

## **EXHIBIT F – Environmental Impact Report Issue Summary**

### **Aesthetics and Visual Resources**

Under the Proposed Project, excavation and reclamation activities would be between one and 0.5 mile from the nearest public roads. Reclamation activities would result in vegetation being established on the horizontal bench surfaces of the mine. This outcome would be marginally visible from these distances. There would be no noticeable difference as viewed from El Camino Real. The only noticeable difference as viewed from State Route 58 would be the lines of vegetation that would traverse the exposed rock face. Nonetheless, the Proposed Project would not result in significant aesthetic impacts. The following impacts are considered to be adverse, but less than significant: visibility of mining activities, equipment, and night lighting (Impact AE-1); the visual contrast and view blockage as a result of the Project (Impact AE-2); and impacts to scenic resources or a scenic vista (Impact AE-3).

No mitigation is required because the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to aesthetics and visual resources.

Implementation of the Proposed Project, when combined with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects would not be expected to incrementally contribute to cumulative impacts to aesthetics and visual resources in a significant way (Class III).

### **Agricultural Resources**

Expanded mining activities would involve removing vegetation, topsoil, and overburden; blasting to fracture and loosen rock; extracting and transporting shot rock; and processing (crushing, screening, washing, sorting, temporarily storing) material for sale and distribution. However, the Proposed Project would directly affect a maximum of 0.04 acre of farmland. Therefore, the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use would be less than significant (Impact AG-1). Also, there would be no conflicts with any existing zoning or other policies related to agricultural use (Impact AG-2).

However, activities in the expansion area, including topsoil removal, blasting, and material transport could potentially affect surrounding grazing operations and hay production through fugitive dust, sedimentation, or accidental spills of hazardous materials (Impact AG-3). Mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts to agricultural resources. The measures below also include mitigation to reduce dust, noise, and to ensure notification of adjacent property owners, which indirectly reduce potential impacts to agricultural land uses. Mitigation for impacts to agriculture include the following:

- ❖ AQ-1: Implement a Dust Control Plan
- ❖ BIO-1.2: Prepare and implement a Weed Control Plan during all Project phases
- ❖ BIO-3.2: Implement Best Management Practices to minimize impacts to plants and wildlife during all Project phases
- ❖ HYD-1: 51. HYD-1 Prepare and Implement Site-Specific SWPPP

Implementation of the above-mentioned mitigation measures would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

The minor impacts of the proposed quarry expansion and Proposed RPA areas on surrounding agricultural operations would be effectively minimized through BMPs and Mitigation Measures AQ-1, HYD-1.1, BIO-1.2, and BIO-3.2. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project,

## Attachment 6

Planning Commission

Conditional Use Permit (DRC2011-00098) and RPA (DRC2011-00099), ED12-008/Hanson

Page 2

when combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects would not be expected to incrementally contribute to cumulative impacts in a significant way (Class III).

### **Air Quality**

Emissions from material processing at the quarry would exceed the 25 tons per year threshold of significance and also would exceed the daily threshold for operational PM10. The impact of PM10 relative to conditions existing without the Proposed Project would be significant (Impact AQ-1). There is a low risk of quarry operations causing substantial toxic air contaminants concentrations of naturally occurring asbestos (NOA). However, to demonstrate compliance with the CARB Asbestos ATCM for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations, the County APCD requires that an exemption request be filed for the determination that naturally occurring asbestos is not present at the site of activities (Impact AQ-2). With implementation of the following mitigation measures, the abovementioned impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels:

- ❖ AQ-1: Implement a Dust Control Plan
- ❖ AQ-2: Implement Applicable Controls for Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA)

Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce impacts to air quality to less-than-significant levels.

In addition, no new notable odor sources would be associated with the Proposed Project and RPA (Impact AQ-3), and no conflicts or obstructions with the implementation of future applicable air quality plans would be anticipated (Impact AQ-4).

The analysis in Draft EIR Section 4.4 (Air Quality) shows that the Proposed Project would individually result in no cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. In addition, implementation of the Proposed Project, when combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects would not contribute to cumulative impacts in a significant way (Class III).

### **Greenhouse Gas**

The Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to climate change. The levels of GHG emissions would not exceed the APCD's GHG threshold of significance for new stationary sources per year. By continuing the GHG emissions at these levels, the Proposed Project would not generate GHG emissions at a significant level (Impact GHG-1). Also, the Project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions (Impact GHG-2).

No mitigation is required because the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to climate change.

Although cumulative projects would cause GHG emissions, implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the cumulative impact of global climate change or contribute to cumulative impacts in a significant way (Class III).

