

**5.1 CONSERVATION ELEMENT**

**Conservation Element (Page 182):** *“No mineral resource extraction should be permitted in the County if significant impacts on the air, water or land environment would result, if flooding and erosion problems would be increase, or if polluting emissions likely to be generated directly or indirectly by the activity in question would result in adopted federal or State environmental quality standards being exceeded.”*

**Discussion:** The proposed project would have a significant, unavoidable impact on air quality, based on the County Planning and Development Department (2006:Section 5.C.2) thresholds for evaluating air quality impacts. Hence, it could be considered potentially inconsistent with this policy. However, the Conservation Element also states that *“Mineral resource extraction in the County makes a relatively important contribution to the local, state, and national economies and, as such, should be encouraged. At the same time, every effort should be made to minimize direct and indirect adverse environmental impacts, and to achieve and maintain federal and State standards of emissions controls and environmental quality. (...) the County and the cities should continue to push for necessary environmental safeguards, as well as to encourage exploration for new resource sites.”* (pages 181 and 182). The Conservation Element encourages mineral resource extraction when potential environmental impacts are minimized. The proposed project incorporates mitigation measures to minimize potential environmental impacts to the extent possible.

In addition, the County of Santa Barbara Inland Zoning Ordinance (Sec. 35-320 Reclamation and Surface Mining Permits) also recognizes that the extraction of minerals is essential to the continued economic well-being of the County and to the needs of the society and that the reclamation of mined lands is necessary to prevent or minimize adverse effects on the environment and to protect the public health and safety. (County of Santa Barbara Inland Zoning Ordinance, Article III of Chapter 35 Santa Barbara County Code, Republished: September 2006). The Zoning Ordinance regulates surface mining operations, as authorized by the California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) of 1975 (P.R.C. Section 2710 *et seq.*), and the California Code of Regulations (14 Cal. Admin., C. Section 3500 *et seq.*), to ensure that:

- a. The adverse environmental effects of surface mining operations will be prevented or minimized and that the reclamation of mined lands will provide for the beneficial, sustainable long-term productive use of the mined and reclaimed lands; and
- b. The production and conservation of minerals will be encouraged while eliminating hazards to public health and safety and avoiding or minimizing adverse effects on the environment, including but not limited to geologic subsidence, air pollution, water quality degradation, damage to biological resources, flooding, erosion, degradation of scenic quality, and noise pollution.

The Zoning Ordinance encourages mining operations which incorporate measures to prevent or minimize its adverse environmental effects. The proposed project would comply with the Inland Zoning Ordinance requirements.

The Conservation Element recognizes both the Blunt-nosed Leopard Lizard (*Crotaphytus silus*) and San Joaquin Valley Kit Fox (*Vulpes macrotis*) as species of particular value (pp. 115-116). However, no specific recommendations are included in the Element, other than that “in order to preserve species, we must preserve whole ecosystems” (p. 164). The protection of important habitats is the general emphasis of the Element with regard to biological resources.

**Discussion:** The proposed project incorporates various environmental protection and species conservation measures to protect these species from adverse impacts and take, which is prohibited under federal law. The EIR also includes additional mitigation measures to ensure further protection. Hence, the project appears consistent with the overall goals of the Conservation Element for these species.

## 5.2 AGRICULTURAL ELEMENT

**Policy I.A:** *The integrity of agricultural operations shall not be violated by recreational or other non-compatible uses.*

**Policy I.D:** *The use of the Williamson Act (Agricultural Preserve Program) shall be strongly encouraged and supported. The County shall also explore and support other agricultural land protection programs.*

**Discussion:** The proposed Processing Area would be located on Parcel 149-220-65 (82 acres), which is designated Agricultural Commercial (AC) with a 40-320 or more acre minimum parcel size. The parcel was under Williamson Act Contract with the County but non-renewal of that contract was approved by the Board of Supervisors. The contract will terminate on January 1, 2007.

At the January 3, 2002 meeting, the APAC expressed concerns regarding the consistency of the materials processing facility with the Uniform Rules. One issue was whether materials processing constitutes “mining.” This issue is the subject of debate at the State Mining and Geology Board. Mining is a permitted use on land designated for agriculture, but may be problematic while in agricultural preserve (Williamson Act) contract status.

