

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
BUREAU OF DISTRICT MINING OPERATIONS

* * * * *

IN RE: HIGHWAY MATERIAL, LLC-PUBLIC HEARING

* * * * *

BEFORE: MICHAEL KUTNEY, District Mining Manager
 TIFFANY FOLK, Permits Chief
 ROSS KLOCK, Compliance Manager
 MICHELE HAMLIN, Geoscientist
 LISA STROBRIDGE, Local Government Liaison
 ROBYN BRIGGS, Regional Communications
 Manager
 STEPHANIE BERARDI, Regional
 Communications Manager

HEARING: Monday, March 24, 2025
 7:09 p.m.

LOCATION: Marlborough Municipal Building
 6040 Upper Ridge Road
 Green Lane, PA 18054

 Reporter: Jessica Ashman

Any reproduction of this transcript
is prohibited without authorization

by the certifying agency

A P P E A R A N C E S

ALSO PRESENT:

Bill Netsch

Bruce Jackson

Marya Schwenholtz

Tim Leach

Matt Jeffers

RuthAnn Heilemann

Nathan Clemmer

William Netsch, Jr.

Mark Cappuccio, Esquire

Chad Camburn

I N D E X

DISCUSSION AMONG PARTIES

5 - 28

E X H I B I T S

<u>Number</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u> <u>Offered</u>	<u>Page</u> <u>Admitted</u>
---------------	--------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------

NONE OFFERED

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. BERARDI: To begin the formal public hearing to obtain public comments regarding the proposed permit modification. DEP staff is here tonight to receive testimony from the public so that all relevant comments can be considered. Public participation is an important part of the DEP's regulatory and oversight responsibilities.

There are many ways that the public can play a role in DEP's decision-making process. The most common way is providing comments during the designated public comment period, which includes participating in events like today's public hearing. In addition to providing the oral testimony presented here tonight, members of the public may also submit written testimony no later than 5:00 p.m. on Monday, April 7th to the DEP via email or postal mail.

If you would like to submit any written testimony, please pick up a flyer which has our contact information at the table. DEP gives equal consideration to all public comments, regardless of whether a comment is received verbally here tonight or in writing prior to the deadline.

1 Please note that our purpose here tonight is to
2 listen to your comments and gather your input that
3 may be useful during the permit review process.

4 DEP staff does not directly answer
5 questions during this time or respond to individual
6 comments during this official proceeding. All
7 formal testimony given tonight or provided in
8 writing by the deadline will be addressed in writing
9 by the DEP in what is called a comment and response
10 document.

11 Finally, let's establish a few ground
12 rules. Please turn off all cell phones or put them
13 on vibrate. Make any calls outside of the
14 auditorium.

15 I'll call on people to speak in the
16 order in which they signed up and announce who will
17 be the next speaker. When your name is called,
18 please approach the table here. You can either sit
19 or you can stand. And please speak loudly and
20 clearly so that everyone can hear you, including the
21 stenographer to my right. Each person will be
22 allowed a maximum of three minutes to offer
23 testimony.

24 We do have a few registered speakers
25 that signed up this evening and we'll be asking them

1 to not exceed their three minutes.

2 To keep the proceedings moving
3 forward and to ensure that all speakers have a fair
4 and equal opportunity to present their testimony,
5 I'll keep the time and provide a warning as the
6 speaker approaches the end of their time.

7 As stated previously, if a speaker
8 runs out of time, remaining comments can still be
9 submitted in written form. Please be respectful of
10 everyone's opportunity to speak and to be heard.
11 Don't interrupt a speaker by clapping, booing, or
12 speaking out of turn. I want to thank you all in
13 advance for your cooperation with these ground
14 rules.

15 And our first speaker, we have Bill -
16 is it Netsch?

17 MR. BILL NETSCH: Netsch.

18 MS. BERARDI: Bill Netsch, you're
19 first and then followed by Bruce Jackson. Bill?

20 MR. BILL NETSCH: I want to know what
21 this hearing is about. Are you telling me that all
22 you people who don't live here are going to issue a
23 permit that my elected officials already denied? Is
24 that what you're saying? Is that what this hearing
25 is about?

1 MS. BERARDI: He can't respond.

2 These are comments on the permanent record.

3 MR. BILL NETSCH: I don't see anybody
4 that lives in this Township here. How are you
5 making decisions about what - our quality of life?
6 This is a waste of time.