### **Biological Resources**

Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would result in direct and indirect impacts to native vegetation and sensitive communities (Impact BIO-1). Impacts would be considered less than significant through the implementation of Applicant-Proposed Measures (APMs), along with mitigation measures. Direct impacts to jurisdictional waters could occur from heavy equipment use and re-contouring of the Proposed Project site. Indirect impacts such as spread of weeds or degradation of water quality in adjacent areas could also occur (Impact BIO-2).

## Attachment 6

### Planning Commission

Conditional Use Permit (DRC2011-00098) and RPA (DRC2011-00099), ED12-008/Hanson

Page 3

A variety of listed and other special-status plants and wildlife occur in the Project region, and several have the potential to occur in or adjacent to the Proposed Project site (Impact BIO-3). Several mitigation measures have been developed to reduce impacts to special-status species to a less-than-significant level.

Ground-disturbing and mining activity could interfere with terrestrial wildlife movement during excavation and reclamation activities. The Proposed Project would also affect wildlife in adjacent habitats by interfering with movement patterns or causing animals to temporarily avoid areas adjacent to the work (Impact BIO-4).

Potential conflicts with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources would be avoided with implementation of mitigation measure (Impact BIO-5).

Mitigation for impacts to biological resources are as follows:

- ❖ BIO-1.1: Compensate for permanent excavation-phase impacts to vegetation
- ❖ BIO-1.2: Prepare and implement a Weed Control Plan during all Project phases
- ❖ BIO-2.1: Implement Best Management Practices to Minimize Impacts to Jurisdictional Areas during all Project phases
- ❖ BIO-3.1: Implement a Worker Environmental Education Program (Biological Resources) during all Project phases
- ❖ BIO-3.2: Implement Best Management Practices to minimize impacts to plants and wildlife during all Project phases
- ❖ BIO-3.3: Implement biological monitoring during all Project phases
- ❖ BIO-3.4: Conduct surveys for special-status plants and mitigate impacts during the excavation phase
- ❖ BIO-3.5: Complete focused surveys for special-status reptiles and amphibians and implement avoidance measures during all Project phases
- ❖ BIO-3.6: Conduct protocol surveys for California red-legged frogs and implement avoidance measures during all Project phases
- ❖ BIO-3.7: Nesting Bird Management Plan, nest surveys, and impact avoidance measures for migratory and nesting birds during all Project phases
- ❖ BIO-3.8: Bald and golden eagle surveys and impact avoidance during all Project phases
- ❖ BIO-3.9: Conduct maternity colony or hibernaculum surveys for sensitive bats and avoid impacts during all Project phases
- ❖ BIO-3.10: Conduct focused surveys for ringtail cat and avoid active maternity dens during all Project phases
- ❖ BIO-3.11: Complete focused surveys for American badger and implement avoidance measures during all Project phases
- ❖ HYD-1: Prepare and Implement Site-Specific SWPPP

With implementation of the aforementioned mitigation measures, the Proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts to biological resources.

Although the Proposed Project would result in the removal of 33.2 acres of native habitats, proposed mitigation measures would require the preservation of habitat at a 1:1 ratio for non-sensitive and 3:1 for sensitive communities; these ratios result in the preservation of approximately 43.14 acres of sensitive and non-sensitive communities. Impacts to special-status species, such as the removal of foraging habitat for golden eagle, have been determined

## Attachment 6

Planning Commission

Conditional Use Permit (DRC2011-00098) and RPA (DRC2011-00099), ED12-008/Hanson

Page 4

to be less than significant with the implantation of the proposed mitigation measures (i.e., preservation of habitat). The Proposed Project would not have a significant impact to terrestrial wildlife movement or bird migration because Project activities would be in areas immediately adjacent to the existing actively mined quarry. Therefore, when combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects (Table 5.2 1), the Proposed Project's incremental contribution to cumulative impacts would be mitigable to a level of less than significant (Class II).

### **Cultural and Paleontological Resources**

The Applicant maintains a vested right to approximately 143 acres of the total existing quarry area. A 61.5-acre portion of this has been surveyed for historic resources. CA-SLO-1952 was identified as extending into this area. The activities associated with proposed final reclamation of the property, which includes grading, diking, and ripping the ground surface, could impact this historic resource (Impact CR-1), as well as unknown archaeological sites (Impact CR-2), paleontological resources or unique geologic features (Impact CR-3), or unknown human remains (Impact CR-4).

