



Draft EIR Comment Form

Proposed Las Pilitas Quarry Project

Date: June 4, 2013

Name*: Kelso Vidal

Affiliation (if any)*: n/a

Address*: P.O. Box 397

City, State, Zip Code*: Santa Margarita, CA 93453

Telephone Number*: (805) 704-3674

Email*: kjvidali@gmail.com

Comment:

HELLO,

I AM NOT FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT, BUT I AM NOT NECESSARILY AGAINST IT. I ONLY HOPE THAT AS THE COUNTY MOVES FORWARD WITH THE PROJECT, THAT THE COUNTY WILL TAKE THE RESPONSIBLE APPROACH AND CONTINUE TO FIND CREATIVE-ALTERNATIVE WAYS TO REDUCE THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE.

-I HAVE DRAFTED ADDITIONAL COMMENTS THAT ARE WRITTEN ON A SEPERATE / ATTACHED PAGE. PLEASE REVIEW AND ADDRESS

THANK YOU,

Kj Vidal

**Please print. Your name, address, and comments become public information and may be released to interested parties if requested.*

Please either deposit this sheet at the sign-in table before you leave today, or fold, stamp, and mail. Insert additional sheets if needed. Comments must be received by June 5, 2013. Comments may also be faxed to (805) 788-2413 or emailed to mwilson@co.slo.ca.us.

Las Pilitas Quarry Project Environmental Document Comments

4.01 Aesthetics

It appears for the viewshed identified in Figure 4.1-1, could have additional perspectives for analysis and have additional photo simulations. Please provide additional perspectives. Can this be viewed anywhere from Highway 101?

Since impacts to visual are significant and not mitigated, commitment to revegetate areas and remove roads should be graded to look natural with random undulations and gently rounded transitions.

The preliminary landscaping plan would be beneficial to see in the EIR so we can visualize how the off-site landscaping may look, and how it off-sets the visual impacts. Please add some kind of simulation or rendering of this in the EIR.

The project should include additional landscaping off-site that can distract a viewer's perspective of the quarry. Please add various native trees and of different sizes throughout project vicinity.

Another mitigation measure to off-set the dumping of twice as many trucks compared to existing truck volumes is to provide some aesthetics in the small town that will detour/distract the appearance of an industrial-mining looking town. Add features such as described in the Santa Margarita plan.

4.03 Air

The EIR should have more than 8 air quality receptors analyzed. The additional amount of trucks (2x existing truck volumes) will add twice the amount of carbon monoxide and other particulate matter from truck exhaust as they pass nearby residences and storefronts. The EIR should analyze the entire stretch of SR58 through the small town of Santa Margarita to highway 101.

4.05 Biological

The appropriate and responsible thing to do is mitigate the loss of 44 oak trees by replacing them in the conservation easement, with a 3 year plant establishment period.

The EIR must have a map depicting the trees to be removed, and their sizes, so people can get a sense of the age of these trees.

Did the EIR analyze impacts to wildlife from noise? If so, what is the conclusion?

4.0 8 Noise

The noise section should mention how there are anticipated 273 trucks that may travel the roadway each day, but it fails to lack that this is more than twice the amount of existing trucks that currently use roadway. This must be mentioned to the public.

In subsection 4.5.5 of the EIR, a reference to Policy 3.3.3 of the County Noise Element states "if existing exterior noise levels already exceed this value, then higher levels may be allowed". Please

indicate where this is stated in the County Noise Element, for when I look Policy 3.3.3, I do not see that stated. However, what I do see in Policy 3.3.3 of the Noise Element is that noise created by new transportation noise sources, shall be mitigated so as not to exceed the levels of 60 dBA. Thus, the EIR should provide adequate mitigation for additional traffic the project will produce.

The Noise Element Policy 3.3.1 states "New development should minimize noise exposure and noise generation". With that stated, the EIR should attempt to produce realistic, effective traffic noise measures other than what is suggested in Section 4.8.16 "No compression brakes, except under emergency conditions". It is ridiculous to suggest mufflers as a proposed minimization measure proposed for noise impacts since they are standard on all vehicles. Since the project proposes to dump an additional 273 truck trips (2x of existing) through the small town of Santa Margarita, the project should at least attempt to find additional mitigation measures to reduce traffic noise impacts. Measures that would seem appropriate for the environment/ community:

- The project should implement installation of a rubberized roadbed.
- The project should maintain or assist with repairs of the roadway on a regular basis within Santa Margarita to Highway 101. I would assume that transportation of 500,000 tons per year will have an impact on the life expectancy of the roadway. A deteriorated roadway could potentially be a safety issue; as well as potentially increase noise levels.
- The project should look at alternative routes to utilize or construct so that trucks can avoid traveling through town.
- Landscape, tree vegetation installed through town to act as a barrier to assist in reduction of noise, pollution, and visual impacts.

Any noise that approaches or exceeds noise by 1dba should consider adequate noise abatement measures. The EIR suggest an increase of "approximately 2 dBA" for a minimum of two residences, but I would anticipate that if readings were taken from adequate locations throughout town, there may be more than 2 residences impacted by higher dBA.

The EIR needs to include a map of all the noise receptors in section 4.8. This mapping should also indicate where noise readings were taking from and at the time recorded. The noise contours (project vicinity) should extend through the small town of Santa Margarita to Highway 101. There are many homes along the west end of the town that reside within 50-feet of the edge of travel way, the dBA is not provided for these homes on page 4.8-4. The assumption of 45 MPH speed through this segment may increase noise levels and should be identified. We must preserve the tranquility of residential areas by preventing the encroachment of noise-producing uses such as truck noise (County Goal 3.1.3). Also, the neighborhood park needs to be addressed for noise impacts.

Revise the Noise Report to analyze the noise readings from 50 from the edge of travel way for all noise receptors, NOT the center of the roadway and provide data in a revised EIR. This reading is more logical since truck tires are also located closer to edge of travel way, not just the center of the roadway.

The mentioning of the train does not seem appropriate. This project is bringing NEW noise. The train is an existing noise that is quick and only occurs at certain moments of the day. This project could potentially bring in new constant noise heard throughout the day.

Based on the significance level for noise and issues that still should be addressed, a request is made to have the EIR recirculated, and to have flyers be sent to all residences along SR58, so they are notified of a public meeting and EIR circulation.

4.11

The ADT may be 7200 vehicles, but the project would add more than double the amount of truck traffic volumes to the small community. There are many safety concern for the kids who ride bikes or walk to school. Additional mitigation measures should be implemented to guarantee the highest safety for the community's children.

The project should include adequate shoulders and/ or provide sidewalks though the small town for child safety. The project must implement the landscaped median that is part of the Santa Margarita Design Plan. This median would provide safety for kids that ride bikes or walk to school, for it should regulate the speeds of large trucks that do not always abide by the speed limit though town.

Will the truck backup/waiting, or queuing of trucks that will leave the facility and travel onto SR 58 have any adverse impact on the kids health, or exacerbate symptoms of kids with asthma, or other health issues? Did the EIR address this in the health risk assessment?

7.1.1 Population/ Economic

The EIR should let the Public know how much money will be reinvested into the community? How much anticipated to be invested in Santa Margarita specifically? How much to the County?

7.1.2 Growth

Growth should also analyze how this project may influence the growth of other quarries, industrial companies in the small rural town of Santa Margarita.