

Oster/ Las Pilitas Conditional Use Permit/ Reclamation Plan Scoping Meeting July 8, 2010

Introduction – John Nall

- Purpose of scoping meeting – receive public comment and concern regarding physical impacts of proposed project
- Notice of preparation for other public agencies circulated for comments
- Comments deadline is August 3rd, 2010

Project Description/ Overview – Jeff Oliveira

- Sign in sheet announced
- Public comment deadline reiterated
- Brief CEQA overview, permitting, EIR process
- Presentation of project map area
- Project description and location
- Operational details: mining, reclamation, recycling
- Site Plans: buildings, water retention ponds, mining areas, reclamation area
- Site photos
- EIR scope: Example issues to be evaluated. Looking for input on potential impacts, possible mitigation measures, alternatives for EIR to look at
- Comment period reiterated and contact info given

Project Introduction/ Purpose – Ken Johnston

- Project overview and reason for project
- Introduction to the Oster Family
- Zoned for mining and good aggregate minerals on property (huge granite slab)
- Create local jobs
- Not a creation of a new market but there to create competition
- Already 2 quarries in area utilizing the slab of granite
- Hired consultants to conduct studies on project impacts and will be online with the County for public viewing, reclamation plan online as well
- Emphasized how project will improve roads and intersection by local school
- Offered to meet with people in groups to discuss nuts and bolts of project

Public Comments/ Questions – comments by some people have names while others are “unnamed.”

1) William Miller

- Represents concerned citizens of Santa Margarita (SM)
- Wants to see cumulative/ other impacts quantified in EIR, especially with the development of the SM agriculture cluster development
- Concerned about facilities and trucking on adjacent land owned by Mike Cole (zoned residential/rural) and concerned activities on this land are not permitted (he’s looking into

it). Also wants to know if Mike Cole will be contracted as the trucking company for the Oster project. Wants these truck trips on adjacent lands quantified as well.

- Concerned about one of the principal owners/investors in the project (didn't get the name) because he is associated with "unwarranted" activities on adjacent property

2) Harry Harlow

- Lives by proposed project site
- Other quarry is loud and has night time operations at 2 am, keeping him up (Noise)
- Worried about request to modify project in the future after operations begin. Wants some provision to prevent such modification
- Traffic issues: fatalities, nearby schools
- Visual impacts on ridge, problems with the mitigation measures adopted by the other quarries, says they didn't work

3) Unnamed Citizen

- Wants to know if recycling will continue after mining operations end in 30 years

4) Kathy Hustace

- Wants to know how long the trucks will be (54', 72')?
- Provision for merging lanes uphill and downhill, especially around Digger Pine Road
- Road curve around Parkhill Road a problem, wants signs and flashing lights
- Left hand lane going eastbound a problem
- Traffic problems, wants traffic study and areas around the school assessed

5) Unnamed Citizen

- Fire and water concerns: will water be used in blasting? Fire an issue in California
- Water quality and quantity concerns, area has limited water resources, concerned about competition for available water to keep dust down

6) Charlie Kleeman

- Lives by existing quarry
- Air Quality: public health from dust emissions
- Biological Resources: removal of vegetation, increased traffic means increased wildlife fatality. Worried about effects to bird migration corridor
- Cultural Resources: Salinas River nearby. Were Native Americans consulted?
- Fire: removal of vegetation does not mean decreased fire
- Hazardous Materials: how will they be dealt with?
- Noise: impacts from equipment, blasting, and loud trucks (especially drum effect from crossing the bridge nearby). Different trucks produce different sounds depending on condition...will there be a standard?
- Traffic: 200 trucks a day will increase accidents. Need to study effects in detail,
- Water: quantity a problem
- Land Use: number of residents in the area and how will they be affected
- Environmental Justice/ Cumulative Impacts: need to be considered. Is a third quarry really necessary?