7 MS. BERARDI: Mr. Jackson?

8 MR. JACKSON: I prepared a statement
9 and tested it and edited it and tested it and got it
10 down to everything I could, but it exceeds three
11 minutes.

12 MS. BERARDI: That's okay. You can
13 read as much as you can. And then I'll take a copy
14 when you're finished.

15 MR. JACKSON: If you could take a
16 copy. Well, I'll note at the beginning. My first
17 was also made in writing and acknowledged by the
18 applicant in a March 5th letter to the DEP Bureau of
19 Mining, hereafter DEP, but they failed to address my
20 assertion that the applicant woefully misrepresented
21 facts on General Information Form authorization
22 application dated 12/3/24 by checking yes under
23 number one on page three of seven, claiming to have
24 informed the surrounding community addressed any
25 community concerns prior to submitting the

1 application to the DEP.

2 The applicant heard many concerns
3 raised by residents of Marlborough Township, Upper
4 Salford Township and Green Lake Borough to
5 incorporating mine reclamation fill, MRFS,
6 reclamation option and post mining land use during
7 two public hearings held in the spring of 2024.

8 It has since been repeatedly reported
9 that unresolved concerns were such that the
10 Marlborough Township Board of Supervisors chose not
11 to even vote on a motion to pass the proposed zoning
12 exchange. Marlborough Township is not served by a
13 public water system and properties are reliant on
14 private groundwater wells for water. So we could
15 benefit greatly from water empilement as the only
16 method of reclamation that for the past half century
17 has been repeatedly promised in this permit.

18 Water is far more valuable in
19 Marlborough Township than reclamation fill of any
20 kind and there is no guarantee that reclamation
21 would not be slowed by the economy or if the - the
22 Perkiomenville quarry began competing with other
23 regional quarries already receiving mine reclamation
24 fill as landfill. I would add that Marlborough
25 Township already has open space that they don't know

1 what to do with.

2 There was absolutely no attempt by
3 the applicant to address surrounding community
4 concerns between the last public hearing on May 8th
5 and the date the application was submitted to the
6 DEP on December 3rd, 2004 - 24.

7 Yet the applicant came on the
8 application to have addressed community concerns
9 prior to submitting the application to the
10 Department, which evidence proves is simply not
11 true. The public expects the DEP to deny any
12 application knowingly containing misleading or false
13 information. I'll try to pick it up.

14 Secondly, I object that the DEP has
15 not treated this application as an opt-in project
16 containing requests that would lead to significant
17 public concern due to potential impacts on human
18 health and the environment in accordance with the
19 Office of Environmental Justice Public Participation
20 Policy.

21 The public has not had timely access
22 to the application since online links to it were
23 unceremoniously removed shortly after a legal notice
24 for this hearing was published. Concerned citizens
25 have been put to an unfair disadvantage by

1 repeatedly having to submit right to know requests
2 to obtain information pertinent to this application.
3 And only by doing so did I learn that the applicant
4 failed to inform me of their responses to my own
5 written objections.

6 Yes, we are here today, but there has
7 not been any community outreach whatsoever in
8 accordance with enhanced public participation. And
9 we're only here because of written requests. That
10 is the minimum legal requirement.

11 The DEP's failure to treat this
12 application as an opt-in project has kept the public
13 at arm's length. And then asking groups to
14 designate one speaker here while only allowing
15 individuals three minutes to present collective
16 testimony is excessively restrictive and inhibits
17 concerned citizens that cannot submit written
18 comments from expressing their heartfelt objections
19 to the application.

20 I will end with a gentle reminder
21 that the Department of Environmental Protection's
22 mission to protect Pennsylvania's air, land, and
23 water resources while ensuring the health and safety
24 of all residents and visitors to the Commonwealth,
25 that include Marlborough Township and surrounding

1 communities.

2 Thank you for allowing me up to three
3 minutes to present my verbal testimony.

4 MS. BERARDI: Mary - I'm not going to
5 try to pronounce it.

6 MS. SCHWENHOLTZ: Schwenholtz.

7 MS. BERARDI: Schwenholtz. Got it.

8 ATTORNEY CAPPUCCIO: Excuse me, Mr.
9 Kutney. I apologize for interrupting.

10 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. Could
11 you identify yourself, sir, for the record?