The proposed 14.2-acre Processing Area will displace agriculture from the southern portion of the 82-acre agricultural preserve parcel for the life of the permit. The remaining 51 acres of this parcel will continue to be cultivated according to the landowner. The EIR analyses indicate that the remaining acreage is agriculturally viable. At the end of the 30-year permit, the Processing Area would be returned to pre-project grades and available for agricultural production. The conserved topsoil would be returned to the area and cultivated once again.

Reclamation of the site would be complete when productive capability of the former Processing Area is equivalent or better than the pre-mining condition for two consecutive years. Financial assurances approved by County and Office of Mine Reclamation would be posted for the life of the project to guarantee reclamation consistent with SMARA minimum verifiable reclamation standards.

Based on the above information, the proposed project would not permanently displace agriculture from the project site. Existing agriculture would continue on the unaffected portions of the project site, and the displacement of 14.2 acres of current agriculture would be temporary – that is, for the permit period. The reclamation plan for the proposed mining operations requires that Processing Area be returned to agricultural production at the end of the permit. Finally, the EIR includes a mitigation measure (AG-1, Section 3.10.3) that prohibits the development of the Processing Area until the Williamson Act Contract expires on January 1, 2007.

Based on the above considerations, the proposed project appears consistent with the Agricultural Element and policies and rules associated with the Williamson Act Contract.

### 5.3 LAND USE ELEMENT

**Third Fundamental Goal, Agriculture:** *“In the rural areas, cultivated agriculture shall be preserved and, where conditions allow, expansion and intensification should be supported. Lands with both prime and non-prime soils shall be reserved for agricultural uses. “*

**Discussion:** The proposed project appears consistent with this goal, as described in Section 5.2.

#### 5.3.1 Land Use, Adequate Services and Resources to Support Development

**Land Use Development Policy 4:** *Prior to issuance of a development permit, the County shall make the finding, based on information provided by environmental documents, staff analysis, and the applicant, that adequate public or private services and resources (i.e., water, sewer, roads, etc.) are available to serve the proposed development. -The applicant shall assume full responsibility for costs incurred in service extensions or improvements, that are required as a result of the proposed project. Lack of available public or private services or resources shall be grounds for denial of the project or reduction in the density otherwise indicated in the land use plan.*

**Discussion:** The applicant has provided well data reports and plans for an on-site engineered septic/leach field system to demonstrate that adequate services are available for potable water, wastewater treatment, and processing water. The site has frontage on a state highway and electricity is present at the site. Hence, the proposed project appears consistent with this policy.

### 5.3.2 Geology and Water Quality

**Hillside and Watershed Protection Policy 1:** *Plans for development shall minimize cut and fill operations. Plans requiring excessive cutting and filling may be denied if it is determined that the development could be carried out with less alteration of the natural terrain.*

**Discussion:** The proposed project necessarily involves extensive excavation and fill operation in order to accomplish the mining. No significant, unavoidable geologic impacts associated with the cut and fill operations were identified in the EIR. There are no feasible alternatives to the proposed excavation that would yield aggregate resources. Hence, the proposed project appears consistent with this policy.

**Hillside and Watershed Protection Policy 2:** *All developments shall be designed to fit the site topography, soils, geology, hydrology, and any other existing conditions and be oriented so that grading and other site preparation is kept to an absolute minimum. Natural features, landforms, and native vegetation, such as trees, shall be preserved to the maximum extent feasible. Areas of the site which are not suited to development because of known soil, geologic, flood, erosion or other hazards shall remain in open space.*

**Discussion:** By necessity, the proposed mining will occur in the river channel where the suitable aggregate is located. The proposed mining pit, with the EIR mitigation measures and suggested conditions of approval, would minimize hydraulic and topographic impacts to the extent practical. Hence, the proposed project appears consistent with this policy.