Mitigation measures required to reduce impacts to cultural and paleontological resources to less than significant levels are as follows:

- ❖ CR-1: Implement Avoidance Measures
- ❖ CR-2.1: Prepare and implement Unanticipated Discovery and Monitoring Plan
- ❖ CR-2.2: Implement a Worker Environmental Education Program (Cultural and Paleontological Resources)

With implementation of the abovementioned mitigation measures, the Proposed Project's impacts to cultural and paleontological resources would be less than significant.

The proximity of the Proposed Project within one mile of the proposed Oster/Las Pilitas Quarry provides an appropriate cumulative impact study area for cultural and paleontological resources. As outlined in the Draft EIR prepared for the proposed Oster/Las Pilitas Quarry, no historic structures were found to be present and no paleontological resources were known to exist within the proposed quarry area; at this proposed quarry site it was determined that the likelihood of major cultural or paleontological resources to be present would be very low, and potential impacts were determined to be less than significant. Therefore the cumulative impacts from the Proposed Project would be considered negligible even when combined with the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the proposed Oster/Las Pilitas Quarry. When combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, the Proposed Project's contribution to cumulative impacts would be mitigable to a level of less than significant (Class II).

### **Geology, Soils and Mineral Resources**

Based on the existing geologic conditions and the existing and proposed post-reclamation land uses, seismic hazards related to the excavation and reclamation phases of the Proposed Project would be less than significant (Impact GEO-1); and potentially expansive soils (if present) would have no impact on excavation of the proposed expansion area and the proposed RPA area (Impact GEO-3). For impacts associated with mineral resources, expansion of excavation activities would increase the extraction of mineral resources which would have a beneficial impact; however, reclamation activities would have no impact on the availability of potential mineral resources (Impact GEO-4).

## Attachment 6

### Planning Commission

Conditional Use Permit (DRC2011-00098) and RPA (DRC2011-00099), ED12-008/Hanson

Page 5

Phased mining over the life of the Project may expose previously unidentified fractures with adverse orientations that could affect slope stability, which is a potentially significant impact (Impact GEO-2). The mitigation measure required for impacts to geological resources or soils is as follows:

- ❖ GEO-1: Annual Inspection of Hard Rock Slopes Stability

With implementation of this mitigation measure, impacts to geology and soils would be less than significant.

As outlined in Section 4.8 (Geology, Soils and Mineral Resources) of the Draft EIR, implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce impacts associated with stability of hard rock slopes within the Project site to less than significant (Class II). As a result, the Proposed Project would not incrementally contribute to any adverse cumulative effects related to geologic hazards in a significant way. All direct and indirect impacts associated with the Proposed Project would be either less than significant (Class III) or less than significant with mitigation incorporated (Class II). Therefore, when combined with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects (Table 5.2 1), the Proposed Project's incremental contribution to cumulative impacts would be mitigable to a level of less than significant (Class II).

### **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

The Proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or as a result of an accidental release of hazardous materials (Impact HAZ-1). There are no schools located within one-quarter mile of the Proposed Project, so the potential release of hazardous emissions, materials or waste would not adversely affect a school (Impact HAZ-2). The Proposed Project would not disturb land affected by solid/hazardous waste disposal or hazardous materials releases and, thereby, would have no impact related to these land use conditions on the public or the environment (Impact HAZ-3). Based on a review of FAA records, there are also no private airstrips in the vicinity of the Proposed Project. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not expose people to safety hazards related to public-use airports or private airstrips (Impact HAZ-4). Development of the Proposed Project would not be expected to interfere with emergency response or evacuation plans, because development would not restrict access to California Canyon Highway (Impact HAZ-5).

The Proposed Project would involve excavation activities that would disturb the top foot of soil where the fungal spores that cause Valley Fever may be; and reclamation activities involving the use of overburden mined from the quarry would have the potential to expose workers to the fungal spores that cause Valley Fever and spread the fungal spores to new areas when people and equipment leave the Proposed Project site (Impact HAZ-6). Mitigation measures required to reduce significant impacts associated with Valley Fever are as follows:

- ❖ HAZ-1a: Dust control to prevent worker exposure to Valley Fever
- ❖ HAZ-1b: Control methods to prevent the spread of Valley Fever
- ❖ HAZ-1c: Worker training

With implementation of the above mentioned mitigation measures, hazardous impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Hazards and hazardous materials impacts are generally site-specific and/or have limited mobility, and thus would not be expected to have cumulatively considerable effects beyond a specific project site. Therefore, when combined with other past, present, and reasonably

## Attachment 6

Planning Commission

Conditional Use Permit (DRC2011-00098) and RPA (DRC2011-00099), ED12-008/Hanson

Page 6

foreseeable future projects, the Proposed Project's incremental contribution to cumulative impacts would be mitigable to a level of less than significant (Class II).

