearly states the reasons that a mine could be denied.

Kara asked if an EGLE permit can be obtained before the application is approved, due to the EPA flagging this as a red file and the involvement of the US Fisheries and Wildlife. This would give the township more time and could free up some potential costs.

Mike recommended that township's require all state permits to be in-hand, as sometimes the work needed to obtain the state permit will show very serious consequences. He asked if the EPA has been involved due to the superfund site.

Kara stated because of the Poweshiek Skipperling and the Eastern Massasauga and other endangered species.

Chris Todd reiterated that he feels Levy isn't providing all the information up front and the township must ask for it, also because of the Holly Sand and Gravel mine in Springfield Township, he feels this is another reason why there isn't a full comprehensive application.

Kara stated that the Holly mine was approved in 2023 to expand their dredging lake, when it was stated that this mine was "dying". She wonders if the production of this mine could be verified.

Supervisor Davis stated that he is concerned this would create more issues. He recently found out that there is supposed to be an annual permit for this mine, but the previous administration grandfathered them in to allow them to forego the annual permit. He is consulting the township attorney on how to undo this.

Kara stated that in Levy's presentation to the township, they specifically stated that they need the Springfield Township mine because their other mines in the area are in their

Next Meeting: TBD

Adjourn: 12:50 P.M.



EXPERT INTERVIEW

SPRINGFIELD TOWNSHIP

12000 Davisburg Road, Davisburg, MI 48350

Tuesday, September 30, 2025

10:00 A.M.

PRESENT: Richard L. Davis, Township Supervisor
Sean R. Miller, Township Clerk
Sarah Richmond, Parks and Recreation Director

RESIDENTS PRESENT: Amanda Gruzin
Kara Okonewski
Chris Todd

OTHERS PRESENT: Dave Van Haaren, Triterra Environmental, Director
Meredeth Crane, Triterra Environmental, Natural Resources Division
Gerald Fisher, Township Special Counsel
Julia Upfal, Giffels Webster, Township Planning Consultant
Joelle Talerico, Clerk's Assistant/Recording Secretary

Supervisor Davis led this meeting by summarizing the interview process, stating that Ms. Upfal will provide an overview, followed by questions from him and Clerk Miller, legal questions from Special Counsel Fisher, a natural features overview and questions from Director Richmond, and the resident committee will have a chance to ask questions also. The end work product will be given to the Planning Commission for them to be able to review clear and specific data for approval or denial of the Levy mine application.

Ms. Upfal began her overview by stating that part of the proposed gravel mine property is in the Natural Resource Overlay District, therefore the applicant will need to survey and refine those boundaries based on the location of the natural resources. The original boundaries provided were based on the 2000 MNFI and will need to be updated based on today's wetlands, woodlands, wildlife habitat, etc. Triterra's task will be to review what the applicant presents. In addition, the applicant provided a natural resource study that reviews the different wetland and soil conditions and endangered species that are impacted by the development. There are recommendations in the study, and an expert needs to review these recommendations and determine if there are legitimate protections for the wildlife that would be impacted and the effects of the changes to the natural resources' boundary.

Dave Van Haaren introduced himself and stated that Triterra is a Michigan based company established in 2008. Their main headquarters is in Lansing with various offices in central Michigan. They service sectors relating to brownfield development, environmental due diligence, investigation and remediation, industrial hygiene, and natural resources. He has 30 years of experience in environmental consulting by starting out his career in environmental due diligence which evolved into grant projects and with a current focus on brownfield development.

Meredeth Crane introduced herself stating that her focus is natural resources with a primary focus on wetland delineation, wetland permitting, threatened and endangered species, water quality and stormwater concerns, and compliance with the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA), which covers a whole suite of environmental regulations. They are a pre-approved NEPA consultant for MISHDA and on their group-B list. They also handle environmental compliance for the MEDC.

Mr. Van Haaren stated that they welcome this process as they want to ensure they are the right fit for the township as well. They are going to look at the facts, look at policies, and see where they can best fit in.

Supervisor Davis asked if they have ever done work or been affiliated with the Edward C. Levy Corporation or Burroughs Mining.

Mr. Van Haaren stated no, as an individual nor as a company.

Supervisor Davis asked if they had been involved in any process where Levy was on the other side.

Mr. Van Haaren stated no.

Supervisor Davis asked how familiar they are with the unique environment in Springfield Township.

Ms. Crane stated that she doesn't have on-site knowledge of Springfield Township. Her group works within various natural communities and has more of Michigan's general natural community-based knowledge.

Supervisor Davis asked if she could still speak of the natural features in this community.

Ms. Crane stated yes, they are all within the MNFI natural community types which includes Prairie Fens. She knows that Springfield has a lot of unique features. She stated that one of the services they do provide, for example, when they are doing a wetland delineation, is a comparison to the MNFI to the township's natural community and map out the property for what each of those communities are and their basic boundaries.

Supervisor Davis stated that one of the concerns is that Springfield Township has a superfund site that has been tested for years. They are concerned about the proximity of the superfund site to the proposed gravel mining location. He asked if they could speak about any environmental impacts that a gravel mine would have on the superfund site.

Clerk Miller added that the superfund site sits approximately one mile southeast of the proposed mining site. From his understanding of reviewing EPA data, the water flows in a northwesterly direction from the superfund site to the proposed mine site.

Mr. Van Haaren stated that they could do a review of the superfund site to analyze groundwater contamination.

Clerk Miller added that the superfund site is historical, and it was originally thought it could be cleaned up within a short period of time but has now been going on for 50 years. He is concerned about any ground disturbance and the impact it would have on the aquifer.

Mr. Van Haaren stated this would be analyzed in a hydrology study but noted that they could be a resource to use when the township is working with a hydrologist from an environmental perspective. Ensuring that the mining won't exacerbate the conditions of the superfund site will be critical. How the mine is managed and how things are stored is important to note. This would also include excavations and mining and how this will affect ground water flow.

Special Counsel Fisher noted this mine will be dredging.

Ms. Crane stated this will probably show up in surface water, as Michigan has a lot of shallow ground water, so as they are excavating, they will create surface water of small lakes. This could be concerning in regard to contamination. She stated that having no knowledge of the elevation of the contamination she can make an inference that if the contamination is shallow then surface water will become contaminated.

Supervisor Davis asked if they could review the information that the township has regarding the superfund site and confirm validity of the information. He also asked if they looked at the hydrology report that the township will be receiving, could they connect the dots to the impact of the environment.

Mr. Van Haaren stated yes. He also suggested that the applicant construct an environmental management plan, which will include how they will implement and construct the mine and what kind of environmental patrols they will have in place to prevent any impacts.

Supervisor Davis asked Ms. Upfal if she could review what's missing in these reports, beyond what was already identified.

Ms. Upfal stated that she would recommend the experts to provide recommended revisions, and she could compare it to the township's zoning ordinance, that way they could work together to ensure they are giving the right feedback, but noted that their expertise is needed because it is beyond her scope.

Mr. Van Haaren stated that they want to respect the hydrologist and stay in their lane, but they are willing to be a resource. He asked if the proposed mine site has had an environmental investigation and if it is a clean site.

Supervisor Davis stated that Levy began testing the site in the 1970's and purchased the property in the 80's. They have done evaluation of the property both in the valuation of the minerals and have installed drop wells to evaluate the aquifers. In their application they have a lot of information about what they

have done. At this point, the township has an idea of what is missing and is trying to put the dots together.

Supervisor Davis asked if the experts could speak on the topic of dust that would be generated from the proposed mine.

Mr. Van Haaren stated that Triterra has an industrial hygiene group, which is a group that oversees asbestos abatement and demolition projects. As part of a health and safety plan, they can put together measures to control and mitigate dust and if needed, they can monitor air quality with their equipment, which can give real-time data. He stated that he can bring more information if needed.

Special Counsel Fisher asked if these air monitors would work with silica dust.

Mr. Van Haaren stated that he believes so but can verify.

Supervisor Davis asked if prudent, could they monitor existing mines and what kind of cost would be incorporated if they did this.

Mr. Van Haaren stated this could be done and he could come up with a cost for this service.

Clerk Miller agreed that this could be a critical service, because right now the township is in the preliminary review stage. He would rather have the information about how other mines are operated to better inform them of their decision.

Supervisor Davis stated if there is already vetted data regarding air quality of surrounding mines, could this data be analyzed by them and would they know if it was unbiased data.

Mr. Van Haaren stated if there are established criteria for mining then this could be compared to data that is already out there.

Ms. Crane stated that getting access to current operations could be very difficult. DNR does a lot of permitting with mining sites and she stated she could reach out to her contact to find out what the best managing practices are.

Mr. Van Haaren stated that what may come into play when talking about air particulates and dust is for the township to hire a certified industrial hygienist. Triterra has an industrial hygienist group, but none that are nationally certified.

Supervisor Davis stated that since there is overlap in work from the experts that the township is working with, from an environmental standpoint, would they be able to look at the work from these various experts to see if there is missing data regarding impact to the environment.

Mr. Van Haaren stated yes.

Special Counsel Fisher noted that the dust issue wouldn't necessarily just be dust on-site. It would include impacts of dust around the site and beyond.

Supervisor Davis noted this would include gravel trucks on the road and dust blowing from the site.

Mr. Van Haaren stated this would fall into the work of a certified industrial hygienist.

Supervisor Davis stated that the township wouldn't be as interested in modeling of this data, they are looking for real case scenarios, if there are any out there.

Clerk Miller asked Mr. Van Haaren if they do any work with noise and vibration.

Ms. Crane stated that they don't currently do any noise studies. The closest to noise studies that they get are for NEPA compliance for residential and estimates for communal noise for airports and roadway traffic. Measuring noise is not currently in their expertise realm.

Mr. Van Haaren stated that he will clarify whether noise issues would fall under the expertise of a CIH.

Special Counsel Fisher asked if the water quality they would be working with is surface water or ground water.

Ms. Crane stated ground water, surface water, and storm water. They don't get into aquifers because they don't have the drilling capabilities. This would be in a hydrologist's scope of work.

Special Counsel Fisher asked if they could potentially study the aquifer.

Ms. Crane stated if there was existing data, she could make inferences.

Mr. Van Haaren noted that they do have a hydrogeologist on staff that could review data.

Supervisor Davis asked if they could review a hydrology study and determine if it would impact the temperature of surrounding water or cause any environmental changes to surrounding water.

Mr. Van Haaren stated this would fall under the scope of a hydrologist.

Supervisor Davis rephrased his question. He asked if a hydrologist concluded that the mining activities would have an impact on ground water, would they then be able to review studies that Michigan State has done regarding Springfield's prairie fens, and make a correlation between a change of temperature of the water when it reaches the fens and the impact that it could potentially have on that environment.

Director Richmond stated that Springfield has the long lake fen complex and has worked continually with MNFI, MSU, CMU, DNR, and US Fish and Wildlife on doing reports with this complex. Because this is such a rare ecosystem, they have concerns about the impact the mine will have. Any changes to the water flowing into the fen could impact the species and their critical habitat. She asked if they could make inferences and review data that could show potential impacts.

Ms. Crane stated that this would not be in her immediate capabilities. She stated that she could dig into this topic and reach out to her contacts in the various departments that she works with and fan out from there.

Supervisor Davis stated they are looking for her expertise and because of the area that she works in, her ability to reach out to other experts.

Ms. Crane stated that she has a good network for finding solutions to problems that she doesn't have specific knowledge of. This is something she would be willing to dig in to.

Director Richmond stated that because Springfield already has a lot of reporting that has been done, she asked Ms. Crane if she could review these reports and reach out to other experts for them to review also.

Ms. Crane stated absolutely. She has never gotten the opportunity to do this before, and she is absolutely willing to do this.

Clerk Miller asked Ms. Crane if she has any experience with gravel mines and their effect on ground water-fed prairie fens.

Ms. Crane stated she does not.

Director Richmond asked if they have worked with prairie fens at all, in the state of Michigan.

Ms. Crane stated that she has delineated them but has not done anything regarding restoration or anything in that scope of work. She is aware of the importance of them as a rare and in peril ecosystem.

Director Richmond noted that Springfield Township has the number one prairie fen in the state of Michigan, and they are very protective of it and the species that it has. She asked Ms. Crane who she works with when working with MNFI.

Ms. Crane stated that she just did a herpetology study, working with Yu Man Lee, who is a conservation scientist at MSU. They also partnered with MNFI to conduct a bat survey. She works with Jenny Wong and Carrie Tansy from US Fish and Wildlife and Mike Sanders from MNFI. Triterra doesn't do any specific species surveys but will farm these surveys out to MNFI.

Supervisor Davis asked Ms. Crane if she would be willing to consult with alternative people about the areas that she has no experience in.

Ms. Crane said absolutely.

Ms. Upfal stated at Giffels Webster, there are landscape architects who have helped with the application review, and while there are township ordinances for landscaping, there are some questions regarding tree replacement, as the applicant will be taking out tree canopy for the proposed mine.

Ms. Crane asked how much of the tree canopy they are removing and asked if they are removing any on the west side of the property.

Ms. Upfal stated the west side is protected and they will not be removing that, but there will still be a lot of tree removal from the mine area itself.

Ms. Crane stated if they are removing 10 or more acres, then a survey must be done for the Northern Long Ear and Indiana Bat species. This would also be the case if a connected habitat is broken up. This rule covers the whole state of Michigan, but in certain areas where bat species are less prominent, there is only a limit on when trees can be taken down during the year.

Ms. Upfal stated that this property wouldn't be considered as woodland, but there are trees throughout the property that will be removed. She thinks it would be helpful for Ms. Crane and the landscape architect at Giffels Webster to come together and discuss terms of replacement as the applicant noted only two species of trees on their landscape plans. She feels any tips would be helpful and noted it would not only be for existing conditions but also future conditions with what they are proposing to plant on the site. She also stated that overburden soil storage is a big issue when it comes to mining operations and she would like to have extra opinions on Giffels Webster's recommendations for this.

Ms. Crane asked if the township has a tree species ordinance.

Ms. Upfal stated there is a landscape ordinance that has recommended species for deciduous and evergreen trees, as well as prohibited species.

Special Counsel Fisher asked Ms. Crane, in her experience with wetland delineation, does she look at any potential sub-surface connections.