12 ATTORNEY CAPPUCCIO: Yes. Mark
13 Cappuccio, C-A-P-P-U-C-C-I-O. I'm the solicitor for
14 the Township. And I apologize for interrupting. My
15 question is in terms of format tonight. I thought
16 for the hearing we would perhaps hear a presentation
17 by the applicants. I know they did ask some
18 questions, but I do have some questions not only for
19 the applicants, but of the Township engineer and
20 perhaps one or two individuals who are in the public
21 tonight.

22 Would you prefer that that occur
23 before the public continues its questions? That may
24 alleviate some of their concerns or it may raise
25 additional concerns. I just didn't want you to hear

1 my questions and the public then ask for opportunity
2 to speak again. I - I'll leave that to you as how
3 you want to handle it.

4 MR. KUTNEY: I think it's probably -.

5 COURT REPORTER: Could you identify
6 yourself, sir, for the record?

7 MR. KUTNEY: Sorry. My name is
8 Michael Kutney. I'm the district mining manager at
9 the Pottsville District Mining Office. We - we want
10 to be respectful of the allotted time. So let's -
11 let's, kind of, pause it and pretend - if you're
12 willing to - do you want to go, or do you want to
13 wait? And how do you want to -. Okay.

14 So we're not going to take this time
15 away from the designated hour, so fire away. And
16 maybe that'll help. Or maybe it'll bring up more
17 questions.

18 ATTORNEY CAPPUCCIO: Sure. Thank
19 you. And I'll try to be brief, so -.

20 ---

21 (WHEREUPON, A PAUSE IN THE RECORD WAS HELD.)

22 ---

23 MS. BERARDI: We're now - yes, we are
24 now live for the record on -.

25 MS. SCHWENHOLTZ: Good evening. My

1 name is Marya Schwenholtz and I represent a group of
2 residents of Marlborough Township in expressing our
3 strong opposition to the proposals included in this
4 major permit revision to the large non-coal mining
5 permits submitted by Highway Materials, a division
6 of Heidelberg Materials.

7 For the last 60 plus years this
8 community has been told that at the conclusion of
9 mining, this quarry would be a water empilement .
10 Now we are being told that we will benefited by
11 reclamation fill. We strongly disagree. It is of
12 zero importance to us that we revert this land back
13 to its approximate original contour. The quarry has
14 been mined for over a hundred years. No one here
15 has ever had access or use of that land. Reverting
16 to the approximate original contour should not be
17 the basis for making decisions about our future.

18 Additionally, this Township has close
19 to 2,000 acres of open space. We do not need the
20 open space that reclamation fill would provide.
21 These items should not be prioritized in a
22 reclamation plan. What should be a priority is the
23 air, land, and water safety of this Township. This
24 application does not address those concerns.

25 As indicated, this quarry is situated

1 within feet of a high quality stream, the Unami
2 Creek. Any mining activity such as reclamation that
3 jeopardizes the health of that stream should be
4 scrutinized and strictly overseen.

5 The plan of the quarry's due
6 diligence and self-certification is not good enough.
7 Especially when a quick search of Heidelberg
8 Materials' environmental record turns up pages of
9 violations and millions and millions of dollars in
10 penalties. We cannot rely on Highway Materials,
11 which financially benefits from every load of fill
12 being brought into that quarry, to adequately
13 protect our land and water resources.

14 The permit application contains
15 plenty of accommodations if a, quote, unexpected
16 pollution event occurs. Well, that may necessitate
17 some additional paperwork and maybe another fine for
18 this company. But for our community, it can mean
19 irreparable damage to the land and water on which we
20 live.

21 Of additional concern is that Highway
22 Materials has demonstrated that it cannot
23 self-monitor the most basic zoning requirements that
24 they are required to adhere to. The dust from their
25 operation coats our roadways, trees and houses.

1 They consistently operate outside of approved
2 operating hours. And yet we are expected to trust
3 that they will adequately self-monitor against a
4 profit incentive to protect this Township's most
5 precious resources.

6 This application does not provide
7 adequate protections for the unique and sensitive
8 area this quarry is situated on. Heidelberg has
9 plenty of other quarry sites that are more suitable
10 for reclamation fill. This is not the place. For
11 the protection of our air, land, and water, we ask
12 that the DEP decline to approve this permit
13 application and adhere to the plan for water
14 empilement. Thank you.