**Hillside and Watershed Protection Policy 6:** *Provisions shall be made to conduct surface water to storm drains or suitable watercourses to prevent erosion. Drainage devices shall be designed to accommodate increased runoff resulting from modified soil and surface conditions as a result of development. Water runoff shall be retained onsite whenever possible to facilitate groundwater recharge.*

**Hillside and Watershed Protection Policy 7:** *Degradation of the water quality of groundwater basins, nearby streams, or wetlands shall not result from development of the site. Pollutants, such as chemicals, fuels, lubricants, raw sewage and other harmful waste, shall not be discharged into or alongside coastal streams or wetlands either during or after construction.*

**Streams and Creeks Policy 1:** *All permitted construction and grading within the stream corridors shall be carried out in such a manner as to minimize impacts from increased runoff, sedimentation, biochemical degradation or thermal pollution.*

**Discussion:** No significant water quality impact is expected to occur due to the in-stream mining because low flows in the river will be diverted around the mine pit, and because high flows would fill the mine pit as part of a natural riverine process. Stormwater runoff from the Processing Area will be directed to a percolation pond to remove sediments and

pollutants, and to provide for groundwater recharge. No significant groundwater quality impact was identified in the EIR. Hence, the proposed project appears consistent with these policies.

### 5.3.3 Visual Resources

**Visual Resource Policy #2:** *In areas designated as rural on the land use plan maps, the height, scale, and design of structures shall be compatible with the character of the surrounding natural environment, except where technical requirements dictate otherwise. Structures shall be subordinate in appearance to natural landforms; shall be designed to follow the natural contours of the landscape; and shall be sited so as not to intrude into the skyline as seen from public viewing places.*

**Discussion:** The proposed project includes the use of a landscaped berm along Highway 33 to screen the equipment and stockpile at the Processing Area, and reduce visual impacts to viewers along the road. The EIR includes mitigation measures to increase the effectiveness of the proposed screening, such that a significant visual impact would not occur. The mine pit in the river would not be visible to public viewers. The proposed project appears consistent with this policy.

### 5.3.4 Flood Hazard

**Flood Hazard Area Policy 1:** *All development, including construction, excavation, and grading, except for flood control projects and non-structural agricultural uses, shall be prohibited in the floodway unless off-setting improvements in accordance with HUD regulations are provided. If the proposed development falls within the floodway fringe, development may be permitted, provided creek setback requirements are met and finish floor elevations are above the projected 100-year flood elevation, as specified in the Flood Plain Management Ordinance.*

**Discussion:** A portion of the proposed Processing Area may occur within the boundaries of a FEMA flood hazard zone. As such, the proposed Processing Area may be exposed to localized flooding. Under Santa Barbara County's Floodplain Management Ordinance No. 3898, the construction of the shop, fuel storage facility, and scale house at the Processing Areas facilities and mining in the river will require a floodplain development permit from Santa Barbara County Public Works Department, Flood Control District. If the proposed project is approved, the applicant will need to submit an application to the County for the permit, and include pertinent hydraulic calculations and analyses. Non-residential structures, like those proposed for the Processing Area, only require floodproofing the buildings. The proposed project appears consistent with this policy.

**Flood Hazard Area Policy 2:** *Permitted development shall not cause or contribute to flood hazards or lead to expenditure of public funds for flood control works, i.e., dams, stream channelizations, etc.*

**Discussion:** The proposed mining would not cause any increase in flooding. The proposed Processing Area can be modified by floodproofing to meet the County's flood hazard reduction requirements. Hence, the proposed project appears consistent with this policy.

#### 5.4 OPEN SPACE ELEMENT

The Open Space Element recognizes both mineral resource development and agriculture as "open space for the managed production of resources" as defined in California Government Code. Hence, the proposed project appears consistent with this classification.

#### 5.5 NOISE ELEMENT

**Recommendation 1:** *In the planning of land use, 65 dB Day-Night Average Sound Level should be regarded as the maximum exterior noise exposure compatible with noise-sensitive uses unless noise mitigation features are included in project designs.*

**Discussion:** No significant, unavoidable noise impact was identified in the EIR. Hence, the proposed project appears consistent with this policy.

Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15130, an EIR must discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effect is “cumulatively considerable,” which means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects (Section 15065). Section 15355 of the CEQA Guidelines defines cumulative impacts as two or more individual effects, that when considered together, are either considerable or compound other environmental impacts. These cumulative impacts are changes in the environment that result from the incremental impact of the proposed project and other nearby related projects.

