

[This is the Final Environmental Impact Report \(EIR\) for the Diamond Rock sand and gravel project in Santa Barbara County. Section 1 – Introduction contains more information regarding the organization of the Final EIR.](#)

The County of Santa Barbara, Planning and Development Department (P&D) has received an application from Troesh Materials Inc. (Troesh) for a new sand and gravel mining operation and aggregate processing facility that will be known as Diamond Rock Sand and Gravel Mine and Processing Facilities (Diamond Rock). Troesh is seeking approval to mine aggregate from the Cuyama River and process the mined materials at an adjacent upland location to produce marketable Portland cement concrete-grade (PCC-grade) aggregate. PCC-grade aggregate is an essential building material for public infrastructure projects and private development approved by cities and counties in the region.

Troesh's current sources of aggregate material include operations in the Santa Maria River (San Luis Obispo County), the Hanson operation in Sisquoc, the Hanson Aggregates West operation in Santa Margarita, and the Union Asphalt operation (Garey and Rocky Canyon). Troesh conducted a review of potential aggregate resource sites, which concluded that factors including the quality and quantity of material present, environmental constraints, distance, and area for production facilities make potential alternative sites less preferable than the proposed site along the Cuyama River. It appears unlikely that a similar site with the volume and quality of aggregate material would be found. If a similar site could be found, it would be located elsewhere along the river or in a similar habitat and would most likely have similar or greater environmental and land use constraints.

The Santa Barbara County Conservation Element (County of Santa Barbara 1994:176) recognized that production of sand and gravel has ranged below the California Division of Mines and Geology estimated need for growing areas, and that some aggregate resources were imported from Ventura and Orange Counties to meet local demand. In the past 10 years, there has been a dramatic increase in the demand for aggregate resources. This is a direct result in the increased development rates of residential housing, commercial and public buildings, highways, roads, bridges, dams, airports, canals, military facilities, water and sewer facilities, railroads and other public transit facilities. In addition, there is a potential for unplanned demand in response to such catastrophic events such as the 1989 Loma **Frieda Prieta** and 1994 Northridge earthquakes. Following those earthquakes, the need for aggregate for highway, bridge and other reconstruction was greater than available aggregate supplies. Hence, there is an ongoing need to ensure that permitted aggregate reserves are sufficient to meet future local demand, with a capacity to ramp up production in response to the increased demand following a catastrophic event.

The County Conservation Element recognizes the important contribution of mineral resource extraction to the local, state, and national economies (County of Santa Barbara 1994:181). At the same time, it is recognized that the County should have discretionary review over

aggregate mining activities in order to minimize adverse direct and indirect environmental impacts. The Conservation Element identifies policies for the County to balance the protection of environmental resources with the identification and exploitation of rock, sand, and gravel mineral resources.

The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluates the environmental effects of the proposed project. The EIR identifies potentially significant impacts of the project, as well as feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to avoid or reduce such impacts. Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the County will use the information in the EIR during their consideration of the application, which will involve a public hearing. The EIR is also used to inform the public about the project and to facilitate public input. The EIR, together with public comments, in turn, allow for an informed decision by the County.

### **ES.1 PROJECT SUMMARY**

The Diamond Rock site is located in the Cuyama Valley, an unincorporated portion of Santa Barbara County. It is located along State Route 33 approximately 5.9 miles southeast of its intersection with State Route 166. The proposed mining area occurs in the riverbed of the Cuyama River. The overall mining, processing, and reclamation area encompasses about 133 acres on three parcels that total 280 acres. The parcels are all zoned for agriculture wherein mining and associated processing and reclamation are allowable uses through the Conditional Use Permit Process (CUP).

Aggregate would be extracted from a pit located in the Cuyama River. Mined materials would be mechanically crushed, sorted by size and type; sand would be washed to remove fine material. All finished products would be stockpiled, and products would be transported offsite via haul trucks.

The average annual production is estimated to be 500,000 tons of product per year. The maximum annual production from the mine would be 750,000 tons. The actual production levels would vary over time and would be a direct function of the general regional economic conditions, the number and type of contracts obtained, and equipment usage rate and maintenance requirements. The applicant is seeking a 30-year permit.