Ms. Crane stated yes, she must do this but it's hard to prove it. Most of the time they are looking for surface level connections. If there's reason to believe there is a connection, then she would lean towards a more conservative Memorandum for the Record report. MR reports formally delineate wetlands and make the determination if they should be regulated. Her group is not conducting borings deep enough that it would be running into the water table, so they are limited and must make inferences. If historical records show patterns of saturation that show connection, or if there is an upland swale, or if the topography looks like there could be a connection, she will make the instance that they are regulated based off hydrological connection. She stated that she always recommends

getting a level 3 wetland identification program review from EGLE to verify boundaries and review of her determination. She noted that EGLE won't do a wetland delineation over 5 acres, but they will do thousands of acres of review of someone else's wetland delineation. They will agree or disagree with boundaries that she has identified, and they will agree or disagree if a certain wetland is regulated under the state of Michigan. They will then write a report, and this report will be good for 3 years for the determination of that specific wetland.

Special Counsel Fisher stated this would be better for the applicant also to answer those questions.

Ms. Crane stated she would push to have the applicant do that.

Ms. Upfal stated that if the applicant's current wetland delineation is done by one of the qualified wetland consultants on the list from EGLE, does this mean that it is automatically approved by Michigan's Wetland Identification Program (WIP).

Ms. Crane stated there is no requirement for anyone to go to EGLE and do this, but it is a good idea as it is the end all for regulated versus not regulated wetlands by the state.

Ms. Upfal noted that she had previously called EGLE and was told this would be a 6-month process.

Ms. Crane stated it is not an easy process, as there is only one person that will conduct these reviews. Typically, she submits her application at the end of the year, and she will usually get these reviews at the beginning of the year (May 1st).

Director Richmond asked Ms. Crane if she could go through her method and process and who she typically reaches out to.

Ms. Crane stated that it depends on what her scope of work is. Typically, when she is doing a wetland delineation, specifically for a fen, she is looking at potential threatened/endangered species, cross referencing with state threatened/endangered species lists, and recommending additional investigations if a wetland is going to be impacted. She stated that she is generally looking at this from the standpoint of working with an applicant who owns the property and wants to do something with the property.

Residents' questions:

Kara Okonewski asked for clarification in that they don't do work in the sense of secondary in-direct impacts.

Ms. Crane stated this is typically not something people ask for. They generally work with commercial or landowner properties and help guide them through environmental laws. She stated if the township wants to know secondary impacts this would be a scope she is willing to work towards.

Ms. Okonewski asked if she had worked with someone previously who was not the property owner or a government body looking for data.

Ms. Crane stated that NEPAs essentially do this, but on a broad scale. She stated that generally her projects don't have issues and are very limited as far as their impacts or they are mitigated. She stated that this project sounds much bigger. She stated this is exciting to her.

Director Richmond asked Ms. Crane if she has ever recommended to an applicant "don't do this because..." does she give a reason as to why this could be a potential issue.

Ms. Crane stated she would note the environmental laws to the applicant as to the why.

Director Richmond asked if she conducted a wetland delineation of a smaller wetland, would she be able to say, "if A happens, then this will cause B, C, and D to happen".

Ms. Crane stated this is usually not in her scope of work.

Supervisor Davis asked if she knows someone who could do this.

Ms. Crane stated that this would end up becoming a team of people.

Director Richmond asked if she would feel comfortable gathering that team to review data.

Ms. Crane stated she could pull people together, but she questioned how a secondary impact could be made without a major number of studies being done. She could make inferences.

Ms. Okonewski asked if she would be able to scale these potential impacts by risk level.

Special Counsel Fisher clarified to Ms. Crane that the task for this project is whether this mining will result in a very serious consequence to the community. He stated that she could think about risk in that context.

Ms. Crane stated that she could give a level of risk, but her concern right now is that she doesn't know the details of the applicant's site plan.

Supervisor Davis stated this will be reviewed at a future time. He wants to ensure that she has the expertise to evaluate the data that has been given and the expertise to guide the township on what needs to happen. Or be able to make recommendations of an expert that could be helpful to the township.

Ms. Crane stated that she has an excellent partnership with EGLE, and she is always open to working with others, as long as the township is open to her contacting various people. Cost would be the limiting factor.

Supervisor Davis stated the township is looking for what is missing and what they should be looking at. This would include her recommendations as to who the township should contact if something is not in her scope of work.

Ms. Upfal noted that the very serious consequence mentioned by Special Counsel Fisher is statutory law from the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act. For mines, the Planning Commission's number one task is to determine if there are or are not very serious consequences associated with this mine. The township needs her to say that they either need more information, or she thinks there are/are not very serious consequences from the information that the applicant has provided in their application.

Supervisor Davis clarified that they need this information to be proven.

Ms. Crane stated that environmental compliance is what she does. She can look at the site plan and make determinations about what needs to be done.

Ms. Upfal noted that she is unsure if the applicant has done environmental studies of the property but stated that they do have monitoring wells to evaluate the presence of the natural resources.

Kara Okonewski asked how far out in terms of boundaries Triterra typically goes in a project or do they work strictly within the confines of a parcel.

Mr. Van Haaren stated that this project sounds unique, but typically they are working with property owners or some type of real estate transaction. On isolated sites, they must sometimes go off-site to install wells and delineate and are familiar with accessing sites where permission is granted by the property owner.

Kara Okonewski noted that this will be important regarding the superfund sites. She continued by saying with dust, there is a challenge with mining because it's not considered industrial, it's agricultural, which has its own challenges. She wants to ensure if they are reviewing existing studies that they keep the comparisons consistent. She asked if they have any experience with arsenic, sulfates, or nitrates.

Mr. Van Haaren stated they are constantly sampling and testing for arsenic in soil and ground water. Sampling for sulfates and nitrates would involve their investigation remediation group.

Amanda Gruzin noted that she loves the idea of conducting air monitoring and air quality at a different mining site. She asked if MNFI would do a flora and fauna study for the township.

Ms. Crane stated yes.

Ms. Gruzin stated that she also likes the idea of bringing in a Certified Industrial Hygienist.

Mr. Van Haaren noted it's not someone that will be easy to obtain, but for this project he recommends it.

Chris Todd thanked Mr. Van Haaren and Ms. Crane for their work.

Supervisor Davis thanked them for coming and asked that they prepare a cost proposal for review.

Ms. Crane asked if the mining company has any other mines in the area and if there are any issues with those mines.

Supervisor Davis stated yes and noted that he has been told there aren't any issues, but he has concerns about loose regulations. When the mine first started, there were different zoning and mining regulations and ordinances. He is working on these issues.

Ms. Crane asked if the mining company would show good faith to the township and let them conduct on-site dust monitoring and testing.

Supervisor Davis stated that this has been discussed.

Ms. Okonewski asked Ms. Crane and Mr. Van Haaren if they had ever been an expert witness in litigation.

Both answered no.

Interview with Triterra concluded at 11:16 AM.

Supervisor Davis stated that part of this process includes the Township Board granting authority to the supervisor, Special Counsel Fisher, and Attorney Need to interview candidates. He asked Special Counsel Fisher and Clerk Miller for their thoughts on Triterra.

Special Counsel Fisher stated that he thinks they would be good team players. He noted that they would have to carve out the specific areas that Triterra would be involved in, as would be the case for many other expert candidates.

Clerk Miller agreed and stated that they seem to have a good network of resources.

Supervisor Davis asked if they feel comfortable with Triterra's level of services and asked Special Counsel Fisher if he feels confident that they would provide the level of expertise that he needs.

Special Counsel Fisher stated that they have expertise in a few areas, and he is very confident in the areas of expertise that they do have. The areas that they aren't familiar with, such as fens, they would have to partner with someone else, therefore the township would be receiving someone else's work.

Clerk Miller added that the township will be hard pressed to find anyone that has true on-point relevant experience that hasn't also worked with Levy or another mine company. This will be the biggest hurdle that the township will encounter in their search for candidates.

Supervisor Davis asked if they would be comfortable hiring Triterra.

Special Counsel Fisher stated he would like to review their proposal of work.

Clerk Miller stated he would like to know more about the contacts they have that would assist with the prairie fen and watershed.

Supervisor Davis agreed that it will need to be defined as to what work Triterra will be doing for the township and what contacts they will be working with.

Special Counsel Fisher stated that it's important to note that Ms. Crane has a good relationship with EGLE, which not everyone has.

Ms. Upfal noted that in her review of Levy's application, she feels Triterra has the capability to review what Levy has submitted. Levy has not done initial investigation, such as in-direct or secondary impact, which is the additional information that the township is seeking. They have not provided these studies to the township for review; therefore, it is hard to ask candidates to review data that is unknown to the township. The first step would be to ask Levy to provide these studies.

Supervisor Davis stated that it was discussed with Special Counsel Fisher and Attorney Need on what the township is legally able to compel Levy to provide versus negotiations items. He asked the resident committee if they noticed anything that isn't heading in the right direction or anything that could have been done differently in the interview process.

All stated no. They thanked Supervisor Davis for letting them be a part of this process.

Supervisor Davis noted that Levy just dropped off the escrow money.

Next study review: Traffic Study, October 16th @ 12:00 PM

Meeting adjourned at 11:31 AM.

Agenda

DATE: **October 16, 2025**

SUBJECT: **Meeting with Levy Company- Traffic**

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Status since PC Meeting
 - a. Road Commission Permits
3. Routes and Customer Locations
4. Resident Concerns
5. Questions from Factfinding Committee
6. Next Steps



FACT-FINDING COMMITTEE

Traffic Study Review

SPRINGFIELD TOWNSHIP
12000 Davisburg Road, Davisburg, MI 48350

Thursday, October 16, 2025

12:00 P.M

PRESENT: Richard L. Davis, Township Supervisor
Sean R. Miller, Township Clerk
Kevin Sclesky, Township Trustee/Planning Commissioner
Danielle Sink, Supervisor's Assistant

RESIDENTS PRESENT: Amanda Gruzin
Kara Okonewski
Chris Todd

OTHERS PRESENT: Michael Darga, Giffels Webster
Julia Upfal, Giffels Webster, Township Planner
Jill Bahm, Giffels Webster
Alyssa Wambold, Fishbek Engineering
Kyle Reidsma, Fishbek Engineering
Scott Sintkowski, Road Commission for Oakland County
Keith Sieg, Road Commission for Oakland County
Reuben Maxbauer, Levy Representative

Supervisor Davis noted that the goal of this meeting is for all involved to ask questions and be on the same page. This creates transparency and allows for open and honest communication.

Julia Upfal began by stating that the first topic is to discuss the Levy application and the status from the last Planning Commission meeting regarding truck routes, if the routes have changed, and if Levy has been engaged with the Road Commission for Oakland County for permitting.

Reuben Maxbauer stated that when this property was first purchased, the logical route was Ormond Road north, Davisburg east, to Dixie Highway. Fishbek traffic engineers have helped to evaluate many different routes. After engaging with the township for the first time, it was made clear by the current administration that there was a strong desire for the trucks not to go east on Davisburg Road. This information was then passed on to Fishbek with the intention of reviewing alternate routes. The current proposed route is Ormond north, west on Davisburg Road, and south on Milford. This route was suggested because it gets the trucks on a truck route. He stated that they have not formally approached the Oakland County Road Commission with their plan because they have still been seeking input from Springfield and Rose Township's. As of right now, no route has been finalized or formalized.

Keith Sieg noted that Davisburg Road is a designated route but is also a season restricted road.

Ms. Upfal asked Mr. Maxbauer to discuss where his customers are located.

Mr. Maxbauer stated their single biggest customer is the Ace Holly off Tindall Road. They have various other concrete and asphalt customers in the area.

Ms. Upfal asked if most trucks would be going north to Holly Sand and Gravel and which direction others would be going.

Mr. Maxbauer stated that none of the trucks will be going to Holly Sand and Gravel, they will be going to Ace Holly, which is directly across the street from Holly Sand and Gravel. Ace is the largest customer to Holly Sand and Gravel and will also be the biggest customer for the mine off Ormond Road.

Mr. Sieg stated that the trucks will go anywhere in the county.

Supervisor Davis clarified, provided it's an approved road.

Mr. Maxbauer stated yes. It's all about getting to a major thoroughfare so the trucks can get to where they need to go.

Ms. Upfal asked if the empty trucks are going to follow the same route also.

Mr. Maxbauer stated that is Levy's intent.

Trustee Sclesky asked if empty trucks would be traveling through downtown Davisburg at all.

Mr. Maxbauer stated that the route they will tell their trucks to take will not be through downtown Davisburg, although he cannot guarantee that a truck won't go through downtown Davisburg.

Mr. Sieg stated that legally they are allowed to go through there, it is the understanding that they will avoid that route for the township's sake.

Ms. Upfal asked if a type of legal agreement can't be made because Davisburg Road is a designated truck route. Therefore, the township couldn't make this a condition of approval.

Supervisor Davis stated that after talking with Attorney Need, he was told that if the application is denied, the township will have no control. But if the application is approved with conditions there could be agreements between Levy and the township in which the approval could be based on.

Ms. Upfal stated this condition could be made for trucks leaving the site, but not necessarily trucks coming to the site.

Mr. Sieg stated that the trucking company that Mr. Maxbauer contracts through will follow the township's wishes, but other trucking companies may not do the same. He stated that 80%+ of the trucks coming to the site will be other contracted companies.

Mr. Maxbauer noted that each truck driver will receive route instructions when leaving the site. He stated that while they cannot force every driver to follow the designated route, he stated that if they don't follow the route instructions, then Levy can ensure that they won't haul from the site.

Ms. Upfal reiterated that the trucks coming to the site will not get these route instructions until they are physically leaving the site.

Mr. Maxbauer stated this is true, but once it is an established operation, the drivers will understand the rules of the road and tend to follow what directions they are told.

Mr. Sieg stated that Levy won't let a truck off their site if they are overweight, at this creates a liability. He stated that another concern is Ormond Road is a normal load-road.

Supervisor Davis asked him to clarify what a normal load-road is.

Mr. Sieg stated that roads are classified as "A" and "B" roads. An "A" road is state designated/special designated. A normal load for a "B" class would be considered gravel, two-lane asphalt (in most cases), with restrictions on length, weight, and a spring restriction of a 35% reduction. Ormond is a classified "B" road. He stated that there are no new truck routes, as all current routes are grandfathered in. Davisburg Road and Milford Road are restricted "A" roads, which means they are at a 25% reduction. His concern is that when trucks leave the site, they must continue travelling on normal load-roads. He stated that most roads are normal load-roads, even subdivision roads and roads leading to subdivisions. The problem becomes when the fully loaded trucks travel on restricted roads.

Scott Sintkowski stated this would have to be a comprehensive review by the Road Commission and their design team.