### 6.1 GPS MINE

The only other nearby project is the proposed expansion of an existing aggregate mine, the GPS mine, located about 1,000 feet north of the mining area in the Cuyama River (Figure 2-4). The mine operator has filed an application to expand the current in-channel mine pit to a 30-acre area located south and west of the existing pit. The additional area will extend the life of the mine for another 10 years and provide area to mine when the main pit is flooded. The average annual production of the mine would remain unchanged at about 250,000 tons. The average daily truck trips (one way) is 55 ADT. ~~Under the current land use permit, mining and processing occur Monday through Saturday from 5:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., with extended operating hours when daylight permits~~

Potential cumulative impacts of the proposed Diamond Rock mine and the expansion and continuation of the adjacent GPS mine are listed below:

- Reduction in sediment transport downstream of the two mine sites during the mining period, and until such time that the mine pits are replenished
- NO<sub>x</sub> and fugitive dust emissions from on-site mobile equipment and highway haul trucks that contribute to the degradation of regional air quality
- Loss of alluvial scrub habitat in the river channel
- Disturbance of wildlife in adjacent habitats due to noise, dust, traffic, and human activity
- Disruption of wildlife movement in the river channel due to mining
- Possible disturbance to the endangered blunt-nosed leopard lizard, Sphinx moth, and San Joaquin kit fox from mining activities

### 6.2 ~~CUMULATIVE IMPACTS WITH TRUCK TRAFFIC FROM~~ OTHER MINES IN THE REGION

There are two other existing mines in the Cuyama Valley that contribute truck traffic to State Route 33 – Ozena Valley Ranch Sand and Gravel Project and the Lima Gypsum Mine

(Figure 2-8). A summary of their existing operations (including truck volumes) is provided below. In addition, an application to modify the permit for the Ozena Mine is being reviewed by Ventura County; information on the proposed mine operation expansion is provided below.

The Lima Gypsum Mine is located at the end of Quatal Canyon Road east of State Route 33, in the unincorporated area of Ventura County. Excavation, processing, and trucking are limited to Monday through Saturday, 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Daily truck trips are limited to 240 one way trips (120 round trips). Truck traffic may not exceed the maximum of 25 exit loads per hour. The project sells material in Ventura, Los Angeles, Kern, Santa Barbara, and San Luis Obispo counties, and utilizes State Routes 33 and 166 without restrictions.

The Ozena Valley Ranch mining project is located approximately 1.2 miles east/northeast of Highway 33 on Lockwood Valley Road, in the unincorporated area of Ventura County. The current permitted area is 7.08 acres. The existing project consists of a small-scale sand and gravel excavation project permitted to average no more than 66 one-way trips (ADT) for trucks with a 24-hour maximum of 100 one way trips. The expansion project is to excavate a new 15-acre pond, increase allowed truck trips (one way) from 66 to 132 ADT, increase maximum truck ADT within any 24-hours from 100 to 200 ADT, add a rock cutting operation, and add a concrete and asphalt recycling plant. The expansion project would increase the production of the project from approximately 250,000 tons/year to approximately 500,000 tons/year. The project sells material in Ventura, Los Angeles, Kern, Santa Barbara, and San Luis Obispo counties. Mining and processing are restricted to the hours 3:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Under current permit, truck loading and exiting is restricted to the period 3:00 a.m. to 5:00 a.m. Under the new project, truck loading would be expanded to 3:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Truck traffic is currently restricted from hauling aggregate on SR-33 through Ojai during peak hours (i.e. 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.). While there are no current directional restrictions, about 80 percent of the existing traffic at the Ozena plant is to and from the south. Under the proposed project, none of the additional trips would occur on SR-33 south of Lockwood Valley Road. All the additional trips would use SR-33 northbound to SR 166 or Lockwood Valley Road northbound.

### **6.3 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS WITH TRUCK TRAFFIC FROM ALL PROJECTS**

The potential cumulative traffic and noise related impacts of the proposed Diamond Rock mine and the existing Lima Gypsum Mine and the existing and proposed expansion of the Ozena Mine and GPS mine are as follows. There will be a cumulative increase in truck traffic along State Route 33 north of Lockwood Valley Road due to the combination of the new truck trips from Diamond Rock (18 to 28 trips per day), the existing truck trips from Lima Gypsum Mine (approximately 40-50, but no restrictions), and the existing and additional truck trips from the Ozena Mine amounting to about. ~~The Ozena Mine expansion will be adding up to 100 additional truck trips on this segment of State Route 33, which is~~