Material will be excavated from an 84-acre mining area located in the Cuyama River channel. Material will be excavated from the riverbed using heavy mobile equipment and transported by trucks, scraper or conveyor. Excavation will begin in the southwest corner of the mining area, and then progress eastward towards the western river bank and the processing area. The maximum anticipated depth of the mine pit is 90 feet below ground surface. The mine pit will be replenished periodically by flood flows in the river.

The mined materials would be processed at a 14.2-acre Processing Area adjacent to State Route 33. The proposed mining and processing operations would occur up to 303 days per

year; truck loading operations (using stockpiled product) may occur on additional days. Mining would occur Monday through Saturday during daylight hours. Processing would also occur Monday through Saturday, but may extend to 10:00 p.m. No processing would occur after 10:00 p.m. Truck loading would occur at the Processing Area based on demand, which may include 24-hour operations during both weekdays and weekends for certain orders. Occasional special orders for large public works projects that are being constructed on an expedited basis may require mining and processing on Sundays.

Truck traffic would vary with production. During peak operation days, there could be up to 69 product delivery truck loads (138 ~~round~~-trips). On an average operational day, there would be approximately 46 product delivery truck loads (92 ~~round~~-trips).

### ES.2 REQUIRED APPROVALS

The project requires approval of a Conditional Use Permit and Reclamation Plan by the Santa Barbara County Planning Commission. Key permits and approvals from other agencies include: a Permit to Construct and a Permit to Operate from the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District; a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game; Section 404 Permit from the Corps of Engineers; and the following approvals by the Regional Water Quality Control Board: NPDES Stormwater Permit (Industrial Permit) and Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification. In addition, the project would require a building permit for grading, building, structures and utility connections within the processing area. A building permit will not be required for mining and reclamation activities.

### ES.3 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Issuance of County permits and approval for the proposed project represents a discretionary action subject to the environmental review requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In October 2003, P&D completed a CEQA Initial Study and determined that there was a potential for the project to cause significant environmental impacts. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared to evaluate the impacts of the project. A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was issued in November 12, 2003 for a 30-day public review period. The County received written comments on the NOP from various public agencies and non-governmental organizations.

A previous Draft EIR was issued for review and comment on February 4, 2005. A public meeting was conducted to receive comments on the Draft EIR on March 3, 2005 in Cuyama. Over 30 letters and emails of comments were received on the Draft EIR from public agencies and the public. The letters and emails raised several important issues that required additional analysis and public comment. Hence, the County determined that a revised Draft EIR should be issued for review and comment. The revised Draft EIR addresses the issues and concerns

raised in the letters of comment. The Revised Draft EIR was issued for review and comment on November 29, 2006. A public meeting was conducted to receive comments on the Revised Draft EIR on January 9, 2007 in Cuyama. Approximately 200 letters and e-mails were received regarding the EIR or the project. The comments are summarized, and responses are presented, in Appendix H.

## ES.4 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

### ES.4.1 Significant and Unmitigable Impact (Class I)

The proposed project would result in a significant, unavoidable impact (Class I) on air quality. The proposed project would create a new source of nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>) and reactive organic compound (ROC) emissions due to onsite mining, onsite hauling, and processing activities. Both the average and peak daily NO<sub>x</sub> ~~and ROC~~ would exceed the County Planning and Development and APCD significance thresholds for emissions during operation (55 pounds per day for ROC or NO<sub>x</sub>). The daily ROC emissions under both the average and peak production rates would remain below the significance threshold.

~~In addition, the proposed project could occur simultaneously with the existing and/or proposed mining operations within the Cuyama Valley region. The cumulative effect of the combined mining operations may influence the quality of life in the area. 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), and increase in air quality emissions. Mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce these impacts in a project-by-project basis. 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 (GPS Mine, Ozena Valley Ranch Sand and Gravel Project, Lima Gypsum mine, and the proposed project) are operating in the area, their combined effects would likely be viewed by some residents as inconsistent with the rural nature of the region. For these reasons, the potential cumulative impacts on the quality of life in the area are considered adverse and unavoidable.~~

### ES.4.2 Significant but Mitigable Impacts (Class II)

The proposed project would also result in various significant, but mitigable impacts (Class II), which are summarized below. Mitigation measures to avoid these impacts, or to reduce them to less than significant levels, are presented in the EIR. These impacts and the associated mitigation measures are described in more detail in Table ES-1.