Ms. Upfal mentioned that concerns by residents through public comments are the site's sight lines and the hill on Ormond Road. She asked if this was something that would need to be redesigned or worked through.

Mr. Sintkowski stated that this would be reviewed once they receive a site plan and traffic impact study.

Supervisor Davis noted that this is something that Burroughs would need to supply.

Trustee Sclesky clarified that they would need to provide a traffic safety study.

Supervisor Davis noted that the township would make this conditional on the review of the application. Once this study is received, he wants to ensure the township has the opportunity to review the data.

Mr. Maxbauer stated that when they first submitted their application, they submitted a complete application. They then received feedback from the township and Giffels Webster requesting lots of additional information. Subsequently, the application has been put on pause. The additional information requested is being gathered and they will be supplementing their records with new data.

Supervisor Davis clarified that the pause on the application serves the township and gives them time to gather and evaluate the data that is given. Which will ensure that the Planning Commission receives a better overall product to review.

Ms. Upfal noted that while working with the Road Commission, she believes the local community would be very responsive to any conditions that the Road Commission sets and this would be a helpful way to alleviate any potential concerns.

Mr. Maxbauer stated that he agrees.

Ms. Upfal stated that, aside from level of service, there have been additional concerns from residents. She wondered how Levy is planning to address those concerns. Some of the concerns are:

- Noise and Emissions
- Student safety/bus routes
- Limiting trucking operations during school bus hours
- Enforcement for empty trucks
- General compliance for trucks during hours of operation, number of trucks, ability to hold sub-contractors responsible,
- Motorcycle safety
- Impacts of insurance rates

She noted that she hopes Levy will supply more qualitative information about traffic impacts that the community will experience and how these impacts will be mitigated.

Supervisor Davis noted that these concerns have been posted on Springfield Township's website, and he has informed Mr. Maxbauer of these concerns.

Trustee Sclesky asked how much control the township has over roads, trucking routes, traffic, and overall capabilities of the roads versus the responsibility and control from the Road Commission. Would the Road Commission take the lead to determine what is acceptable/not acceptable and do they have the ultimate authority or does the township weigh in on this also.

Mr. Sieg stated that because it is a county road, the Road Commission would be the number one authority, followed by the township.

Mr. Sintkowski noted that if this development is to go through, the road commission has jurisdiction. Once they have the site plan, they will review all the information and considerations.

Trustee Sclesky asked if they would also consider the residents' comments.

Mr. Sintkowski stated no, as this is not their purview. This would fall under the township.

Supervisor Davis noted that aside from what the county approves, there is still the opportunity for Levy and the township to come to an agreement.

Mr. Maxbauer agreed and noted that Levy and Springfield Township have had a long relationship, and it is his hope that they continue to have a relationship.

Ms. Upfal stated that she appreciates the willingness to put forward an agreement of that type, she has concerns that it could call into question what other uses are allowed to access Davisburg Road east.

Supervisor Davis stated this is a legal question that he will consult the township attorney on.

A member of the meeting asked if Andersonville Road is also an acceptable truck route.

It was stated yes. But it is restricted in the spring to a 25% reduction.

Mr. Maxbauer noted that Ormond has a 35% reduction spring restriction.

Supervisor Davis asked for clarification on the number of trucks per day.

Mr. Maxbauer stated that when he was first asked this question, he gave the greatest number of trucks that would leave the site per day by stating 80 trucks on a busy day. Therefore, 160 trucks come in and leave the site every day. He stated this doesn't mean every day and this would be the high-end number, not an average number.

Supervisor Davis asked why some of the trucks can't be diverted south onto Ormond Road.

Mr. Sieg stated that this would be an even further distance all on a normal load-road. This route is not designed to handle 80 trucks per day.

Supervisor Davis asked about the wear and tear on the roads and if there will be a bonding for these roads.

It was stated that it would be Oakland County's position.

Mr. Sintkowski stated that the road commission would have to thoroughly evaluate the route and consult with their design group to see what improvements are needed.

Supervisor Davis asked the representatives of the road commission if they are aware of any other situations where a mining company makes an agreement with a township to put money aside to maintain or repair roads.

Mr. Sieg stated that there are existing haul routes that have bonds, which is what levy is mentioning.

Mr. Maxbauer stated that he was unaware that they didn't need to do bonding for routes. It is his expectation that they will do some type of bonding.

Ms. Upfal asked if this would only be Ormond to Davisburg Road.

Mr. Maxbauer stated yes.

Mr. Sieg noted that there is no way to bond Davisburg west to Milford Road to M-59.

Mr. Maxbauer noted that Davisburg and Milford Roads are built for full loads, except for Spring weight restrictions and they are utilizing those roads as they were designed. Ormond Road they are utilizing in a manner that is inconsistent in the way it was designed from a weight perspective. Therefore, they expect to be on the hook for the financial component of that.

Supervisor Davis stated that the intersection of Ormond Road and Davisburg has brought concerns and wondered if that intersection will need improvement by the road commission's standpoint. And if so, could they look to Levy for their participation in the cost of making needed changes.

Mr. Sintkowski stated that the whole route would need to be reviewed for geometry, corner site distance, and corner turning radius.

Supervisor Davis asked who would typically pay for this.

It was stated that the road commission would not be considered a payer.

Supervisor Davis noted that would mean the township would need to look to Levy to pay for this. He asked Mr. Maxbauer if he had done this before.

Mr. Maxbauer stated yes, when designated haul routes are reviewed, this would be part of the bonding, which Levy maintains on an annual basis and is very specific as to what portion of the road they are responsible for and to what specs.

Supervisor Davis asked if the road commission knows of any studies that include emissions and noise from the trucks.

Mr. Sieg stated that there is a statute for jake-brakes, but his department doesn't have jurisdiction over this, the sheriff department would.

Supervisor Davis noted that one of the biggest concerns on the proposed route is the hill and curve on Ormond Road. He would like to get clarification on what kind of things Levy would be willing to do to adjust or change the road, in partnership with the road commission. He asked if the road commission would plan to remove the curve and decrease the height of the hill. During the winter it is a cause for concern especially when the roads become icy.

Supervisor Davis opened the meeting up to residents' questions.

Amanda Gruzin asked what the difference is between a traffic impact study and a traffic safety study.

Mr. Sintkowski stated that a safety study would review crash patterns in the area and contributing factors to those crashes. A traffic impact study is focused on reviewing routes and ensuring there are proper corner sight distances, turning radii, and the general impact to traffic such as how many left turns are going to be made into this site, if a left turn lane is needed, and if lane improvements are required.

Amanda Gruzin asked if there are expected to be any significant variations from this date to the date of the traffic report dated December 2023, that was submitted in the Levy application.

Mr. Sintkowski stated that the traffic engineer didn't have the chance to look at the report submitted to evaluate the scope.

Supervisor Davis added that the township is trying to get data that will show how many driveways and bus stops will be impacted.

Mr. Sintkowski stated this would be better done by a consultant, as the road commission doesn't track this type of data.

Ms. Gruzin asked, if a truck deviates from the designated truck haul route, how does Levy track this or would this be up to the residents to track.

Mr. Maxbauer stated that Levy is responsible for this, along with the sheriff's department.

Ms. Gruzin stated if the truck drivers are told to follow certain driving instructions, how will they know that the driver is following these instructions as there are no GPS trackers on the trucks.

Mr. Maxbauer stated that there are GPS trackers on some of the trucks.

Ms. Gruzin noted that Levy only owns two trucks.

Mr. Maxbauer stated this is correct, but there is GPS tracking on some of the other trucks. He stated that they have devices for certain equipment that has tracking capabilities. He stated that this concern is the easiest one for Levy to enforce because they can ensure that the trucks turn left out of the site.

Ms. Gruzin asked for clarification from the road commission on what redesigning Ormond Road would consist of. She asked if this could consist of straightening the road and decreasing the incline of the hill, as this would have significant impacts on properties that line Ormond Road.

Mr. Sieg stated that he is unsure. He stated it would consist more of the base of the road, how deep the material is on asphalt or concrete to determine if this road can haul the weight.

Mr. Sintkowski stated that the cross-section is the first concern when it relates to loading. If there are changes to the types of vehicles driving on a route, then the entire geometry of the route must be reevaluated as it relates to hills, curves, corner sight distance, and the design speed of the road.

Ms. Gruzin asked if, as of right now, they are unsure of what the scope would be when it comes to redesigning.

They both stated this is correct.

Chris Todd asked Supervisor Davis what his reasoning was for not allowing Levy to drive their trucks through downtown Davisburg.

Supervisor Davis stated parking in downtown Davisburg is dangerous with cars having to back out of parking spaces and he felt it would have a negative impact on the businesses.

Mr. Todd stated that he lives at the base of Pepper Hill, and his family has owned that property since 1971. He is familiar with how dangerous the hill can be, as when there are crashes, they usually end up being on his property. With his house being 85 feet from Ormond Road, he wants to ensure that his family remains safe. He stated that since Ormond Road is a class B road and everyone living on Ormond has the expectation that they will be dealing with class B traffic. He asked how they can allow class A traffic to be on a class B road.

Mr. Sieg stated that safety is always first, and they also must protect the pavement.

Mr. Sintkowski stated that if class A traffic is going to be on the road, then the actual road must be brought up to class A standards.

Mr. Todd stated that his concern is this proposal doesn't fit good with the area, surrounding roads, and hauling route. He wondered if this could open the township up to liability because all the homeowners who bought their houses on the assumption that they are living on a certain type of road with a certain type of purpose and now that purpose and road type is changing.

Kara Okonewski asked for clarification that Ormond Road would have to be changed from a class "B" to a class "A" road.

It was stated that it would need to be brought up to standards for the vehicles using the route. The differences in trucks and weights were discussed.

Ms. Okonewski asked where the road will start being updated to class A and if the whole road will need to be updated.

It was stated it would start at the entrance of the site and is a section of the road.

Ms. Upfal asked if the Road Commission ties their approval to this project to any other Levy developments in the county.

Mr. Sieg stated no because a lot of other sites are grandfathered in.

Supervisor Davis asked Mr. Sieg what his experience had been with the Holly mine.

He stated he hasn't had any issues with trucks coming out overweight.

Supervisor Davis asked the Road Commission representatives if they have run into any other issues with different mines or if the township should be aware of any issues that haven't been brought forward.

It was stated that there have been issues over the years, but not too many with Levy. They have been consistently good with keeping the roads clean from dirt during the rainy season.

Supervisor Davis asked about the wheel washing systems.

Mr. Maxbauer stated that his plan for Springfield is that the truck will go over a calibre, which shakes the truck to loosen and remove any debris from the tires. From the calibre, they go directly onto a steel scale, down a paved ramp to a wheel wash, then onto the road. He stated it will be a similar system to the one in Highland.

Mr. Sieg asked if he knew the distance from the wash to the road.

Mr. Maxbauer stated that he doesn't know offhand.

Supervisor Davis stated when this application was first received, he asked Mr. Maxbauer to explore the north end of the property, purchasing more property, and utilizing that to build an entrance that can connect straight to Davisburg Road. He asked if this had been explored more.

Mr. Maxbauer stated that they haven't found an easy route to do this, but they are open to this possibility.

Ms. Upfal provided a visual of the parcels that could offer this opportunity.

Amanda Gruzin asked Mr. Maxbauer who owns Ace Holly.

Mr. Maxbauer stated Levy does.

Supervisor Davis asked Mr. Maxbauer what Levy's timetable is with the application and submitting reports.

Mr. Maxbauer stated that the biggest next step is to sink a new well on site. The pause in the application is on Levy's end, as they owe a lot of information to Giffels Webster for the data requested. He suggested the township slow down as to not burn through the escrow money too quickly before Levy has a chance to provide all the needed information in approximately three months with a new submittal.

Ms. Upfal clarified that Levy is also going to receive additional comments from the supplemental studies from other outside consultants, some may not have even been received yet, but they will still need to be responsive. Therefore, this process could be even longer than what was stated. She continued by stating that on the traffic review, they are looking for a more qualitative study with more information on customers in the traffic study and updated information on progress with the road commission. This information will be very important to convey to the residents.

A member of the meeting stated it would be helpful if they listed all the options explored, alternative options, and all their potential or non-potentials.

Ms. Gruzin asked if the three Giffels Webster representatives present will be paid out of the escrow account of township funds.

Supervisor Davis stated township funds and the application fee.

Ms. Gruzin asked who she could speak to about Jake-brakes.

Supervisor Davis recommended she talk to Steve Felix.

Ms. Upfal noted that emissions aren't just based on the number of trucks, it's more based on how many times a truck stops and the difference places along the route.

Supervisor Davis stated that the new trucks have cleaner emissions and are all regulated.

Ms. Okonewski stated there are concerns with trucks being lined up and running before the site opens.

Supervisor Davis stated that from a business standpoint, a truck is not going to be sitting and waiting because this burns time and fuel.

Supervisor Davis thanked Mr. Maxbauer, the representatives from the road commission and Fishbek for their time.

Supervisor Davis asked for feedback and questions from the remaining meeting members.

Ms. Gruzin asked if the township is going to be seeking another traffic engineer to do a traffic safety study, since Fishbek is working with Levy.

Supervisor Davis stated that no, because Fishbek is a national company that has a good reputation, and he feels their data will be valid. He feels the expenditure of money should be spent on alternative data that has the potential for more bias.

Ms. Upfal also noted that Michael Darga from Giffels Webster is a traffic engineer who is more than qualified to review data. She also noted it's not only Fishbek's reputation, but also their licenses.

Jill Bahm noted that Giffels Webster will not only thoroughly review the traffic study but will also point out areas of concern and potential issues. The road commission will be responsible for reviewing the traffic safety study data.

Ms. Gruzin asked if Levy will be responsible for providing a traffic safety study or if this will be the township's responsibility.

It was noted that Levy will need to provide a traffic safety study. It was also noted that none of these studies will cover noise and emissions.

Ms. Bahm noted that since these are county roads, it is the road commission's responsibility to ensure that they are safe and maintained.

Ms. Gruzin asked about the statute regarding Jake-brakes.

Supervisor Davis stated it could be a limit on decibels.

She asked if the sound and decibels would then relate to vibration.

Supervisor Davis stated he is unsure. He did note that concerns regarding trucks going above the posted speed limit are not much of a concern because he feels they are slow to accelerate and will maintain a slower speed than other vehicles on the road. He would like to find out data on how many accidents

FACT-FINDING COMMITTEE
SPRINGFIELD TOWNSHIP
12000 Davisburg Road, Davisburg, MI 48350
Monday, November 3, 2025
1:00 P.M.

