

## **Pope Resources (PR)/Iron Mountain Quarry (IM) Questions**

On June 12, 2008 Lynn Gauché, Larry Nobles, Bill Browne, John Cragoe and Dan Meade met with Jon Rose (PR, Director of Real Estate), Tom Kametz (PR, Director of Timberlands), Sue Schroeder (PR, Director of Port Gamble Development), Diana Smeland (PLA, President), Miriam Villiard (PLA), and David Wayne Johnson (Port Ludlow Jefferson County Planner) to discuss the questions below with PR representatives and become informed in regard to the proposed Iron Mountain Quarry development. After an opening background statement by Jon Rose attempts were made to answer these questions (Developed by Lynn Gauche, Bill Browne and other members of the community). Our best understanding of these responses follows each question.

Jon Rose gave a brief history of the Port Ludlow development initiated by Pope & Talbot, with the real estate development part of the company and part of its Jefferson County timber land spun off as PR in 1995. PR sold the Port Ludlow part of the real estate development part of PR to PLA in 2001. During the late 1990s PR attempted to bridge the gulf between the company and Port Ludlow residents by developing a planning forum to obtain agreement on issues that then existed. The trail system and subsequent easement was part of this agreement. PR's major timberland business is currently tree cutting (99%) and mining (1%) and their other major business is Real Estate Management (excluding actual building and ownership of businesses on the properties developed). They want to be good neighbors while developing their properties.

***Issue Statement:** Pope Resources (PR) developed a beautiful Master Planned Resort here in Port Ludlow which Port Ludlow Associates (PLA) continues to grow and improve. Iron Mountain's (IM) mining operations adjacent to our boundaries could have significant impacts on our environment, aquifers and property values.*

- 1) **How will Port Ludlow residents be assured that there will never be damage/contamination to the OWSI aquifer?** For instance could an earth quake rupture the supposed protection divide between the mining operations and the aquifer? Jon Rose indicated that no one can guarantee never, but strongly feels that the proposed mining operation would not cause damage to the aquifer. As far as chemicals used for the operations there should be none. Currently the forest spraying, homeowner spraying and fertilizing, golf course spraying and fertilizing, and other chemical introduced through home ownership would cause more contamination than the mine.
- 2) **How will Port Ludlow be protected from rock mining operations, rock crushing and trucking noise?**
  - a) **Will mining take place M-F after 6 p.m. possibly causing light reflection and noise into Port Ludlow?** Believes that IM's operation would be much like Shine's as the employment costs would escalate substantially if they mined during the night and over the weekend. Currently, Shine has trucks leaving the site Saturday mornings.
  - b) **What will be done to insure that there will not be a negative impact on Port Ludlow's air quality from blasting, rock crushing and trucking**

**operations?** The environmental impact studies and rulings should provide for protection.

- 3) **Approximately how many IM rock trucks will be exiting the mining site each day?**
  - a) **How many might go through Port Ludlow (possibly on Oak Bay Road)?**

Don't know, but this will certainly be covered in the environmental phase of the permitting process.
- 4) **Will the current and future clear cutting open channels for added noise from State Route 104?** Most remaining trees in the area of concern are less than 20 years and it will take 20 more years before harvest. There are some small areas with mature trees that will be harvested.
- 5) **The golf course is a bird sanctuary. What will be done to negate the impact of mining operations and related clear cutting:**
  - a) **On the bird population and their habitats around the golf course and in our community?**
  - b) **On other native wildlife in the area?** As the 142 acres are adjacent to the Shine mine they believe that there wouldn't any measurable effect.
- 6) **Twenty-two of the 142 acres leased fall within the area of easements granted to PLA by PR at the time of sale in 2001.**
  - a) **Why has PR leased land for mining purposes when they granted easements on the same land for our trails and utilities?**
  - b) **How will these easements be protected?** In the planning forum (1998) the Port Ludlow Trails Committee accepted the fact that resource & timber harvesting would take place on PR property.
- 7) **What will be done for the rehabilitation of the Port Ludlow Timberton Trail? When?** The area will be replanted.
- 8) **Can PR develop a buffer zone around Port Ludlow's MPR that will exclude mining operations and other similar disruptions to our environmental and economic quality of life?** Tom Kametz and Jon Rose offered to call Iron Mountain about the possibility of removing the northernmost 22 acres from the lease, as it is the area that is of most concern to us.
- 9) **Is rock mining the best long-term use of the 140+ acres of land owned by Pope Resources?** Yes, economically it is in the best business interests of PR to use the land in this manner.
- 10) **Has PR done economic/environmental studies on how similar size operations affect local communities?** No
  - a) **Has IM done such studies and presented these findings to PR?** Don't know. IM will have to respond to SEPA during the permitting process.
  - b) **Has the Bureau of Mines done similar studies?** Don't know.
- 11) **In terms of expanding the mining operations to include an added 142 acres was Mason (Shine) Quarry considered?** No, IM approached PR on an unsolicited basis in regard to the lease and development. **Mason is**

**considered an environmentally-sensitive operator (a known) versus the unknown record of IM. PR hadn't looked into IM's record as mining is highly regulated in regard to operations and effects on the environment.**

- 12) What are PR's expectations for use of the property after the lease expires?**  
The top soil will be replaced and trees will be planted.
- a) What happens if IM abandons the property at any stage of their expected stay? Bonding is required to cover this possibility.**
  - b) What type of reclamation will take place for the entire mining site?**  
The top soil will be replaced and trees will be planted.
  - c) Will this take place as the mine expands or after mining is finished?**  
This will take place as required.
  - d) Are there any bonding requirements for rehabilitating the site should IM abandon the site? Yes. Same question for Pope Resources?**
- 13) Does the IM lease set the stage for the continual addition of other mining operations on PR property surrounding the MPR? Rose does not believe that there is a market for added rock mining in the area. Most areas are served by local quarries because of the high transportation costs.**
- a) Is there other adjacent PR property with "diminished asset rights"?**
  - b) If so, will it also be leased for mining? When?**
  - c) Does PR have plans for further clear-cutting of timber within the Port Ludlow easement area? Yes, as the timber matures.**
- 14) Where are IM's major markets? Their major market will be the same as Shine's. It was estimated that Shine's current lease will provide rock for 10 more years.**
- a) Will ownership transfer of the rock take place within Jefferson County giving Jefferson County tax revenue or will it be elsewhere? If so, where? Again it will be the same as the Shine Quarry.**
  - b) Will any of the rock be transferred onto barges or other water shipping containers? Not to their knowledge.**
- 15) Did PR disclose to PLA that the PR property adjacent to the MPR would be mined? If so, when? No.**