~~similar to the amount of new trucks associated with average daily production from the Diamond Rock Mine. The GPS mine is already operating, and its proposed expansion would not increase its daily operations or trip generation. Section 3.5.2.4 reviews cumulative traffic effects in the context of projected future traffic volumes. While the overall increase in truck traffic would not substantially affect the operations of SR 33 or SR 166,~~ The combination of new truck trips on this portion of State Route 33 would exacerbate the noise impacts on residents along State Route 33. Increases in the CNEL would range from 5 dBA (with the Diamond Rock project alone) to about 8 dBA (with traffic from all sources). Table 3.6-16 presents estimates of noise levels under different scenarios. The scenarios involving all of the Diamond Rock traffic going to and from the south are fairly representative of potential cumulative effects from all of the sand quarries operating simultaneously. Additional truck traffic would also contribute to ~~and~~ the traffic safety concerns associated with the proposed project and with mining activity in general.

### **6.43 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ON QUALITY OF LIFE**

The County of Santa Barbara Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (County of Santa Barbara Planning and Development Department, 1992, latest revision 2006) defines quality of life as “the aggregate effect of all impacts on individuals, families, communities, and other social groupings and on the way in which those groups function.”(page 137). The County considers that quality of life can have implications on the individuals’ mental health and well-being, on the social structure, and on the community well-being. These implications are defined as follows:

- Mental health and well-being encompasses changes in the mental states of individuals, including their attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs, as well as the associated psychological and physiological consequences of those changes.
- Social structure encompasses changes in the social organization of families and groups, their collective postures over the impacts, and how impacts affect the cohesion and viability of the group.
- Community well-being encompasses changes in community structure that relate to non-economic factors, such as desirability, social cohesion, livability, attractiveness, and sense of place.

The County considers the project's effect on “quality of life” significant in cases where a substantial physical impact to the quality of the human environment is demonstrated. However, the County does not establish a threshold for such impact. Instead, the County considers the elements comprising quality of life on a case-by-case basis.

The Thresholds and Guidelines Manual describes the issues involved in determining effects on quality of life as follows:

Quality of life issues, while hard to quantify, are often primary concerns to the community affected by a project. Examples of such issues include the following:

- Loss of privacy
- Neighborhood incompatibility
- Nuisance noise levels (not exceeding noise thresholds)
- Increased traffic in quiet neighborhoods (not exceeding traffic thresholds)
- Loss of sunlight/solar access

The proposed project would occur simultaneously with the existing and/or proposed mining operations within the Cuyama Valley region described above. Considering the above list of issues, these projects would not influence privacy or solar access on nearby residences. The dominant land use pattern in the Cuyama Valley is intensive agriculture, and in many respects aggregate mining is compatible with this land use. The cumulative effect of the combined mining operations may influence the quality of life in the area. Thus, the most likely impacts to quality of life would originate from:

- Nuisance noise levels (not exceeding noise thresholds)
- Increased traffic in quiet neighborhoods (not exceeding traffic thresholds)
- ~~Increase in air quality emissions~~

In addition, the project will result in increased air emissions, and in one respect—emissions from operating equipment on the site—the emissions cannot be reduced below the threshold used to define a significant impact.

Mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce these impacts in a project-by-project basis. In most instances, all impacts will be reduced to levels below thresholds that are considered significant. Noise from the Diamond Rock project will only be perceived in the vicinity of the project, and at levels well below 65 dBA. The traffic volume from the project is well within the capacity of the state highway, given the existing low levels of traffic in the area. However, even when impacts can be reduced to less than significant levels, residents in the area will remain aware of the mining projects. If all three aggregate mines are operating in the area, along with the Lima Gypsum mine, their combined effects would likely be viewed by some residents as inconsistent with the rural nature of the region. Due to the subjective nature of this evaluation, For these reasons, the potential cumulative impacts on the quality of life in the area are considered potentially significant but mitigable to a less than significant level with the imposition of conditions to reduce the aesthetic, noise, and other effects of the projects..adverse and unavoidable.

Implementation of the proposed project would not require the extension or expansion of infrastructure or services that could induce or serve additional growth beyond the project. The proposed project would not induce growth due to job creation because it would only employ eight people, most of which are expected to commute to the job site from established residences in the region. The production of aggregate would support various construction projects in the region, including public infrastructure (e.g., roads) and private land development, including commercial, industrial, and residential development. The availability of this aggregate for construction would not stimulate or create growth. However, the new supply may better accommodate planned and ongoing growth.