15 MS. BERARDI: Next, we have Tim Leach
16 followed by Matt Jeffers.

17 MR. LEACH: I'm here on a different
18 angle, an angle of whether you enforce your existing
19 - the DEP this is - enforce your existing laws. So
20 I know you can't answer but - so it makes it a
21 little bit difficult, but I'll answer for you. By
22 definition, DEP definition, your own very
23 definition, quarry overburden is an act of
24 quarrying. It's part of quarrying. Absolutely it
25 is. It's written in it - it's in its definition.

1 I've seen it. And I've talked to a real estate
2 attorney who told me it absolutely is because he's
3 dealt with it before somewhere else.

4 Anyway, overburden is existing a
5 football field long, 300 feet high. Took them six
6 to eight months to put it there one summer.
7 Multiple loads all day long, all day long. Backing
8 up trailers, noise pollution, everything. So
9 illegally on residential property, residentially
10 zoned property. Which means this quarry is
11 currently operating illegally on a residential
12 property.

13 What are you going to do about it?
14 There's no amnesia now. You're lucky - you're here.
15 And if you knew about it, why did you not stop it?
16 Who comes out - who comes out from the DEP checks on
17 this egregious violation? Now you're all here on
18 record knowing that this exists, where it is, and
19 what are you going to do about it?

20 Because it's not going to go away.
21 I'm never going away. And that burden is not going
22 - that overburden is not going away. So what are
23 you going to do about it? Now you - you know for
24 the record that this exists right now on residential
25 land. That's all I have to say.

1 MS. BERARDI: Matt Jeffers?

2 MR. JEFFERS: Actually everything I
3 was going to say was already said so I don't really
4 need to add to it.

5 MS. BERARDI: Put it - come up here
6 and - and say what you'd like to say on record.

7 MR. JEFFERS: All right.

8 So Perkiomenville Quarry - excuse me
9 - operations present a nuisance to the people of
10 Marlborough and Upper Salford Townships. We're
11 moving into the third generation of residents that
12 are dealing with this since the former supervisors
13 inadvertently opened the door for the non-conforming
14 use.

15 It appears that a standard business
16 practice for the quarry to routinely tell the
17 residents one plan then come back 5 to 10 years
18 later proposing more expansion, longer mining
19 timeframes. After 50 years of promising water
20 empilement for mine reclamation, they now want to
21 convert the quarry to a landfill to haul in
22 reclamation fill.

23 It also - they deny this, but it also
24 appears that they're taking some, kind of, backdoor
25 approach to circumvent local ordinances and expand

1 the heavy industrial zoning area for future use.

2 I personally am completely opposed to
3 reclamation fill for the following reasons. The
4 truck traffic is very hard on the local
5 infrastructure and the quality of life. From
6 personal experience I can tell you that this truck
7 traffic does decrease our property values. I
8 question why the DEP approved a mining depth back in
9 2018, 2019 of 150 feet below sea level while they
10 knew the potential timetable for the water
11 empilement during that time and didn't require
12 anything else done because we were told that the
13 reason for the reclamation fill is because there
14 wasn't enough water or the timetable would be too
15 long.

16 I find it very unlikely that the
17 reclamation fill will take less time than the water
18 empilement. I'm also opposed to any contaminants
19 being imported into our neighborhood regardless of
20 the regulation that are detectable to the most
21 stringent of laboratory limits.

22 Anything less than 200 truckloads is
23 self-governed. The quarry operators willfully
24 ignore a simple Township ordinance like working
25 within approved operating hours and keeping the dust

1 confined to the property. I have very little faith
2 that they will one hundred percent comply with these
3 fill regulations.

4 In addition, I believe that the water
5 empilement guarantees the property will not be used
6 for any other heavy industrial purposes in the
7 future. And I also would like to question whether
8 other options were considered such as a water
9 reservoir to prevent flooding issues that we've had
10 in past years or for additional water storage to
11 deal with drought issues like we had last summer.

12 That's really all I have. Thank you.

13 MS. BERARDI: Ruth - RuthAnn
14 Heilemann?

15 MS. HEILEMANN: I just want to say
16 that I don't have anything to add between the
17 gentlemen over here speaking and Marya Schwenholtz,
18 speaking for residents of Upper Salford Township,
19 not just residents of Marlborough Township.