### Land Use and Recreation

The Applicant proposes to expand the boundaries of the existing quarry by an estimated 33 acres, thereby enlarging its "footprint" from 160.1 acres to 193.1 acres. Any temporary or permanent disruptions to existing land uses would result in less than significant impacts (Impact LU-1). The Proposed Project would create safety issues as a result of quarry egress and ingress at the El Camino Real/Estrada Avenue intersection or along El Camino Real from Estrada Avenue to Murphy Avenue even under peak quarry operation, which would result in a significant impact to the community (Impact LU-2). Therefore, the following mitigation measure is required to reduce significant land use impacts:

- ❖ TR-1: Fair share contribution to 2030 traffic volumes within the community of Santa Margarita

The Proposed Project would neither result in a new land use that would be incompatible with the community, nor would present issues of safety in the areas surrounding the Project site. Impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, when combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, the Proposed Project's incremental contribution to cumulative impacts would be less than significant (Class III).

### Noise

The measurement of existing conditions indicates that traffic noise levels 100 feet from the centerline of roadways currently exceed the 65 dB Ldn/CNEL threshold for residential receptors in 3 of 12 segments monitored. All three segments are located along U.S. Highway 101. The implementation of Mitigation Measure NS-1 would ensure that noise level increases are minimized; however, this measure may not reduce the noise levels to the 65 dB Ldn/CNEL threshold and therefore the potential traffic noise impact along segments of State Route 58 and El Camino Real as a result of the implementation of the Proposed Project would be significant and unavoidable.

For impacts associated with ground vibrations, the quarry blasting operations would not generate vibration that would exceed the threshold of annoyance. Furthermore, blasting is an intermittent activity, occurring on average about twice per month, and the duration of each blast is less than one second (Impact NS-2). In addition, aircrafts would not be a significant source of noise for workers during the operation of the Proposed Project; impacts would be less than significant (Impact NS-3).

Mitigation measures required to reduce significant noise impacts are as follows:

- ❖ NS-1: Truck noise reduction equipment and notification

Implementation of the above measure would reduce but not eliminate potential unavoidable significant impacts resulting from the Proposed Project's traffic noise impacts (Impact NS-1). In addition, the noise level data presented in Section 5.3.10 of the Draft EIR, indicates that without the Proposed Project noise levels along the nine currently compliant segments would not exceed the 65 dBA/CNEL Ldn threshold. This is consistent with the findings of EIR Section 4.11.5 (Noise and Vibration, Project Impacts, and Mitigation Measures), which indicate that traffic generated during the excavation phase of the Proposed Project has the potential to increase noise levels above the 65 dBA Ldn/CNEL threshold even with the implementation of Mitigation Measure NS 2. Consequently, the Proposed Project's incremental contribution is cumulatively considerable and the implementation of Mitigation Measure NS 2 would not reduce the project's contribution to this cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level.

## Attachment 6

Planning Commission

Conditional Use Permit (DRC2011-00098) and RPA (DRC2011-00099), ED12-008/Hanson

Page 7

### **Public Services, Utilities and Service Systems**

The Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to public services, utilities and service systems. There would be no Project-related change to, or increased demand for, public services in comparison to baseline conditions (Impact PS-1). The Proposed Project would not impede or interfere with public services emergency access (Impact PS-2), or reduce or interrupt of existing utility systems (Impact PS-3).

There would be no Project-related change to local or regional water treatment, wastewater treatment or solid waste facilities or their existing demand (Impact PS-4). Potable water is supplied by an outside vendor and no change to that component of operation would occur because no change to the quarry's existing employee base is proposed. As such, the Project would not require new or expanded water entitlements or resources (Impact PS-5). The Proposed Project would comply with, and adhere to, federal, State, and local laws, regulations and standards relating to solid waste, including Section 22.10.150 of the County's Land Use Ordinance (Impact PS-6).

No mitigation is required because the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to climate change.

Implementation of the Proposed Project, when combined with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects would not be expected to incrementally contribute to cumulative impacts in a significant way. The Proposed Project's incremental contribution to cumulative public services and utilities impacts would be either less than significant (Class III) or have no impact.