The meeting was called to order at 1:10 P.M. by Trustee Sclesky

MEMBERS PRESENT: Kevin Sclesky, Township Trustee/Planning Commissioner
Sarah Richmond, Parks and Recreation Director
Gerald Fisher, Township Special Counsel

RESIDENTS PRESENT: Amanda Gruzin
Kara Okonewski

OTHERS PRESENT: Mike Wilczynski, Pangea Environmental LLC
Brian O'Mara, Agate Harbor Advisors LLC
Danielle Sink, Supervisor's Assistant
Joelle Talerico, Clerk's Assistant/Recording Secretary
Chris Comstock, IT Administrator

Trustee Sclesky began the meeting by stating that Supervisor Davis is no longer going to attend these meetings as he wants to ensure there are no optics of possible steering of any decision making that would be presented to the Planning Commission. All documents that stem from this meeting and any future meetings will follow a chain of custody process for any information that is going to be presented to the Planning Commission.

Mike Wilczynski began with his presentation by providing an overview of legal terms and the framework that they must work in as Geologists, Hydrogeologists, and in any permitting of mines. He also gave a brief overview of his background in Geology and Hydrogeology. He noted that residents' concerns consist of water issues, noise, dust, traffic, the idling of trucks, diesel particulate matter, noise and vibrations from the trucks and mining equipment, property value depreciation, and reclamation and loss of farmland. He stated that sand and gravel form our aquifers, the basis for our lakes, and most of our surface water. In Michigan, 90% of some creeks are groundwater reaching the surface. Because sand and gravel occur in these protected environments, there can be conflict. He provided an overview of the geology of the proposed site stating that the material here is glacial till and glacial outwash which is caused by glacial retreat. The glaciers depress the land surface while moving forward and deposit materials within the ice going backwards. An end moraine, which is a ridge, is the result of a retreating glacier sitting and moving forward and back depending on climate. This process, which occurs over thousands of years, results in the accumulation of sand and gravel. A ridge consists of glacial till, which is various sizes of sand and gravel, and the finer material, stratified drift or outwash, is deposited in front of the retreating glacier. Therefore, the further away from a moraine, the finer the material gets because the water velocity drops and carries smaller material. Within these glacial materials are ice blocks that are buried. When they melt there's depressions in the ground and these form wetlands and lakes. When you see lakes in this area that aren't the result of dams, they're most likely a result of a buried block of ice that was buried by stratified drift, which then melted and left a hole in the ground. He stated that there is an Esker on the property. An esker forms on the bottom of a glacier and is like a river in reverse. Instead of being a depression in a valley, it's a positive relief. He continued by saying

that glacial till consists of large boulders, sand, and gravel of all different sizes. This material generally needs to go through a crusher to break up the larger pieces. He noted that angular material is actually better in pavement because it interlocks and it doesn't slide as much as round material. He continued by saying that stratified drift or outwash is the kind of material that would carry blocks of ice and give you the kettle lakes. Sometimes the till has a lot of clay in it, and not many boulders. On a geologic map, the proposed mine site sits right at the edge of a moraine and therefore consists of sand and gravel.

He continued by highlighting the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act which states only certain reasons that a mine can be denied because of the result of very serious consequences. These very serious consequences are: relationship of extraction with existing land uses, impact on existing land uses, impact on property valuation, traffic and pedestrian safety, impact on health, safety and welfare, and interests and the public interest in it. As geologists, we can help in many of these and also in the permitting processes. The state does very little when it comes to permitting sand and gravel mines. They do get involved at certain times if there is surface water or wetlands. A part 301/303 permit is needed if you're creating a lake five acres or larger and if wetlands five acres or larger are going to be impacted. This would include the wetland having a special interest or if they are within 500ft of surface water and are regulated. Part 327 consists of a ground water permit and would be required if the site is pumping 70 gallons per minute. In their application, Levy states they are only pumping 30 gallons per minute, he feels this is on the light end. Part 55 is an air permit. This is a general permit where a fee is paid, and the applicant agrees to comply with certain conditions. There are no air monitoring requirements for the air permit. Part 91 consists of a soil erosion sediment control plan and generally comes from the county.

Special Counsel Fisher asked if there are federal regulations for air quality.

Mr. Wilczynski stated there is no required ambient air monitoring by federal standards.

He continued by stating that wetlands that are identified on the National Wetland Inventory and other maps and soil areas, which include wetland soils are approximate, as they're done on a desktop. The last wetland survey that was done was in early 2000 and expired in 2005. Therefore, this will need to be redone and must be done during the growing season which will require in-person, on site mapping and surveying. He continued by stating that the hydrogeological reports submitted by HLA and Barr are missing geological cross-sections. When borings are done on a site, they must be organized to be able to interpret the data and information of the soil. When there are outwash deposits right next to a moraine, you get an interlocking inner bedding of sand and gravel which influences the groundwater flow. As the water flows down, it's going to stop as soon as it hits its first impermeable layer like a clay and will form a water table there. But, there could be multiple clay layers that this happens at therefore there could be multiple perched aquifers in one area. This is why a cross section is needed to really see what's going on. He continued by saying that they need to go probably about ten feet deeper than the proposed mine, just to get a feel for what's there and to know if they're going to be able to create the lake that's in their reclamation plan. Levy has proposed that they will be wet mining, but until they get down to the water table, it's going to be dry mining. So, they will be removing the sand, gravel, and water, pumping it to another location. One of the concerns is that 5% of the material is fine material based on their testing, which is called slimes. This is material that really can't be used; therefore, the management of that material becomes important. He also noted that Levy has stated this will be a closed loop system, but it isn't because the water is coming from "A" and being discharged "B". Based on ground water flow, it will not be recharging where it's coming from. A closed loop means you're recharging it where you're pulling it from. Another concern is if water is pulled from a deep aquifer, sometimes poor-quality water is pulled up that could contain hydrogen sulfide (which forms into iron sulfide) and arsenic. Oakland County has a lot of arsenic in the groundwater naturally and this is because of pyrite or Cenozoic pyrite that were in the bedrock formations. In addition to arsenic, there can also be elevated nitrates from

farming activity, fertilizer, and animals. He continued by saying that Springfield Township has a Superfund site that is a mile away. A summary that was available online proved the plume of contaminated groundwater is moving to the north. Pumping groundwater can change the flow direction and start pulling a plume therefore this is something that Levy will need to address. Lastly, if there are more than 70 gallons of water pumped per minute, a test will need to be done, and EGLE determines if there needs to be a site-specific review or not. This test looks at withdrawal of water on surface resources.

Brian O'Mara stated that he and Mr. Wilczynski have about 80 years' experience in consulting work, working for agencies, working for private companies, and mining companies and they're applying their experience with geology, the permitting process, and commenting on what other people have done. He noted that their role is to advise the township as to the adequacy, the facts, if there's deficiencies, or if there's data gaps. It is on Levy to provide any missing information and today he and Mr. Wilczynski are just providing their initial impressions of the materials provided and what they see as ways that it could be improved.

Trustee Sclesky stated that there was a list made up at the last meeting of the information that the township would want the applicant to produce for review. He asked if this list is going to be discussed.

Mr. Wilczynski stated that there was a list of items that Levy may have that could be provided to the Township without a lot of work needing to be done.

Trustee Sclesky noted that he will need to follow up and find out where the Township is at with obtaining the information as requested.

Special Counsel Fisher asked Mr. Wilczynski and Mr. O'Mara if they would call their review at this point a tabletop review.

Mr. O'Mara stated he would consider it a desktop review. Essentially this means they're just reviewing reports, as they haven't gone into the field to take any samples. He stated that it's rare to actually do any sampling. They can walk around the site, but in most cases they're not the ones going out with the drill rig and taking additional samples. He noted that Levy was talking about doing an aquifer pumping test, which will be important. All the other reports that have been submitted are based, for the most part, on desktop reviews. This means Levy is taking the information from other people and compiling it. He stated that there has been a lot of work done at the site, for example, the 25 wells that Levy has been studying for many years. He noted that he and Mr. Wilczynski have gone through and listed what they'd like to see from Levy on various things, if Levy has this information.

Trustee Sclesky stated that on the 25 wells, he believes they've been doing monthly analysis on it since 2008. He asked if this is their conclusion also.

Mr. Wilczynski stated that they're taking water levels, but they haven't sampled the water. He'd like to see some groundwater sampling for nitrates, arsenic, and herbicides. These are things that would commonly be associated with agriculture.

Trustee Sclesky stated that in his review of those reports stemming back from 2008, some of the wells have been taken offline. He asked what a reason would be to take a well offline.

Mr. Wilczynsky stated that it could have been destroyed or deemed unnecessary.

Trustee Sclesky asked for clarification that this would not be uncommon.

Mr. O'Mara stated no, as sometimes a well can get silted up or become fouled with minerals. He stated that this pump aquifer pumping test will be crucial. Evaluating a well is going to tell them what's happening at basically a pinpoint, but with several hundred acres. These wells will only show little snapshots across the site. The pumping test will actually draw water from a large area, and they'll be able to evaluate those results and predict what the mine operation could do to the shallow wetlands and other water table aquifers and the confine aquifer. This will provide a lot of information that will help him and Mr. Wilczynski make recommendations to the Township on how to proceed.

Special Counsel Fisher asked how they are testing the pressure or the quantity of water.

Mr. O'Mara stated this would be determined by the pumping test. A pumping test is done by installing a well with a constant pump of water. This results in drawing water out and water levels going down in certain areas. They'll measure the response of the aquifer as the pumping is happening. Those water levels can be considered pressure values as well.

Mr. Wilczynski noted that this will also show the impact on surface water, the measure of the surface water within that area, and the connection to the groundwater and how far the impact will go from pumping.

Special Counsel Fisher asked if this analysis is done during the whole duration, once a year, or if this is a one-time thing.

Mr. O'Mara stated that it's using sort of a pre design study, but based on the results of the pumping test, they can predict better how it will behave and how the mines lasting effect will be in the community in the future. He stated that this is a good thing that they're planning to do.

Mr. Wilczynski stated that the pumping test is generally run for between 24 and 72 hours, using multiple observation wells, and deciding on how they're doing a step test before that to determine at what rate they want to run the public test and to make sure to stress the aquifer enough.

Amanda Gruzin asked for confirmation that the pressure test is going to run for 1 to 3 days.

Mr. Wilczynsky clarified that it is called a pumping test and yes because it gives an idea on how the aquifer would behave as groundwater is extracted from it. This will provide results in hydraulic conductivity, transmissibility, and any boundaries it may have to the aquifer.

Special Counsel Fisher stated that all these test wells are at various depths.

Mr. O'Mara stated that most are in the water table.

Mr. Wilczynski stated this is why having cross-sections is important as it will tell them where there's screen, which wells should be used for data, which wells are valid for valleys and water table versus the deep rock.

Mr. O'Mara stated that from what he could see most of them are shallow so it must be known where the wells are screened as they're doing the evaluation. They might have to do some additional deeper wells, but the pumping test should help with that.

Mr. Wilczynski stated that he is not sure they have any borings with wells that go as deep as they're proposing to mine. He stated that he is unsure of the total depth of the mine. He noted that this should be considered a preliminary review because they don't have all the information.

Trustee Sclesky stated that with this information and with the agreement between the Township and Levy, Levy has the opportunity to review this before anything is released.

Mr. O'Mara provided a brief overview of missing reports in the Levy application with respect to very serious consequences:

- property values and/or depreciation of value-no study provided.
- Dust and noise studies- Would be helpful if Levy could provide data from other mining sites in the area. If not, could they provide samples.
- Traffic studies- traffic study was done, but a traffic safety study needs to be done.

Trustee Sclesky noted that some of the questions regarding traffic safety were answered at the last Fact-Finding Committee meeting with the Road Commission for Oakland County.

Special Counsel Fisher asked if it matters how close the homes are to the road.

Mr. O'Mara stated regarding dust and vibration, yes. He continued with his overview of missing reports:

- A noise and vibration study is needed which needs to incorporate truck traffic and mining equipment.
- Geologic cross-sections are needed
- Sections or profile views of the proposed mine pits and phases of the reclamation plan with a view of each of these faces from north, south, east, and west.
- Groundwater and surface water quality data is needed. Sampling could be collected while they're doing the aquifer pumping tests.
- Results of the pumping test are needed.
- A 3D groundwater model would be helpful in evaluating the different phases of the life stages of the mine over time.
- Well records are needed from within one half mile of the proposed mine.

He continued by stating that he would like to see contingency measures and how Levy is going to deal with situations that may arise and how they will mitigate any potential issues.

Mr. Wilczynski stated that he would like to see details of the transporting of materials. If they're using water as carriage water to transport material in a pipe, this can use significant volumes.

Mr. O'Mara reiterated that he would like to know more about their process including the management of silts and clays

Mr. Wilczynski also reiterated that if water is pulled from deeper in the aquifer, it may have a high

amount of iron in it. If it is then pumped to the surface and discharged where there's oxygen, this will oxidize it, and it basically turns into rust. It then becomes insoluble and can create an iron film.

Mr. O'Mara stated that these are things that Levy has probably dealt with on other sites. He stated another big item is the reclamation plan. He would like to ask Levy some questions related to the topography, anticipated lake levels, and vegetation.

Trustee Sclesky noted that this was part of Levy's presentation when it was first introduced to the Planning Commission.

Mr. O'Mara stated that he reviewed this, but typically on these sites the operator is required to have a more detailed plan because typically they must post a financial assurance mechanism, such as a bond or some credit, which is tied to reclamation. Therefore, there is typically a cost per acre.

Mr. Wilczynski stated that the problem he saw was with the density of housing in their reclamation plan. He stated that it will be impractical without having municipal water and sewer. The county doesn't like putting septic systems on inland lakes anymore and with the houses so close together, it won't be suitable if you're going to have to run septic and wells. He feels the reclamation plan they have is only viable if there are municipal services.

Mr. O'Mara noted that the septic tanks will eventually contribute to the lake. He continued by noting the washing plant and the separation of the sand and gravel into different sizes. This is going to use a lot of water for a million gallons a year, but there's opportunities to recycle, and he believes they will. The management of all the fine materials and where they are going to go is critical and Levy needs to have a plan for that. He stated that more details are needed on possible crushing operations. In these glacial tills, there can be a wide variety of boulders and sands, therefore, details are needed on what they are going to do with these. Typically they will crush them and make them into the angular aggregate but they need details on crushing operations, such as hours and controls. He stated that Levy needs to provide more backup documentation on the reclamation plan regarding quantities and unit rates. This way the Township will have something that they can, if necessary, go back and say, this is what we base your bond on, and we're assuming that Levy will reclaim the sites to these standards. He continued by stating that there has been a lot of good work done overall in the application, but there were data gaps that need to be closed before the township can make an informed decision.