7) Unnamed Citizen

- **Wants studies to be unbiased. Concerned about how applicant plays a role with the client**
- **Wants public to come first**

8) Unnamed Citizen

- **Parkhill Road not included in project vicinity map, thinks the applicant is biased by and wants to keep it out of sight from the public**
- **Wants to know how water usage will affect downstream users**
- **States that recycling is not a permitted use on rural lands because material can't be brought in, reprocessed, and turned into another good.**
- **Wants to look at Land Use Ordinance for consistency**

9) George

- **Property owner concerned about traffic on Highway 58, says he's lost tenants because of it and doesn't want to endure greater economic loss from trucks**
- **Wants to know how much control locals have on the trucks driving on the road and not Caltrans because road is State maintained**
- **Thinks Caltrans should already rebuild roads from paid taxes**

10) Robbie

- **Air Quality: dust being kicked up, smell of asphalt from recycling (smells it from existing quarry).**
- **Cumulative impacts assessed, especially those that impact residents on Digger Pine Road**
- **Traffic problems with the park and ride along Highway 58**

11) Unnamed Citizen

- **Traffic: concerned about the 200 trips. Wants to know if recycling is included in those trips?**
- **Cultural Resources: were Native Americans consulted?**
- **Wants all 203 acres or greater to be surveyed, not just the 60 acres of the project**

12) Unnamed Citizen

- **Wants to know what a local owner means because other two quarries have local owners too.**
- **Traffic: only major quarry on a major highway. Traffic issues and the road is not wide enough**

13) Unnamed Citizen

- **Traffic: trucks should be required to travel slower on highway and in town (10 mph less). No U-turns.**

14) Paula Antione

- **Wants to know where trucks are going to park/ stage because other trucks already stage in front of her house. Worried about the wear and tear on roads**

15) Elizabeth

- Traffic: damage to roads. Who pays for road repairs from wear and tear? Wants to know about operational personnel and their trips. Traffic lights?
- Wants to know how many people will be onsite during operation
- How much money is going to school and roads?

16) Paul Willinger

- Noise: Jake brakes on trucks, noise of 200 trucks and 400 trips. Noise affects animals and makes them “crazy”. Noise (especially blasting) on livestock and their health which presents an economic loss to locals.
- Air Quality: worried about dust in the air and turning surrounding area white. Wants air quality monitoring to make sure the quarry is in compliance
- Traffic: cars going too fast down the hills leading to the quarry, worried some will hit trucks. Wants to propose an access road to adjacent land to avoid Highway 58
- Says surveying map is no good and wants the impacted residents to be included (especially Parkhill Road).
- Fiscal impacts and mitigation fees – feels County should tax truck trips for income
- Wants a requirement that if air and noise issues not in compliance then the quarry should be shut down

17) Unnamed Citizen

- Noise: concerned about noise from train traveling through the canyon along with trucks
- Where will trucks stage?

18) Unnamed Citizen

- Concerned about redress when the project has already been passed
- Feels legitimate concerns will not be heard by the County because they have deaf ears.
- Concerned about noise, traffic congestion, and pollution

19) Unnamed Citizen

- Worried about bicyclist being hit, calls area a bicycling “Mecca.” Wants bicycle lane

20) Unnamed Citizen

- Traffic: concerned about the amount of room for trucks to turn into the quarry. Says there’s not enough room for more than one truck

21) Unnamed Citizen

- Wants socio-economic concerns addressed in the EIR
- Concerned about people not wanting to buy houses and property in the area because of the traffic, noise, aesthetics etc.

22) Don Baxter

- Traffic: states that Highway 58 was not recommended for truck use. Concerned about truck crossing over the line around a U-pin turn near the entrance site. Not enough stopping room to slow down and turn into the quarry. Cars go too fast. Wants traffic

study done in the winter as well when the roads freeze over. Increased traffic a problem for animals who use it as a corridor

- Concerned about degradation of property values with aesthetics, noise, and traffic issues
- Wants the voice of the people to be heard

23) John Beckia

- Traffic: wants an easement to the adjacent property to use as a road for access instead of Highway 58. (Current?) traffic study not adequate for the curves in the road
- Cumulative impacts need to be assessed with the SM ranch project
- Feels that issues need to be scrutinized

24) Sue Harvey

- Water: says that a water assessment is needed for commercial/industrial uses that use 1.5 AFY or more
- Wants to know if there's a hazardous materials plan?
- What about evacuation routes for trucks and employees?
- Feels the asphalt recycling plant isn't necessary

Closing – Jeff and John thanked the people for coming and providing excellent comments and stated that they would be addressed in the EIR. Jeff also gave his contact information again if there were any more questions.