20 So we also neighbor the property.
21 We've been there for 38 years and we have had dust
22 on our window sills every day. We've seen plumes of
23 dust come - we have the upper view. We've seen
24 plumes of dust come out of that quarry constantly.
25 We've made reports, we've filed reports. But I just

1 wanted it to go on record that she has spoken for
2 residents of Upper Salford Township as well.

3 MS. BERARDI: Thank you. Next we
4 have Dori Laufer. You don't want to put anything on
5 record?

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Neither do I.

7 MS. BERARDI: Okay.

8 It looks like our final registered
9 speaker tonight is Nathan Clemmer?

10 MR. CLEMMER: I just want to share
11 again. I live on Crusher Road and Upper Ridge Road
12 so I can literally view the impact of the quarry and
13 what it does for the surrounding areas every day. I
14 believe hours upon hours could be spent on at least
15 a dozen different individual issues that present
16 themselves in regards to what the quarry is
17 proposing.

18 I just heard from a gentleman on the
19 DEP Board that dust must be stopped from crossing
20 over the quarry property line. Otherwise, it is a
21 violation according to the DEP. Before even a
22 consideration of approval from the DEP, there should
23 be a fully approved remediation plan for a barrier
24 and screening proposal for dust control that should
25 be presented to the residents of this Township and

1 the Board. Dust will increase due to fill dirt
2 being dumped. There is no denying it.

3 As a resident who lives on Crusher
4 Road and Upper Ridge, I can testify that dust is on
5 and can be sighted every day from the quarry
6 entrance down through Crusher Road. It is on
7 vegetation and lies across everything in its path.

8 When I access --- when I assess the
9 entranceway of the quarry at its current grade, I do
10 not believe that the quarry has the ability of any
11 kind with any type of screening to stop the dust or
12 have full control over it. The quarry is high
13 impact. It affects every resident in a negative way
14 around us. It's unfortunate that this is a high
15 industrial operation that sits in the midst of
16 beautiful land with many residents.

17 No one is regulating the conditions
18 of the roads, the traffic, the dust, the dirt, the
19 recklessness of the trucks and drivers coming down
20 29 and then down Crusher Road or vice versa. How
21 are these things regulated? Where do your
22 statistics come from in regards to volume of traffic
23 not increasing?

24 That is inaccurate and again
25 undeniable that truck traffic will increase

1 considerably. We're talking about many different
2 things here, including the safety of the land and
3 the residents as well as the impact in quality of
4 life for all those around us.

5 MS. BERARDI: Thank you.

6 Is there anybody else here that would
7 like to make a comment for the permanent record or
8 have a question that you would like officially
9 answered in our comment response document?

10 MR. JACKSON: May I make a second
11 comment?

12 MR. KUTNEY: Let's make sure
13 everyone's had a go first. And then if there - if
14 there's -.

15 MR. JACKSON: I would just like this
16 one to be on the record. So let me -.

17 MR. KUTNEY: Just wait and see if
18 there's anybody else.

19 MS. BERARDI: Does anybody have a
20 comment or question for the record?

21 MR. WILLIAM NETSCH: Sure.

22 MS. BERARDI: Come on up. Just say
23 your name and spell it.

24 MR. WILLIAM NETSCH: William Netsch,
25 Jr., N-E-T-S-C-H. I noticed on the application it

1 said Highway Materials. The DEP keeps referring to
2 it as Highway Materials. These folks that represent
3 Heidelberg Materials have even occasionally called
4 it Highway Materials.

5 At minimum, shouldn't there be a new
6 application filed with Heidelberg Materials on it?
7 And who is Heidelberg Materials at this point? A
8 shell company to take the fall when everything goes
9 wrong? I'm just confused and I'm hoping for
10 clarification. Thank you.

11 MR. KLOCK: The property is - oh, I'm
12 sorry.

13 MS. BERARDI: Would you like to come
14 up?

15 ATTORNEY CAPPUCCIO: I'm loud.

16 MS. BERARDI: It's totally fine.

17 ATTORNEY CAPPUCCIO: Again, Mark
18 Cappuccio, the Township solicitor. I just want to
19 reiterate on behalf of the Township that the
20 Township is very concerned about the dust issue
21 that's been raised, the traffic issue that has been
22 raised, and also we have the zoning concern as well.
23 And I think that's enough, based on the earlier
24 questions I asked of the applicant. Thank you.

