

# 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.