Special Counsel Fisher asked if Levy is aware of what the gaps are.

Mr. O'Mara stated yes, they should be.

Director Richmond stated that one of the concerns that has been brought up many times is the concern for the Prairie Fens and the impact this mine will have on them. She asked Mr. Wilczynski and Mr. O'Mara if they could derive any information on how it will impact the Fens and the water levels.

Mr. Wilczynski stated that he doesn't want to comment on geology or hydrology until he sees cross-sections. He noted that the contributing area for a Fen can come from a long way away and he has concerns about any possible fens that are to the west.

Director Richmond stated that there are remnant fens in multiple areas within the township such as Mill Pond Park, which was discovered after the dam was removed, and Long Lake Fen, which is the biggest fen in this area. There has been a significant amount of research that has been done in these areas with endangered species such as the Poweshiek Skipperling and other endangered and unique species of mussels and fish in the rivers, as well as all the plant life that could be impacted greatly.

Mr. Wilczynski stated that Levy would have to do an ecological study and then they would have the township review it.

Director Richmond asked if there would be any test that could be done as to how the mine would be affecting the fen that's a mile away.

Mr. Wilczynski stated that it's going to be hard to say yes or no and he doesn't want to comment any further until he sees the data.

Mr. O'Mara stated that the pumping test will tell more.

Mr. Wilczynski stated it will show a little bit more on how far the radius of influence is.

Amanda Gruzin asked for clarification on what material Levy wants the most.

Mr. Wilczynski stated they want Till.

Ms. Gruzin stated that they're seeing the Holly Tindall mine expanding. She asked if Springfield Township is at risk of Levy possibly wanting to go to the other side of Ormond Road, even though they don't own the land.

Mr. Wilczynski stated that this could be a potential.

Ms. Gruzin noted that she found it interesting that the last wetland study was done so long ago and expired in 2005. She asked how long a wetland study stays good for.

Kara Okonewski stated that they are good for three years. The last one was done in 2002 and expired in 2005.

Ms. Gruzin asked what would be considered the growing season.

Mr. Wilczynski stated April through September or October. Plant species must be able to be recognized, and it would be weather dependent.

Director Richmond stated wetland work is typically done here starting in May.

Kara Okonewski noted that this would especially be the case if they want to hit Vernal pools, which are temporary pools of water that host specific wildlife, before they are gone.

Ms. Gruzin asked for clarification that the pumping test won't reflect how far of an effect the mine will have.

Mr. Wilczynski stated that this test is done to determine how much the aquifer can safely yield and then to see how far out it is going to be getting its water from.

Director Richmond asked if there is a better pumping well that Levy should be doing the pumping test from.

Mr. Wilczynski stated that there must be one dictated as a pumping well, and this all depends on the aquifers that need to be tested. For the simplest case, there will be a pumping well that's removing the groundwater and observation wells at different directions and distances where pressure transducers are installed to record the water level changes over time. This data is then uploaded and analyzed on a computer.

Director Richmond asked if ideally there would be a pumping test in each aquifer area.

Mr. Wilczynski stated that this is another reason as to why they need cross-sections, as they are the key part of any hydrogeological study.

Ms. Gruzin asked if in a perfect world, would there be a pumping test for every aquifer.

Mr. Wilczynski stated if it's going to be impacted. But if they're not impacted, no. He stated a big issue is what the impact on surface water will be. If they're going to pump in a confined aquifer, is that confined aquifer connected to the shallow aquifer? By pumping, you can see a change in the water level in the surface water, or you'll see a change in the drawdown rate. You can start to see if it's impacting surface water, if it's going to pinch out and what it can safely yield and how far away you'll be pulling the water.

Ms. Gruzin asked what is a shallow well, 100ft or less?

Mr. Wilczynski stated yes, there must be 25ft of separation between the wells screen and the surface.

Ms. Gruzin asked how current the data is on the number and depth of the surrounding wells.

Mr. Wilczynski stated that it's fairly current.

Ms. Okonewski stated that the Michigan Geological Survey had a presentation in 2024, and currently they've only said that 33% of what they've been able to establish in Oakland County are correct wells at properly located depths. So there could be potentially a lot more wells and a lot of missing information on these wells because it appears as though the mapping data has not been kept up with.

Director Richmond asked for clarity about pumping the groundwater and pulling the plume of contamination northwards. She asked how far northwards that could potentially pull.

Mr. Wilczynski stated they would know when they do the pumping test.

Special Counsel Fisher asked for clarification about whether this is a closed system or not.

Mr. Wilczynski stated that he doesn't believe it's a closed loop system because the water is going to be taken from a confined aquifer and is then going to be discharged to another confined aquifer.

Trustee Sclesky closed the meeting by reminding the Committee Members that the information discussed today must be reviewed by Levy to ensure the Township stays in compliance with the agreement. He thanked everyone for their time.

Meeting adjourned at 2:21 PM.

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP

SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX



LEVY APPLICATION MEETING

SPRINGFIELD TOWNSHIP
12000 Davisburg Road, Davisburg, MI 48350
Monday, November 17th, 2025
2:30 P.M.

PRESENT:

- Richard L. Davis, Township Supervisor
- Sean Miller, Township Clerk
- Julia Upfal, Giffels Webster Senior Planner
- Jason Mayer, Giffels Webster Engineer
- Jill Bahm, Giffels Webster Senior Planner
- Greg Need, Township Attorney
- Reuben Maxbauer, Burroughs Mining Corp. Director
- Bob Doyle, Burroughs Mining Corp. Engineer
- Danielle Sink, Supervisor's Assistant/Recording Secretary

Supervisor Richard L. Davis opened the meeting to review missing or incomplete information related to the Levy Mine application. He explained that the purpose was to evaluate items identified by Township staff and consultants as unresolved so the applicant can prepare a complete next submittal. Planning Consultant Julia Upfal noted that although the Township is meeting in November to discuss a June review letter, it is important to confirm that all requested revisions are understood. This meeting provides an opportunity for the applicant to ask questions and ensure all outstanding details are addressed before the next formal submission. She recommended beginning with engineering comments because that review was shorter and would set the foundation for planning discussion.

Engineer Jason Mayer summarized the June 17 engineering review letter, noting several outstanding items including updated plan details, additional plan notations, clarification of reclamation slopes and sequencing, verification of stormwater treatment prior to discharge, and confirmation of needed utility permits such as septic and water service. A major request involves updating the line-of-sight analysis from surrounding homes, including elevated decks and higher-elevation lots. Jason noted that some updates may appear in the applicant's draft plans, but only officially submitted materials can be used for review, so all updates must be included in the next submittal.

Representatives from Burroughs Mining responded to several engineering items. Reuben Maxbauer explained the reasoning behind berm phasing, stating the applicant does not intend to berm the entire site at the start in order to preserve farmland views in areas not yet affected by mining, but berms will remain ahead of active extraction. Bob Doyle added that a natural east-west ridgeline already provides substantial visual screening for many nearby homes. Updated cross-sections will show visibility from first- and second-story vantage points. The applicant agreed to expand the line-of-sight analysis.

Upfal requested clearer Phase 1 documentation, noting that the entrance driveway is not shown as part of Phase 1 even though its construction occurs early. She asked that all Phase 1 activities, including berms and driveway improvements, be shown. The applicant agreed to provide revised drawings, possibly color-coded or with separate sheets. Upfal also confirmed that the Township requires an updated land survey and updated aerial photography. Maxbauer noted that survey firms have already been hired. The Township also requires projected first-year extraction quantities.

Next steps include submitting revised plans addressing engineering and planning comments such as berm phasing, entrance screening, line-of-sight exhibits, stormwater information, survey updates, and extraction estimates. Once received, Township staff will determine whether the application is ready to proceed.

The group clarified survey and aerial data needs. Doyle explained an updated aerial is being prepared, but the existing topographic survey was presumed adequate; however, Upfal noted the ordinance may require more current survey information, especially since an older 1987 survey was previously submitted. The Township needs an updated boundary and aerial survey, and potentially updated contours. Maxbauer confirmed both the aerial imaging and boundary survey are underway. Upfal asked about the status of the property value study, which Maxbauer said is complete and will be submitted next. Supervisor Davis noted the Township will hire its own reviewer. Dust control requirements were discussed, and the applicant confirmed required information is being prepared.

Supervisor Davis referenced earlier correspondence requesting dust and noise information from other Levy operations. Doyle explained that a recent crystalline silica exposure study at three Levy sites used MSHA-compliant monitors and that test results were well below allowable exposure limits. Supervisor Davis asked whether particulate matter such as PM2.5 was included; Doyle stated the monitoring followed MSHA parameters. Maxbauer clarified that MSHA monitors differ significantly from consumer-grade monitors. The applicant will provide the study and seek clarification from state regulators on dust oversight. The applicant believes the state regulates dust emissions and requires an air quality permit, likely through EGLE. Upfal asked how this differs from NPDES permitting, and Doyle explained that NPDES addresses water discharge, not air.

Upfal asked about the lighting plan submitted informally, and all agreed consultants should review it only after revisions are incorporated. Upfal noted a geological study was recently submitted. Supervisor Davis then raised hydrogeology items, including the need for a 3D groundwater flow model due to the mine's scale and proximity to sensitive habitats and wells that was requested from Geologist Mike Wilczynski. He emphasized the need to demonstrate scientifically sound predictions of groundwater behavior, water table impacts, and wetland effects. He also stated geological cross-sections were missing and that a high-capacity test well is needed for drawdown analysis. The applicant has engaged a drilling contractor and will coordinate siting of the well.

Supervisor Davis asked whether the applicant has compiled well records within a half-mile radius and emphasized the need for a contingency plan addressing potential private well impact. Each mining phase must include representative plan and section views showing elevations, water table levels, and maximum mining depth. He also requested details on overburden storage, quantities, and placement. Upfal added that extensive soil-management comments must be addressed. Supervisor Davis outlined additional required details for reclamation, including lake elevation, final topography, soil profiles, vegetation, and habitat restoration.

Supervisor Davis requested information on the wash plant, water recycling, sediment handling, annual water usage, crushing operations, hours, mitigation methods, and itemized reclamation cost estimates.

Doyle stated these items can be addressed by breaking the plan into phases and documenting quantities and material use. Supervisor Davis then discussed financial assurance requirements. Upfal and Doyle confirmed that bonding can occur by phase and can increase or decrease depending on disturbance and reclamation.

Upfal explained several formatting needs, including consolidating development-wide plan notes and ensuring landscaping requirements apply across all phases. Minor corrections are also needed. She asked about site waste management; the applicant noted dumpsters would be located near the scale office and plant, and Upfal confirmed the ordinance may still require enclosures. She also emphasized the need to show truck-turning movements and identify slopes over 10% and to provide an invasive-species inventory, which the applicant is preparing.

The discussion shifted to the natural resource inventory. Doyle stated that BAR Engineering found limited invasive species in the resource protection area. Upfal clarified that only three species are required for inventory and that the resource protection overlay must be surveyed and flagged. Maxbauer noted that preserved areas can be flagged now, while mining boundaries should be flagged later to avoid confusion as the plan evolves. Supervisor Davis and Upfal agreed that final flagging will be required as a condition of final approval.

Upfal returned to phasing, requesting that each phase clearly show all activities, including berm construction and access modifications. Doyle noted that some operational details naturally shift year to year and are addressed through the annual permit process. Maxbauer and Doyle described how mining and reclamation overlap while maintaining the ordinance's 40% disturbance limit. Upfal suggested a detailed narrative because the process effectively creates multiple micro-phases, and Bahm recommended adding diagrams or slides to explain the sequence. Doyle said phase-specific summary blocks and narrative explanations can be provided, along with site-wide and phase-specific sheets. Upfal emphasized distinguishing between fixed elements such as berms and flexible elements such as stockpiles.

Upfal confirmed that mining permit review will not be handled administratively. She then noted that Ormond Road design work must be coordinated with the Road Commission and included in the next submittal, along with the Davisburg Road intersection. She will also provide formal comments on the traffic study, noise study, and lighting plan. She asked about future setbacks but confirmed that no housing is proposed. She requested a landscape inventory of existing trees. She also emphasized greenbelt requirements including tree counts, species, placement, and the need to show soil volumes for berm construction and stockpile locations. The site plan remains short of required parking lot trees.

Doyle asked about screening and landscaping requirements, noting that the ordinance allows berms and landscaping without requiring a specific number of berm plantings. Upfal explained that greenbelt trees and berm screening are separate requirements and that the full greenbelt requirement must be met. Maxbauer noted concerns about planting trees on berms that may later be removed, preferring placement in the greenbelt. Upfal, Bahm, and Maxbauer discussed setback dimensions and the need for an official interpretation.

Doyle and Upfal discussed planting strategies. While the berm may obscure the greenbelt, the greenbelt still must include additional species and diversity. Evergreen trees can be difficult to source at 12 feet, but deciduous trees generally meet the height requirement; six-foot evergreens may be used outside the greenbelt. The greenbelt applies to the public road frontage, although plantings along the north and south sides remain important for screening. Soil testing will be required to ensure suitable growth

conditions, and a vegetation maintenance agreement is needed. Transplanting native trees was deemed impractical.

Upfal requested written responses to outstanding items. She noted that Wetland 5 shows a 50-foot setback, yet mining is proposed within that setback and must be corrected. She requested detailed entrance dimensions and consistent roadway plans. She also noted a mismatch between employee count and provided parking spaces. Additional parking exists in newer drawings but must be formally submitted. The Township received the Natural Features Inventory, and Upfal suggested expanding protected boundaries to include Wetland 5. She requested that the 25-foot resource protection buffer be clearly shown.

Earlier plans had shown development within the resource protection overlay, but the applicant agreed to remove it and adjust boundaries accordingly. Additional detail is needed for reclamation planning, including material quality, stockpile volumes, storage locations, and timelines. Upfal noted that phasing remains the most confusing element and requested a clear narrative or 3-D visual. The applicant stated that multiple future submittals are expected, with the next major package focusing on water and traffic. Additional well data will be collected over several months.

Supervisor Davis asked about seasonal well-monitoring, and the applicant stated that existing data show minor seasonal variation but agreed to confirm with hydrogeologists and provide comparisons. Bahm emphasized that groundwater materials should be written for readers with no technical background. Supervisor Davis requested scale references for equipment sketches, and the applicant agreed. Visibility issues were discussed, and the applicant explained how the entrance geometry and berm placement are designed to block sight lines.