**SANTA BARBARA COUNTY, PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT**

Larry Appel – Supervising Planner

Gary Kaiser – Planner III

**URS CORPORATION**

John Gray – Project Manager and various topics

John Larson – Project Manager and various topics

Ana Hudson – Policy Consistency and Revisions

Craig Woodman – Management Support

Phil Mineart – Hydrology

John Gray and Johanna LaClaire – Biology

Byron Bass – Archeology

Mike Greene and John Larson – Noise

Claudia Muzzio – Geographic Information System

[John McIntosh – Final EIR revisions](#)

**ASSOCIATED TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERS**

Darryl Nelson – Traffic

**CANNON ASSOCIATES**

Andrew Merriam – Visual Analysis

Meg Abel – Visual Analysis

- Associated Transportation Engineers. 2004. Diamond Rock Sand and Gravel Mine and Processing Facility – Traffic Study.
- 2005a. Memo on Feasibility of Left Turn Lane on State Route 33. Memo to West Coast Environmental.
- 2005b. Compilation of Accident Data from Caltrans, 2001-2004.
- Bumgardner Biological Consulting. 2002. Troesh Ready Mix, Inc. – Diamond Rock Surface Mining Site Biological Report, Santa Barbara County. Sept. 9, 2002.
- 2003a. Supplement to the Troesh Ready Mix, Inc. – Diamond Rock Surface Mining Site Biological Report, Santa Barbara County. May 13, 2003.
- 2003b. Revised Supplement to the Troesh Ready Mix, Inc. – Diamond Rock Surface Mining Site Biological Report, Santa Barbara County. July 9, 2003.
- California Department of Water Resources. 1998. Evaluation of Groundwater Overdraft In Southern Central Coast Region.
2003. California's Groundwater Bulletin No. 118. Sacramento, California.
- Caltrans. 2004. Average Annual Daily Trips, Including Truck Trips for State Highways, 2004 data.
- Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board. 2003. Water Quality Data from the Cuyama River. Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) website.
- Hilltop Geotechnical, Inc. 2005. Report of Cut Slope Stability. Evaluation for Mining Plan Proposed Diamond Rock Aggregate Mine and Processing Facility West of State Route 33 and North of Ventucopa in the Cuyama River Basin, Santa Barbara County, California. Project No.: 521-A05 Report No.: 1. For West Coast Environmental.
- Los Padres National Forest. 2004. Corridor Management Plan, Jacinto Reyes Scenic Byway. Ojai Ranger District and Mt. Pinos Ranger District.
- Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District. 2005. Environmental Review Guidelines for the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District. July 2005.
- Santa Barbara County. 2002. Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual. October 2002.
- Santa Barbara County Water Agency. 2003. Santa Barbara County Groundwater Report, 2003.

- URS Corporation. 2004. Sediment Transport Calculations for Diamond Rock Mine, Internal Memorandum. Oakland, California.
- U.S. Geological Survey. 2000. Operational Guidelines (version 1.0) for Geological Fieldwork in Areas Endemic for *Coccidioidomycosis* (Valley Fever). U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 00-348. By Frederick S. Fisher, Mark W. Bultman and Demosthenes Pappagianis.
- West Coast Environmental. 2003a. Geologic Report, Proposed Diamond Rock Mine Sand and Gravel Mine, State Route 33. For Troesch Ready Mix, Inc.
- 2003b. Noise Study, Diamond Rock Mine. Prepared for Troesch Ready Mix, Inc.
- 2003c. Air Quality Impact Assessment, Diamond Rock Aggregate Mine and Processing Facilities. For Troesh Ready Mix, Inc.
- 2005a. Responses to Questions on Air Quality. Memorandum to Gary Kaiser, Santa Barbara County Planning & Development. Dated August 30, 2005.
- 2005b. Diamond Rock Mine Air Quality Questions from URS. Memorandum to Ingrid Else, WCE. Dated December 1, 2005.
- 2005c. Diamond Rock Sand and Gravel Mine and Aggregate Processing Facility Visual Simulations. Memorandum to John Hecht, WCE. Dated October 6, 2005.
- Ventura County Air Pollution Control District. 2003. Air Quality Assessment Guidelines. October 2003 Ventura County Air Pollution Control District.