### **Recreation**

The Proposed Project would not include construction of recreational facilities, nor does it require the expansion of existing recreational facilities. As such, no adverse physical impacts on the environment would be generated by recreational facilities resulting from the Proposed Project (Impact REC-1). In addition, the Proposed Project would neither increase the existing quarry's employment base, nor involve the construction of new housing; therefore, the Proposed Project would not contribute to population growth. As such, there would be no increased need for recreational resources (Impact REC-2).

To ensure that land is available for the proposed Salinas River Trail, the Applicant has agreed to offer an easement for dedication to the County along the Salinas river corridor subject to the County's conditions and policies for trail development and the protection of public safety and property owner rights (APM REC-1). Also, the Proposed Project would contribute to future pavement damage and wear along some segments of State Route 58 (Impact REC-3).

The following mitigation measure is required to reduce impacts to recreational resources to less-than-significant levels:

- ❖ TR-3: Reduce Project contribution to deterioration of State Route 58 structural conditions

With implementation of the abovementioned mitigation measure and APM REC-1, the Proposed Project's impacts to recreational resources would be less than significant. When combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects (Table 5.2 1), the Proposed Project's incremental contribution to cumulative impacts would be either mitigable to a level of less than significant (Class II) or less than significant (Class III).

### **Traffic and Transportation**

## Attachment 6

### Planning Commission

Conditional Use Permit (DRC2011-00098) and RPA (DRC2011-00099), ED12-008/Hanson

Page 8

The Proposed Project would not generate any average or peak hour vehicle trips beyond that of current quarry operations (existing conditions). This impact would be less than significant with respect to the performance of the roadway study area (Impact RT-1). However, the Project would continue quarry traffic beyond the existing quarry permit that is considered to result in a cumulative contribution to intersection LOS degradation at the intersections of Estrada Avenue (State Route 58) and El Camino Real, and Estrada Avenue and H Street (Impact TR-2). In addition, the Project's contribution of continued heavy truck traffic along segments of State Route 58 is considered a potentially significant impact (Impact TR-3); the Project would generate short-term daily trips, which would not impede emergency access, nonetheless, quarry egress and ingress on El Camino Real would be improved by Mitigation Measure TR-2; and the bicycle level of service (BLOS) score for the segments of State Route 58 affected by the Project indicate an existing BLOS of "F" due to the existing and proposed future percentages of heavy vehicles trips (Impact TR-6). Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce significant impacts to a less-than-significant level:

- ❖ TR-1: Fair share contribution to 2030 traffic volumes within the community of Santa Margarita
- ❖ TR-2: Coordinate and implement El Camino Real improvements at quarry access driveway
- ❖ TR-3: Reduce Project contribution to deterioration of State Route 58 structural conditions

The Proposed Project would not change the accessibility or numbers of existing public parking areas or spaces (Impact TR-4).

When combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects (Table 5.2 1) the Proposed Project's incremental contribution to cumulative impacts would be mitigable to a level of less than significant (Class II).

### **Water Quality and Supply**

The Proposed RPA includes general measures and approaches to minimize erosion; however, these proposed general measures do not provide adequate detail to ensure that water quality impacts related to final reclamation phase grading of the Lower Area would be less than significant, so implementation of additional measures are required to reduce this potential impact to less than significant (Impact HYD-1). Impacts to water quality and flooding related to the changing drainage patterns during the mining/excavation phase and changes in topography during the reclamation period would be less than significant (Impact HYD-2). Similarly, water use for the Proposed Project would be less than significant (Impact HYD-3).

The southern and central portions of the Lower Area are located within the mapped FEMA flood hazard area. Compliance with the County's existing requirements would ensure that reclamation activities in the Lower Area would not result in adverse impacts to flooding conditions along the Salinas River (Impact HYD-4). Based on inundation mapping for failure of the Salinas Dam, flood water levels would not be high enough to flood the existing excavation pit or the proposed expansion area. However, much of the Lower Area (the existing processing area and future reclamation area) is low-lying and within 500 feet of the active channel of the Salinas River and could be affected by flooding related to failure of the Salinas Dam. Nonetheless, flooding is a very low probability event, and the reclaimed land use would not directly or indirectly expose people or structures to flooding risk (Impact HYD-5)

Mitigation required for impacts to water quality and supply is as follows:

- ❖ HYD-1: Prepare and Implement Site-Specific SWPPP

With implementation of the mitigation measure listed above, the Proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts to water resources. In addition, implementation of the Proposed

## Attachment 6

Planning Commission

Conditional Use Permit (DRC2011-00098) and RPA (DRC2011-00099), ED12-008/Hanson

Page 9

Project, when combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects would not be expected to incrementally contribute to cumulative impacts in a significant way (Class III).