The group discussed public concerns regarding groundwater and nearby Superfund sites, including one in Rose Township. Supervisor Davis stated that the Township posted the latest review on its website and summarized concerns about plume containment. Staff agreed that the next submittal should include information addressing these questions, possibly including additional groundwater sampling.

Potential impacts from moving overburden and topsoil were discussed, and the applicant will investigate whether soil testing is appropriate.

The meeting concluded with acknowledgment that the discussion was productive and that the next submittal will address groundwater, traffic, phasing, screening, and the full range of technical details requested.

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP

SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX



Atwell Consultant Interview

Springfield Township
12000 Davisburg Road, Davisburg, MI 48350
Wednesday 19th, 2025
12:30 PM

PRESENT: Richard L. Davis, Township Supervisor
 Greg Need, Township Attorney
 Gerald Fisher, Township Special Council
 Kara Okonewski, Resident
 Chris Todd, Resident
 Don Berninger, Associate Director at Atwell
 Danielle Sink, Supervisor's Assistant/Recording Secretary

Supervisor Richard L. Davis convened the meeting to continue the Township's consultant interview process regarding the proposed sand and gravel mining application. He began by explaining that Springfield Township is one of the most environmentally diverse and ecologically sensitive communities in southeastern Michigan. He emphasized that the Township contains some of the most unique natural features in the state, including prairie fens, as well as critical wetlands, aquifers, and interconnected stream systems that support state and federally protected species. These habitats, he stressed, are essential components of the Township's identity and are deeply valued by residents.

Supervisor Davis stated that as the Township evaluates the proposed sand and gravel mining operation, it must do so with complete integrity, transparency, and neutrality. He reiterated that the Township has no preconceived agenda, neither to approve nor deny the application, and is instead committed to a fact based approach. He explained that the Township is therefore seeking an independent firm with no prior financial or professional connection to the applicant or any associated entities, including Levy Mining Corporation, Burrows Mining Corporation, and American Aggregates. He asked the consultant to confirm that neither he nor his firm had any such connections. Don stated that he personally had never worked with Levy and would verify that Atwell also had no history of work for Levy, Burrows, or American Aggregates.

Supervisor Davis explained that the consultant's role would be to help the Township carefully vet all technical claims and studies submitted by the applicant, identify gaps or inconsistencies, and produce a structured, research driven deliverables that will assist the Planning Commission in making informed and transparent recommendations. He explained that this report must also serve as a public facing resource to help the broader community understand how the proposed mining

operation could affect long term environmental health, public safety, and Township sustainability. He outlined concerns including groundwater impacts, habitat disturbance, infrastructure strain, property value effects, habitat fragmentation, light and noise pollution, traffic impacts, dust migration, and the site's proximity to an EPA designated Superfund site. The most recent five year Superfund review, completed in July, confirmed that the contamination plume is currently contained, but Supervisor Davis stressed that excavation or hydrologic changes could compromise that containment. He also explained that the review must account for future environmental conditions driven by climate change, such as more intense flooding, shifts in recharge patterns, and periods of drought, all of which can influence groundwater behavior and ecological stability.

Don asked whether the Township expected analyses such as groundwater evaluation, noise, traffic, wetlands, and geotechnical testing. Supervisor Davis confirmed that if Atwell intended to use subcontractors, the Township would require that those subcontractors meet the same conflict of interest standards and that the Township would review credentials before approving any subconsultant involvement. He then asked whether Atwell had any direct or indirect conflicts that could impair neutrality. Don said no, noting that he had no current projects in Springfield Township and was reviewing Atwell's prior work history to confirm no past involvement with the entities mentioned.

Special Counsel Fisher asked whether Atwell's work in Springfield in the past was done for private entities, and Don confirmed that it would have been. Supervisor Davis then moved into questions about technical expertise, asking what specific areas of competency Atwell offers that are relevant to evaluating a sand and gravel mining application. Don explained that Atwell is a full service engineering, survey, and environmental firm, but that its environmental division is more narrowly focused on natural resources. His personal expertise lies in wetlands science, state and federal wetland permitting, and sensitive habitat evaluation. He noted that Atwell routinely partners with subconsultants for geotechnical work, traffic analysis, and light/noise studies, as those services are not provided in house.

Supervisor Davis asked whether Atwell had experience evaluating mining or excavation projects near sensitive ecosystems or protected species. Don responded that he had worked on multiple gravel operations. Supervisor Davis then asked whether Atwell had experience working in environmentally sensitive communities facing active residential and ecological concerns. Don referenced the Saline Data Storage Center project, a large and highly publicized development with complex environmental impacts, explaining that he and his team are currently engaged in that review.

When asked whether Atwell had experience with site reclamation or long term post mining monitoring, Don stated that his firm has limited experience in long term mining monitoring but has conducted numerous mitigation monitoring projects for residential developments, wetland mitigation banks, and habitat restoration sites. Attorney Need asked whether Atwell has represented sand and gravel operators seeking permits; Don said no. Supervisor Davis also asked whether Atwell had ever evaluated mining applications for municipalities and what risks they observed; Don stated that Atwell typically works for private entities rather than municipalities.

Supervisor Davis asked whether the firm is familiar with dewatering, ground vibration, dust, and diesel emission risks. Don noted that Atwell had assisted as an impartial reviewer on the Nestlé water withdrawal case in Everett, Michigan, which involved groundwater modeling and environmental impact assessments. Supervisor Davis asked whether Atwell could evaluate both direct and cumulative impacts, including offsite impacts. Don answered yes. Supervisor Davis also

asked whether the firm could address complex issues such as the impact of large scale material removal on groundwater pressure and flow. Don asked for clarification regarding reclamation, and Supervisor Davis explained that the applicant intends a phased extraction followed by ongoing phased reclamation. Don asked about future land use, and Supervisor Davis stated that low impact residential development with a lake is the expected outcome.

Supervisor Davis then asked whether Atwell could evaluate changes in groundwater flow caused by excavation or dewatering and whether they could analyze interactions between the mining operation and the adjacent Superfund site, including plume mobilization. Don said that Atwell's subconsultants could. When asked whether they had worked in areas with legacy contamination or federal cleanup sites, Don referenced an EPA Superfund project in Howell where Atwell completed wetland, habitat, and species evaluation work while subcontracting the groundwater modeling components. When Attorney Fisher asked whether Atwell itself conducts groundwater work, Don confirmed that neither he nor Atwell performs groundwater modeling directly. When asked which subconsultant they typically use, he named G2.

Attorney Need asked whether Atwell performs GIS or environmental modeling, and also who would be assigned to the project if the Township retained Atwell. Don stated that he would lead wetland related tasks, with their vice president, Bourke Thomas, serving as project lead, and that Atwell would provide CVs. Presentations to boards or commissions would likely be done by Don and Bourke, with additional specialists as needed. Sarah asked whether Atwell presents to the public on environmental impacts, and Don confirmed that they do, noting that their work frequently involves EGLE public hearings. When Attorney Need asked about transparency and resident engagement, Don confirmed that he is comfortable participating in those settings, although he focuses strictly on wetland expertise during such presentations.

Attorney Need asked whether Don had provided expert witness testimony; Don confirmed two past cases, one involving a residential development on Michigan's west side and another commercial project in southeast Michigan. He also clarified that compliance evaluations include federal and state requirements.

Supervisor Davis asked whether Atwell's reporting could be prepared in a form suitable for inclusion in the Township's official record or for legal use. Don said yes. When asked whether Atwell could independently verify the applicant's technical submissions, including hydrogeological, traffic, noise, and environmental data, he confirmed that they could.

Supervisor Davis moved into project scope and capacity, asking about timeline and availability. Don stated that Atwell could begin immediately and confirmed that they have the capacity for ongoing review work and follow up evaluations. Supervisor Davis explained that attendance at Planning Commission and Township Board meetings may be required; Don said that he, Bourke, or their public relations specialist Danielle would attend as appropriate, noting that he has substantial experience presenting in environmentally sensitive communities such as West Bloomfield and Pittsfield Township.

Special Counsel Fisher asked who would handle groundwater issues for Atwell, and Don again identified G2 as their likely subcontractor. Attorney Need asked about property value analysis, and Don stated that a subcontractor would be required.

Sarah raised questions about ecological modeling and potential impacts to the Township's fen, which hosts endangered species. She showed Don a map illustrating the mining site, adjacent

wetlands, the nature preserve, and the Superfund site. Supervisor Davis added context, explaining that groundwater in the region generally flows toward the fen and that any hydrostatic pressure changes on the mining site could affect both plume containment and ecological temperature and flow conditions. Jerry noted that excavation would remove esker deposits that provide natural filtration. Don acknowledged the complexity and confirmed that the site contains numerous wetlands. Sarah explained that Springfield is known for its seeps, springs, and groundwater fed systems, noting that changes in water flow or temperature could significantly affect sensitive plants and the species dependent on them. Don said that baseline groundwater monitoring wells and surface level monitoring would be essential and could be done in coordination with Atwell's GIS and survey teams.

Jerry asked whether Atwell performs wetland delineations; Don confirmed they do. Jerry then asked whether delineation could result in reclassification of isolated wetlands as regulated wetlands. Don explained EGLE's 500 foot rule, differences between state and federal jurisdiction, and how groundwater connections may exist even when not recognized as regulated features. Kara asked how Atwell integrates subcontractor modeling into comprehensive reports identifying impact ranges and thresholds. Don explained that baseline data especially the decades of well records already available is crucial for valid long term projections. He stated that Atwell would analyze the applicant's proposed excavation depth, groundwater movement patterns, and site geology before structuring a multi layered assessment.

Supervisor Davis emphasized that the Township has paused the application and that the public hearing remains open, giving ample time to gather data and proceed methodically. Don agreed that time is essential for credible projections. Kara asked whether Atwell incorporates seasonal variation and climate conditions into assessments; Don confirmed that they do, explaining how annual precipitation and Army Corps APT tools are used in their evaluations.

Supervisor Davis then explained that the Township may compartmentalize consultant roles, asking whether Atwell was willing to work only on specific segments of the project. Don agreed and said he is most effective when focused on wetland related issues. Supervisor Davis asked whether Atwell is able to identify when certain segments overlap or require additional work outside the initial scope; Don confirmed that they would.

Supervisor Davis asked whether Atwell could provide a proposal by the first or second week of December. Don said yes and asked what the Township wanted included. Supervisor Davis stated that the Township prefers hourly rate structures, full transparency regarding subcontractor rates, and the ability to review subcontractor qualifications in advance. He explained that the Township may ask Atwell to work intermittently starting certain components, pausing at defined points, and resuming once additional information is available. He emphasized that the Township may host public sessions where Atwell's findings will be discussed alongside the applicant's experts, and he asked whether Atwell was comfortable communicating clearly to the public and working collaboratively with other professionals. Don said yes and added that they maintain good working relationships with many environmental firms. Supervisor Davis asked whether Don was familiar with the Township's existing experts, Brian O'Mara and Mike Wilczynski, and Don confirmed that he was.

Supervisor Davis reiterated that the proposal should include CVs, hourly rates for all Atwell contributors, and the rates or pass through costs for any subcontractors such as G2. Don confirmed that Atwell typically uses direct pass through billing for subcontracted work. Supervisor Davis said the Township might have follow up questions and explained again that he, Special

Counsel Fisher, Attorney Need, and himself were tasked with interviewing firms with residents present for transparency.

After concluding the interview, Supervisor Davis thanked Don for his time and excused him so that Township officials and residents could discuss their impressions candidly.

Following Don's departure, Special Counsel Fisher commented that Atwell could be valuable for wetlands analysis specifically. Attorney Need agreed, noting that Atwell lacked gravel mining experience and limited municipal experience. Supervisor Davis said he viewed Atwell's strength as highly focused on wetlands, and that this specialization could still serve a purpose as part of a multi expert review team. Fisher noted that having someone accustomed to private sector work might even add credibility before the applicant. Supervisor Davis observed that the Township would likely assemble a team of experts rather than relying on a single consultant, and that Atwell might fill a targeted role rather than a broad one. He also noted that Don was less strong as a public presenter compared to the other group, which several in the room agreed with.

Residents and staff shared observations. Sarah appreciated Don's strong grounding in wetlands science and his understanding of seasonal and ecological variability, which she felt other consultants had not addressed. Jerry commented on Don's evident passion for wetlands. Kara noted that Don demonstrated strong technical fluency, especially regarding endangered species, flora, and fauna. She believed that while groundwater modeling was outside Atwell's scope, Don clearly understood the ecological connectivity and could provide expertise that the Township currently lacks. She also remarked that the opportunity to work with Michigan's top fen would likely motivate him to do a thorough job.

Fisher concluded that Don came into the meeting without background preparation but answered questions truthfully and openly. Several participants agreed that while wetlands expertise alone would not cover the entire project, it would be useful to treat this review as a multi-disciplinary effort, hiring different specialists for different components. Supervisor Davis agreed, stating that using multiple experts would minimize bias and strengthen the credibility of the final record. He closed by indicating that Atwell may serve a limited but meaningful role in the Township's broader technical evaluation strategy.

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP

SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX



Fleis and VanderBrink (FVeng) Consultant Interview

Springfield Township
12000 Davisburg Road, Davisburg, MI 48350
Wednesday 19th, 2025
11:00 AM

PRESENT: Richard L. Davis, Township Supervisor
 Greg Need, Township Attorney
 Gerald Fisher, Township Special Council
 Kara Okonewski, Resident
 Chris Todd, Resident
 Dan Cabage, Fleis and VanderBrink
 Katie Hillenbrand Strohauer, Fleis and VanderBrink
 David DeLind, Fleis and VanderBrink
 Danielle Sink, Supervisor's Assistant/Recording Secretary

Supervisor Richard L. Davis convened the meeting at 11:00 AM on Wednesday, November 19, 2025, at the Springfield Township offices. Supervisor Davis opened by clearly stating the purpose of the interview: the Township is seeking an independent, highly competent consulting team to assist in evaluating a large-scale sand and gravel operation. The applicant is proposing to use a 244-acre parcel of land west of Ormond Road and north of Big Lake Road in Springfield Township and an adjacent 60-acre parcel of land in Rose Township as a new sand and gravel mine site. The extraction activity is expected to take place over the course of approximately 20 years and encompass five distinct phases. During this time, the applicant estimates that between 60,000 and 665,000 cubic yards of sand and gravel will be removed from the site annually. He explained that Springfield Township contains some of the most environmentally sensitive and ecologically diverse systems in Michigan—wetlands, aquifers, interconnected stream corridors, and prairie fens that support rare and protected species. Supervisor Davis reiterated that these natural systems hold exceptional value for residents and form a core part of the Township's identity, making it the Township's obligation to approach the application with integrity, neutrality, and total transparency.