25 MS. BERARDI: You're welcome.

1 Does anybody else want to come up and
2 provide testimony? Sir?

3 MR. JACKSON: Again, Bruce Jackson
4 apologize for a second time, but only because it was
5 not part of my testimony, but only because it's come
6 up. I just want to point out for the record that
7 your complaint process - the DEP's complaint
8 process, is wholly ineffective from my own personal
9 perspective.

10 And what that means, they used to
11 have an online means of filing a complaint, then
12 it's turned to a phone. But what my experience has
13 been - and I actually, when I was working from home,
14 had a little check sheet on my desk where when I
15 felt the blast, I'd put down small, medium, big.
16 That was the classification of that one. I did
17 that. And some of them that were just plain
18 excessive, I would call. They'd send somebody out,
19 he'd do all this stuff. But it never accomplished
20 anything because --- in my own opinion, your
21 regulations are too lenient.

22 Tony DePaul operated his quarry in
23 accordance with your regulations. But you let them
24 get away with too much, especially in regards to the
25 blasting, because that is far more destructive

1 again. But you have to be there to experience it.

2 And I just wanted to say that - that
3 if there's a way that you could come up with a thing
4 - that you can file a complaint and not go through
5 this big thing because it wears out - it wears out
6 the resident. After three complaints, nothing,
7 nothing, nothing, they lose interest and they stop
8 doing it. That's the nature of people. And that's
9 why maybe complaints go down. It's not that
10 anything has changed. It's just that the people are
11 worn out and they've just given up. And I know it's
12 - I guess that's it.

13 MS. BERARDI: Thank you. Okay.

14 This is the final call for anybody
15 else that would like to give testimony this evening.
16 Sir?

17 MR. CAMBURN: I'm Chad Camburn,
18 C-A-M-B-U-R-N. I'm the Township engineer from Van
19 Cleef Engineering. And I just simply want to make a
20 statement about the final build-out of this property
21 once it is completely reclaimed. They provided a
22 map to show the topography reverting back to the
23 previous topography that existed prior to the
24 quarrying operation. And we heard the quarrying
25 operation has been in effect for approximately 110

1 years.

2 By the time this is completely filled
3 in and, you know, reclaimed back to the original
4 topography, we might be looking at 150 years since
5 this was first quarried. And I don't know the exact
6 timeframe and neither do they.

7 But my concern is roughly half of the
8 property, the northern half would, once it's filled
9 in, drain towards Upper Ridge Road to the north of
10 the property. And my concern is the storm water
11 runoff from the property onto that road and the
12 downstream properties.

13 I understand that may be how it used
14 to drain the runoff, but you can't expect the
15 infrastructure and the properties to react the same
16 way it did 150 years ago. Nature changes things.
17 Man-made improvements change things. And the
18 properties may have changed downstream since that
19 time.

20 So again, my concern is the final
21 build-out if this were to be reclaimed back to the
22 original topography where the runoff would drain
23 onto Upper Ridge Road and the downstream properties
24 and the importance of the infrastructure not being
25 in place to support that water.

1 MS. BERARDI: Thank you. Okay.

2 I'll open it up to the audience one
3 last time. Is there anybody else that would like to
4 make a comment on the record?

5 Okay.

6 Hearing nothing, this will conclude
7 tonight's public hearing. As a reminder, written
8 comments on this application will be accepted until
9 5:00 p.m. on Monday, April 7th. If you wish to
10 submit written comments or questions, please see us
11 for the appropriate contact information.

12 Thank you for being here and for your
13 comments. We appreciate your interest in this
14 project. Have a safe trip home.

15 * * * * *

16 HEARING CONCLUDED AT 7:51 P.M.

17 * * * * *

18

19

20

21

22

23


24

25

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings,
a hearing held before District Mining Manager Kutney,
was reported by me on March 24, 2025 and that I,
Jessica Ashman, read this transcript and that I
attest that this transcript is a true and accurate
record of the proceeding.

Dated the 27th day of March, 2025



Court Reporter
Jessica Ashman