He reminded everyone that the applicant has owned the land for decades and submitted extensive data earlier in the year, which the Township has begun reviewing alongside concerns raised by the Township's planning consultant and hydrogeologist. The Township is therefore seeking a firm capable of rigorously vetting every technical claim, identifying omissions, clarifying inconsistencies, and producing structured, accessible deliverables for both the Planning Commission and the broader public. Supervisor Davis stressed that there is no predetermined outcome—approval, denial, or conditional approval will rely solely on factual evidence and objective analysis. He clarified the process for those unfamiliar: the Planning Commission, functioning independently, will deliberate on findings and make a recommendation to the Township Board, and a strong technical record is essential to support that work.

Supervisor Davis began with questions about independence and conflicts of interest, asking FV Engineering to confirm they had no financial, contractual, or informal ties to the applicant, Levy, or any affiliates such as Burroughs Materials Corporation Mining Corporation or American Aggregates. FV Engineering confirmed they had none. He asked whether any direct or indirect conflicts might exist that could compromise neutrality, and the team stated they were not aware of any but would immediately disclose if something emerged during the review.

He then requested detailed descriptions of the firm's technical expertise in areas relevant to sand and gravel mining, including hydrogeology, ecological assessment, noise, blasting, reclamation, climate resilience, and regulatory compliance. FV Engineering outlined extensive experience supporting municipal clients on mining inspections, plan reviews, and regulatory oversight, including work in Brighton Township, Saline Township, and other communities. Supervisor Davis pressed further, asking whether they had experience evaluating mining near sensitive ecosystems, protected species, or in communities with high environmental value and active public concern. The team supplied examples involving wetlands, brownfields, and large residential districts, including situations adjacent to the GM Proving Grounds where groundwater contamination required close monitoring.

The discussion turned to contamination pathways, where Supervisor Davis referenced the GM salt plume and asked whether FV Engineering could assess how excavation or dewatering might alter groundwater flow or affect containment boundaries. FV confirmed they could model contaminant mobility under different mining scenarios. They also described their experience evaluating water use impacts for large industrial proposals, such as the Big Rapids battery plant, where they performed groundwater modeling and presented detailed findings at public meetings. Supervisor Davis asked whether the firm could predict hydrostatic pressure changes, evaluate cross-contamination between aquifer layers—such as mobilizing naturally occurring arsenic—and determine impacts of deep excavation on groundwater recharge. FV stated these analyses are feasible when adequate data is available, and while geotechnical modeling may require specialized subconsultants, they routinely coordinate those services and would thoroughly vet any firm used.

Supervisor Davis then examined their capacity to evaluate long-term and cumulative impacts, including the physical consequences of removing millions of cubic yards of material. With shallow water tables and an elevated glacial formation on the property, he asked whether FV could quantify how lowering overburden weight could alter groundwater behavior across hundreds of acres. Residents added context, noting the applicant estimated 660,000 cubic yards removed annually—equivalent to billions of pounds. FV explained that geotechnical specialists would contribute to such modeling, but their hydrogeologists could integrate those findings into comprehensive groundwater assessments.

Turning to reclamation, Supervisor Davis asked whether the firm could evaluate phased reclamation plans and verify whether the applicant's approach aligned with best practices. FV emphasized their strong preference for phased reclamation to avoid "Swiss-cheese" excavation that leads to poor restoration outcomes. Supervisor Davis asked whether they could evaluate legacy agricultural impacts—herbicides, fertilizers, and soil nutrients—and determine whether contaminants could migrate into groundwater during or after mining. FV responded that baseline monitoring wells and continued sampling would form part of that analysis.

Supervisor Davis then addressed concerns regarding vibration, dust, diesel emissions, dewatering effects, and habitat disturbance, asking whether the firm could assess both direct and cumulative

impacts extending off-site. FV said yes. He then asked whether FV could evaluate potential hydrologic changes associated with exposing groundwater or creating new post-extraction lakes, noting EGLE's involvement when final pit lakes exceed certain sizes. FV confirmed familiarity with those processes.

He next shifted to the adjacent Superfund site, asking whether the firm could model how excavation or dewatering could alter the plume's movement and whether contaminants could migrate under changing pressure conditions. FV confirmed substantial experience with groundwater transport modeling, contamination pathway analysis, and regulatory coordination with EGLE and the EPA.

Supervisor Davis then raised climate resilience, asking whether FV had evaluated how long-term trends—intense rainfall, flooding, drought, shifts in recharge, and wetland hydrology—might interact with mining operations. While the firm had not studied climate trends specifically for mining, they described completing similar risk assessments for municipal wellfields in Battle Creek and said they could apply those same tools here. Supervisor Davis asked whether they could assess whether the mine would increase environmental vulnerability or reduce long-term climate resilience, and FV responded that they rely on EPA trend data, evolving federal standards, and modeling projections to make those assessments.

He then asked about legal and regulatory compliance, verifying that FV can review the application under local ordinances, EGLE requirements, the Clean Water Act, and the Endangered Species Act. FV confirmed they routinely coordinate with EPA and state agencies and noted that their senior hydrogeologist, Jim Brody, has extensive expert witness experience, including in dewatering litigation.

Supervisor Davis turned to transparency and public engagement, explaining that the Township expects unbiased data verification and clear public communication. He asked whether the firm could independently verify hydrological, ecological, traffic, noise, and environmental submissions, including the applicant's traffic study prepared by Fischbeck. FV described their in-house traffic group—one of the region's strongest—and noted recent examples where Fischbeck's studies required additional elements. Supervisor Davis emphasized the need for a traffic safety study, not just a volume study, given resident concerns about trucks near driveways, mailboxes, and pedestrian activity; FV confirmed they perform such analyses regularly.

He asked about their review methodology, and FV explained their multi-step process comparing third-party submissions to regulations, industry best practices, and data consistency benchmarks. They often coordinate with MDOT, EGLE, county soil erosion officers, and other agencies to ensure alignment. Supervisor Davis confirmed that the firm has worked with the Road Commission for Oakland County, which they have.

He then asked about GIS and modeling capabilities, which FV confirmed, and whether they were willing to present findings publicly—even when challenged by the applicant's experts. The firm described multiple instances where they represented municipalities during contentious public meetings and worked alongside contractors and opposing experts to ensure factual clarity. Attorney Need asked about team structure, and FV stated that the Township could designate a single point of contact or use a broader communication structure. Supervisor Davis reiterated that a single point person is essential.

Supervisor Davis discussed his emphasis on transparent government, referencing his establishment of a citizens fact-finding group, and asked whether the firm was comfortable operating in full public transparency with all findings shared openly. FV responded that openness is integral to their work, noting personal and professional commitments to public information and engagement.

Turning to logistics, Supervisor Davis asked about availability and timing. The application remains paused, the public hearing is still open, and the Township expects a roughly year-long review. FV said they could begin immediately. He also explained that applicant data will come in organized “drops,” and asked whether FV can complete intermittent reviews and provide progress updates. FV confirmed they can. Supervisor Davis clarified that Planning Commission meetings are held the third Tuesday of the month and Township Board meetings the second Thursday, and attendance may be required at certain sessions.

Residents and counsel raised additional questions. Fisher asked whether FV could help determine bonding amounts once excavation begins, and FV confirmed they have experience setting bond levels based on pit size and reclamation obligations. Fisher also asked whether they could model traffic impacts on residential living patterns rather than just intersections; FV said they could. Sarah raised concerns about sensitive habitats in the area, and FV described their work evaluating high-capacity wells, precipitation effects on wetlands, and habitat changes. Supervisor Davis asked about invasive species and whether FV could evaluate sheet-flow changes after reclamation; FV responded that they aim to avoid altering natural flow paths and would analyze any effects on the identified wetland to the rear of the site. Okonewski asked how far out secondary impacts would be evaluated, and FV explained that they often review areas four to five miles from a site depending on the issue. Supervisor Davis asked whether the firm could identify boundaries beyond which no additional scientific concern exists, and FV described using pre-modeling, pumping data, and hydrologic buffers to determine that limit. They also stated they could continue monitoring active mining sites over time.

Supervisor Davis noted that Springfield has other active and depleted mines and asked whether FV could assist with improving oversight and supporting reclamation on one of the older sites; FV said yes. Okonewski asked about dual watershed impacts on the Ormond site, which FV said is common. Supervisor Davis then requested examples of projects where the firm recommended approval, denial, or approval with conditions. FV described examples including a controversial project where the applicant met all ordinance standards, leading to a recommendation for approval, and explained that their mining recommendations often rely on hydrogeological modeling and environmental risk evaluation performed by their senior team members. Supervisor Davis reiterated the Township’s framework of three potential outcomes: full approval if no significant impacts can be demonstrated, denial if serious consequences are proven, or approval with stringent conditions if impacts can be mitigated.

Supervisor Davis asked when the Township could expect a formal proposal, and FV committed to the first or second week of December. They asked how many firms the Township was interviewing, and Supervisor Davis stated that the Township is evaluating three firms in addition to two experts already retained, seeking multiple perspectives to ensure comprehensive coverage. After expressing appreciation for the firm's time and professionalism, Supervisor Davis dismissed the consultants and held a short internal discussion with Township staff and residents. Fisher remarked that FV’s candor about their strengths and limitations was reassuring. Council Need agreed that their responses were direct, clear, and grounded in experience. Supervisor Davis asked the group whether any topics had been missed or should be added to future interviews, and

participants agreed that the questions were thorough, methodical, and effectively covered all critical areas.

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

Agate Harbors and Pangea

Springfield Township

12000 Davisburg Road, Davisburg, MI 48350

Friday November 21st, 2025

1:00 PM

PRESENT:

Richard L. Davis, Township Supervisor

Greg Need, Township Attorney

Gerald Fisher, Township Special Council

Brian O'Mara, Agate Harbors Advisors LLC

Michael Wilczynski, Pangea LLC

Danielle Sink, Supervisor's Assistant/Recording Secretary

Supervisor Davis opened the meeting at 1:00 p.m. to review the Levy materials, emphasizing the Township's commitment to an honest, transparent, and accountable process. He reiterated that his priority is maintaining integrity in every step of the review and ensuring that all work is coordinated properly through the Supervisor's office, so decisions remain structured, neutral, and fully documented.

Attorney Need outlined the Township's approach, explaining that the primary technical analysis will be performed by the Township's contracted experts, with O'Mara and Wilczynski providing a second level, devil's advocate review to identify any weaknesses or gaps. He reaffirmed that the Township is not operating with any predetermined outcome and that Supervisor Davis has insisted on maximum transparency given the level of resident concern. He noted that the Citizen Fact Finding Committee has been included in prior meetings as part of Supervisor Davis's commitment to openness. Attorney Need confirmed that all questions from Township staff and consultants, including Wilczynski's, had been delivered to Levy, and Levy did not push back on any of them.

When Supervisor Davis acknowledged that past projects suggested O'Mara and Wilczynski may have perspectives shaped by industry work, both consultants explicitly stated they are pro mining. Wilczynski clarified that he personally invests in mining and even opened a diamond mine in

SPRINGFIELD CHARTER TOWNSHIP



SEAN R. MILLER, CLERK

248-846-6510 | 248-846-6538 FAX

Canada, and O'Mara added that if anything, they bring a mining aligned viewpoint. This distinction reinforced Supervisor Davis's goal of balancing perspectives by pairing their mining industry experience with independent, neutral reviews from larger firms.

Supervisor Davis explained that the Township's structure is deliberate: Levy must supply all required data; the Township's main experts will rigorously review it; and O'Mara and Wilczynski will then perform an additional challenge-based review. He emphasized that this tiered process reduces risk, increases accuracy, and ensures that no single viewpoint, Township, applicant, or industry aligned consultant dominates the record. The goal, he said, is scientific clarity and a defensible process before anything is forwarded to the Planning Commission.

The consultants discussed multiple firms, including Ramboll, Atwell, Fishbeck, and Fleis & Vandenbrink, with Supervisor Davis clearly outlining the Township's expectations for neutrality and expertise. Supervisor Davis also noted that while Triterra was interviewed, the Township determined that their experience did not meet the level required for this project, though they showed strength in wetland work.

Supervisor Davis reflected briefly on his first year in office, stating that he always follows proper channels, seeks board approval on major decisions, and maintains collaboration with legal counsel. He emphasized that strong communication and accountability guide every action taken by his office. Supervisor Davis noted that O'Mara and Wilczynski are valued contributors but reiterated that all work must be initiated by the Supervisor's office to ensure consistency and oversight.

Wilczynski said his immediate need is access to the large format engineering sheets, since the digital copies were difficult to read. Supervisor Davis offered to obtain them if they were not already at the office. With no further questions, Supervisor Davis ended the meeting.

SCOPE OF WORK

Prepared by
Ric Davis
Township Supervisor

Reviewed for Form and Process by

Greg Need
Township Counsel

Gerry Fisher
Special Counsel

Review and Concurrence Statement

This document has been reviewed by Township Counsel and Special Counsel. Counsel approve the process outlined herein and concur that the process described is legally sufficient and consistent with applicable law and Township procedures.

Such review does not alter the supervisory authorship of this document but reflects counsel's agreement as to the legal validity of the process described.

Scope of Work (SOW)

Independent Environmental Review – Burroughs Gravel Mine Application

Location: Springfield Township, Michigan

Prepared by: Ric Davis, Springfield Township Supervisor

Purpose and Guiding Principle

Springfield Township will commission an independent, science-based review of the environmental studies submitted by Burroughs Mining, as part of their gravel mine Special Land Use request.

This review is a proactive measure to ensure decisions are informed by verified facts, expert analysis, and community interests, not assumptions or outside pressure. The purpose is not to oppose or endorse the application prematurely, but to create the conditions for sound, lawful, and community-conscious governance.

Directive from the Supervisor

This review shall be entirely fact-driven and impartial.

Independent experts must approach their task without predisposition toward approval or denial of the application.

All work products, draft or final, must be reviewed and approved by the Springfield Township Supervisor prior to any public release or distribution.

Public communication of findings must align with the Township's commitment to transparency, clarity, and due process.

All professional services rendered under this Scope of Work shall be conducted in accordance with the prevailing standards of care, skill, and diligence practiced by qualified professionals in the field of environmental and land-use review.

Strategic Objectives

Determine the scientific validity of all environmental studies submitted
Protect Springfield Township's natural resources, public health, and infrastructure
Provide a clear, neutral, and trustworthy assessment for Township officials and residents
Ensure public decisions are guided by truth, not influence
Identify any cultural, historic, or tribal resources that may be affected and ensure compliance with state and federal expectations
Evaluate both individual and cumulative environmental impacts to ensure a complete understanding of community risk

Environmental Review Focus Areas

Groundwater and Hydrogeology

Evaluate aquifer integrity, flow modeling, residential well impact, and contamination risk
Include analysis of off-site impacts to connected hydrologic systems

Stormwater and Surface Water Runoff

Evaluate the applicant's stormwater management plan
Assess erosion, sedimentation, flood potential, and downstream impacts on wetlands, prairie fens, and streams

Air Quality and Dust Control

Analyze particulate and silica dust projections and alignment with state and federal health standards
Assess the probability of dust migration beyond the proposed mining site

Noise and Vibration Impact

Review operational sound levels and vibration effects on nearby homes, schools, wildlife, and infrastructure

Ecological and Wildlife Assessment

Assess impacts on sensitive ecosystems, including prairie fens and other wetlands
Evaluate risk to rare or endangered insect, animal, and plant life within and beyond the project area
Determine whether proposed activities could disrupt ecological corridors or habitat continuity

Traffic and Infrastructure Stress

Examine projected truck volumes, road wear, pedestrian safety, and emergency access implications

Reclamation and Post-Mining Land Use

Assess feasibility of the reclamation plan, timeline, and long-term land use compatibility with the Township Master Plan

Regulatory Compliance

Confirm alignment with Michigan EGLE standards, Springfield Township Zoning Ordinances, and applicable federal environmental policies

Proximity to Existing Contamination

Evaluate cumulative or compounding environmental risks associated with the nearby Superfund site

Assess whether mining activities could alter hydrological or airborne pathways that increase contaminant spread

Property Valuation Impact

Assess potential impacts on residential and commercial property values surrounding the proposed mining site

Include comparisons to similar mining operations in other municipalities

Consider both short-term and long-term market effects, including development limitations

Cultural, Historic, or Tribal Resources

Identify any known historic, archaeological, or tribal resources in or near the site

Determine whether any federal or state cultural resource reviews are applicable

Cumulative Environmental Impact

Assess combined effects when considering nearby industrial uses, natural resource vulnerabilities, and community exposure levels

Emergency Preparedness and Response

Evaluate the applicant's emergency response and mitigation plans

Assess readiness for environmental accidents, contamination events, or hazardous material situations

Consider coordination capabilities with local first responders and Township emergency personnel

Deliverables and Approval Protocol

Initial Document Review

Memo identifying completeness, deficiencies, or missing elements in the applicant's submission

Technical Evaluation

Full scientific assessment by discipline-specific experts

The expert team must identify any deficiencies, inconsistencies, or unsupported assumptions in the applicant's materials

Consultation on Additional Needs

If additional data, analysis, testing, or third-party review is required for a complete perspective, the expert team must promptly consult with the Township Supervisor and legal counsel to recommend next steps

All deliverables must present a complete and logically supported evaluation, leaving no relevant issue unaddressed

Comparative Risk Matrix

Side-by-side comparison of applicant data with scientific and industry standards

Risk Summary

Identification of potential environmental, health, safety, or economic risks, including the likelihood and scale of off-site impacts

Public Summary Report

A plain-language version of findings designed for public meetings and engagement

Must be reviewed and approved by the Supervisor prior to release

All deliverables must be easy to read and understandable by the general public

Visuals, charts, graphs, and maps should be used to communicate key findings

Presentation materials must be suitable for use at public meetings and on the Township website

Public Input Integration

Where appropriate, deliverables should acknowledge relevant themes or concerns raised by residents during public comment periods or hearings

Expert Testimony

Availability for presentations at Township Board meetings or public hearings when requested

Community Q and A Session

The expert team may participate in a virtual or in-person Q and A session at the Township's discretion following Supervisor-approved report release

Ongoing Monitoring Recommendations

Experts must provide recommendations for ongoing environmental monitoring, compliance checks, and post-approval oversight if the project is granted approval

Personnel Documentation Requirement

All participating professionals must submit

CVs or resumes

Areas of expertise

List of subcontractors

Statement confirming independence from the applicant or related parties

A signed declaration affirming no financial interest, current contract, or pending agreement with the applicant or affiliated parties

Deadline for submission: [Insert Date]
All documents must be provided in PDF format

Confidentiality and Oversight

All findings, reports, and supporting documents are the property of Springfield Township
No information may be publicly released, published, or distributed without written approval by the Springfield Township Supervisor

All communications must comply with Michigan FOIA requirements and Township transparency policies

All participating consultants and contractors shall treat all data, draft reports, communications, and internal documents as confidential unless expressly authorized in writing by the Township Supervisor. Unauthorized disclosure will be considered a breach of contract and may result in legal or professional consequences

Use of Findings

All final reports and supporting documentation may be used by the Township in public meetings, zoning decisions, regulatory agency communications, or legal proceedings

Any use or representation of these findings outside of official Township actions must receive prior written approval from the Township Supervisor

Disclaimer

The findings and conclusions presented by the expert team are those of the independent consultants and do not necessarily reflect the official position of Springfield Township
The Township shall not be held liable for any errors, omissions, or conclusions made by contracted parties involved in the review

Governing Law

This Scope of Work shall be governed and interpreted under the laws of the State of Michigan.
Any disputes arising from the execution or interpretation of this document shall be subject to the jurisdiction of Oakland County Circuit Court

Approved by

Ric Davis
Springfield Township Supervisor
Date: _____

Acknowledged and Agreed by *(if applicable)*

[Consulting Firm Name]
Authorized Representative Name and Title
Date: _____

Appendices (To Be Attached as Needed)

Appendix A: Public Comment Summary

Appendix B: Site Maps and Zoning Data

Appendix C: Reporting Format Templates

Appendix D: Consultant Contract Agreement (if applicable)

Springfield Township
Fact-Finding Committee
Review Kickoff Meeting Packet
Independent Consultant Review
Levy / Burroughs Mining Application

Prepared by
Ric Davis
Township Supervisor

Reviewed for Form and Process by

Greg Need
Township Counsel

Gerry Fisher
Special Counsel

Review and Concurrence Statement

This document has been reviewed by Township Counsel and Special Counsel. Counsel approve the process outlined herein and concur that the process described is legally sufficient and consistent with applicable law and Township procedures.

Such review does not alter the supervisory authorship of this document but reflects counsel's agreement as to the legal validity of the process described.

Contact
Rdavis@springfield-twp.us

Meeting Date
January 15, 2026

Meeting Time
2:00 PM

Meeting Location
Lower-Level Conference Room
Civic Center Building

Table of Contents

1. Meeting Purpose and Supervisor Overview
2. Supervisor Opening Remarks
3. Overview of the Independent Review Process
4. Overview of the Township Scope of Work

5. Independent Review Materials Provided
6. Fact-Finding Committee Evaluation Worksheet Instructions
7. Independent Review Instructions and Submission Requirements
8. Process Discussion Guidelines
9. Next Steps Following Independent Review
10. Follow-Up Meeting Purpose

Section 1

Meeting Purpose and Supervisor Overview

This meeting serves as the formal kickoff for the Fact-Finding Committee's work related to the independent consultant review of the Levy / Burroughs mining application.

The purpose of this meeting is procedural and preparatory. It is intended to establish the process, expectations, and structure for independent review by each committee member.

This meeting is not intended for discussion, comparison, evaluation, or selection of consultants. No opinions, preferences, or conclusions regarding the proposals will be shared or debated.

Any discussion during this meeting is limited strictly to process, logistics, and procedure.

Section 2

Supervisor Opening Remarks

Good afternoon. Before we begin, I want to clearly state the purpose of today's meeting and how it fits into the Township's overall process.

This meeting is not for discussion, comparison, or evaluation of the consultant proposals. It is not a meeting where opinions are shared, preferences expressed, or conclusions drawn. No consultant selection, task assignment, or recommendation will occur today.

The sole purpose of this meeting is to set the stage for independent review by each committee member. Each of you will review the materials on your own, using the evaluation worksheet provided, and form your own assessments without influence from group discussion.

This structure is intentional. Independent review first ensures that when we come back together, our discussion is informed, disciplined, and fair. There will be time for discussion at a later meeting, after all independent reviews are completed.

Any questions today should be limited to process, materials, or logistics.

Section 3

Overview of the Independent Review Process

Springfield Township is using a phased and deliberate process to evaluate independent consultants for the review of the Levy / Burroughs mining application.

The first phase focuses on orientation and process setup. Materials are distributed, expectations are explained, and deadlines are established. No evaluation occurs during this phase.

The second phase is independent review. Each committee member reviews the consultant proposals and the Township Scope of Work independently and completes the evaluation worksheet without consultation with other members.

The third phase is structured discussion. After all independent reviews are submitted, the committee reconvenes to discuss findings, identify strengths and weaknesses, and begin developing a task-based approach to consultant selection.

The fourth phase involves development of the selection approach. Based on committee discussion and legal guidance, the Township determines appropriate consultant roles, scopes, and next steps.

Section 4 Overview of the Township Scope of Work

The Township Scope of Work establishes what must be reviewed, not who should perform the work.

It includes environmental review, technical analysis, regulatory and ordinance compliance, infrastructure impacts, public communication, and long-term oversight considerations.

The Scope of Work serves as the foundation for evaluating consultant qualifications and determining which firm is best suited for particular review tasks.

Section 5 Independent Review Materials Provided

Each committee member has been provided the following materials for independent review:

- Consultant proposal submitted by Ramboll Americas
- Consultant proposal submitted by Fleis & VandenBrink
- Township Scope of Work for Independent Environmental Review
- Fact-Finding Committee Evaluation Worksheet

Committee members are expected to review all materials thoroughly as part of the independent review phase.

Section 6 Fact-Finding Committee Evaluation Worksheet Instructions

The Fact-Finding Committee Evaluation Worksheet is the primary tool for documenting independent review.

Each committee member is required to complete the worksheet independently, without discussion or collaboration with other committee members.

Completed worksheets will be used to inform later committee discussion and do not represent a final recommendation or decision.

Section 7 Independent Review Instructions and Submission Requirements

Each committee member shall independently review the consultant proposals and related materials following the kickoff meeting.

Each committee member shall complete the Fact-Finding Committee Evaluation Worksheet independently.

Completed evaluation worksheets must be submitted no later than 5:00 PM on February 15, 2026.

Completed worksheets shall be submitted to:

Danielle Sink
Assistant to the Township Supervisor
Rdavis@springfield-twp.us

Copies shall be provided to:

Greg Need
Township Counsel
gneed@anafirm.com

Gerry Fisher
Special Counsel
fisherg@cooley.edu

All submissions must clearly identify the committee member and date of completion. Submitted materials will be treated as committee working documents.

Section 8 Process Discussion Guidelines

Limited discussion is permitted during the kickoff meeting, but only on matters related to process.

Permitted discussion topics include review timelines, use of evaluation worksheets, submission procedures, confidentiality, legal roles, and scheduling of future meetings.

Discussion of proposal content, consultant qualifications, strengths, weaknesses, preferences, or comparisons is not permitted at this meeting. The Supervisor will redirect discussion if it moves beyond process.

Section 9

Next Steps Following Independent Review

After independent reviews are completed and submitted, the Supervisor will compile common themes and identify areas requiring discussion.

The committee will reconvene for a structured discussion meeting focused on comparing findings, identifying strengths and gaps, and beginning development of a task-based selection approach.

No consultant selection will occur until after this discussion phase and review by legal counsel.

Section 10

Follow-Up Meeting Purpose

The purpose of the follow-up meeting is to begin substantive discussion after all independent reviews have been completed.

This meeting will focus on reviewing evaluation themes, identifying task categories, discussing firm suitability by task area, and outlining next steps in the consultant selection process.

This meeting marks the transition from independent analysis to structured committee deliberation.

Process Discussion Invitation

The Supervisor will invite any questions or discussion limited to the review process as outlined in this packet.

To: Clerk's Office <clerk@springfield-twp.us>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] FOIA Request, Levy/BMC Review Meetings

Caution: This email originated from outside of Springfield Township's email system. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Clerk Miller,

Pursuant to the Michigan Freedom of Information Act, MCL 15.231 et seq., I am requesting copies of public records related to any meetings held from November 15, 2025 through the date this request is fulfilled involving the Springfield Township Fact-Finding Committee and/or individuals participating in the review of the Ormond Road Levy/BMC sand and gravel mining proposal.

For clarity, I am not requesting records from regular evening public meetings of the Township Board, Planning Commission, Zoning Board of Appeals, or other publicly noticed meetings where minutes are already posted or publicly available. This request is intended to cover the other meetings and discussions related to the Levy/BMC proposal and review process.

This request includes, but is not limited to, records of any meetings involving one or more of the following individuals or entities:

- Supervisor Ric Davis
- Residents Chris Todd and/or Amanda Gruzin
- Planning Commission Chair Brian Galley
- Trustee Kevin Sclesky
- Giffels Webster
- Carlisle/Wortman Associates
- Brian O'Mara, Agate Harbor Advisors
- Ramboll Consultants
- Mike Wilczynski, Pangea Environmental
- Reuben Maxbauer, Levy/BMC
- Any other independent expert, consultant, engineer, planner, hydrogeologist, environmental reviewer, or technical reviewer involved in the Levy/BMC mining proposal review process

I am specifically requesting the following records for any such meetings related to the Ormond Road Levy/BMC mining proposal:

- Meeting dates
- Meeting minutes
- Agendas
- Notes
- Handouts
- Presentations

- Reports or draft reports discussed
- Sign-in sheets or attendance lists
- Meeting summaries
- Written materials distributed before, during, or after the meetings
- Any related attachments or supporting materials

This request is limited to the time period of November 14, 2025 through the date this request is fulfilled.

Please provide the records electronically by email if possible. If any portion of this request is denied, please provide the specific statutory exemption relied upon and release all reasonably segregable non-exempt portions of the records.

Thank you!

Sincerely,

Kara Okonewski

Certified Environmental Interpreter & Founder

Oko Environmental, LLC

Okoenv.com

kara@okoenv.com

(248) 483-0183

Science Within Reach - Providing Clear Environmental Science for Communities and Leaders



Oko Environmental, LLC