#### ES.4.2.1 Drainage and Flooding

- The results of a sediment transport simulation model indicated the proposed Diamond Rock mine, combined with the nearby existing GPS mine, would create a sediment

deficit in the river as mining rates exceed natural sediment replenishment rates. This condition could result in downstream channel degradation and upstream headcutting, although there is uncertainty if this impact would occur.

- Deer Park Creek is a tributary that will discharge at the mine pit. Significant flows in the creek could cause headcutting which could migrate upgradient to State Route 33 unless sufficient grade control is provided at the edge of the mine pit where the creek will discharge.
- The proposed Processing Area may be exposed to localized flooding from two sources during very wet winters with severe runoff conditions: 1) runoff from an old tributary that is parallel to the river, but which may or may not convey the same flow volume as it did prior to land development in the valley; and 2) flow from Highway 33.

### **ES.4.2.2 Geologic Hazards**

- The proposed mining plan would involve mine slopes that would not have suitable factors of safety under seismic or saturated conditions. Although slope failure would not affect any structures or adjacent properties, the potential for failure could affect worker safety.

### **ES.4.2.3 Biological Resources**

- Mining in the Cuyama River channel would remove up to 27 acres of alluvial scrub during the 30-year permit period, which would displace wildlife and reduce the amount of scrub habitat for wildlife use along this portion of the river.
- The time required for mixed alluvial scrub to become established in the river channel and to match pre-mining conditions is unknown, but could require 10 years or more. The lag time required for habitat recovery would extend past the permit period.
- The nighttime lighting at the Processing Area would adversely affect nocturnal wildlife in the habitat area located to the south, although the variety and abundance of wildlife are low.
- Haul trucks traveling from the mine pit to the Processing Area may inadvertently strike reptiles and small mammals.
- Over time, the proposed mining would extend across most of the river channel and alter the river channel habitats and topographic conditions. The mining operation in the river channel would create potential impediments to wildlife movement in the river channel and force wildlife to find new travel corridors.
- The endangered blunt-nosed leopard lizard occurs on the terrace adjacent to the river channel. The occurrence of this species in the river channel where mining will occur is unknown. The applicant's leopard lizard impact avoidance plan and additional mitigation

measures included in this document would avoid take of the lizard during mine operations.

### **ES.4.2.4 Traffic**

- The proposed project would involve truck traffic on State Route 33 from the project site to Ventura. If all or a substantial amount of truck trips were directed to Ventura, the project would potentially have a significant impact to State Route 33 due to the addition of one or more peak hour trips on [the Ojai to Casitas Springs portion of](#) State Route 33.
- The State Route 33/project driveway intersection at the project site is forecast to operate at Level of Service A, with vehicles experiencing less than 10 seconds of delay. However, Caltrans has requested a northbound left turn lane on State Route 33 to reduce future conflicts with turning trucks and fast-moving traffic. Caltrans stated that this facility would be necessary to ensure the operational integrity of the highway.

### **ES.4.2.5 Noise**

- The projected ambient noise levels at residential receptors near the project site during mining and processing operations would be less than 65 dBA for daytime and nighttime conditions, and would not exceed the County's 65 CNEL significance threshold. However, the increase in daytime, nighttime, and CNEL levels would range from occasionally audible (around 3 dBA) to clearly audible (6 to 9 dBA). The latter increase during the day or night, and during occasional Sundays, could cause a nuisance to nearby residences, and is considered a potentially significant impact based on the County's threshold in which a significant effect may also occur when ambient noise levels affecting sensitive receptors increase substantially but remain less than 65 dB(A) CNEL.
- If all mine production was hauled to Ventura County, the additional daily truck trips along State Route 33 south of the project site and north of Ojai would increase daytime and nighttime noise levels at residences along this rural highway, many of which are located within 100 feet of the road. The increased noise levels would be moderate (~5 dBA) relative to the existing ambient noise levels, and would not exceed 65 CNEL.

### **ES.4.2.6 Air Quality**

- The peak daily NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from project traffic in Santa Barbara County (32.4 lbs/day, Table 3.7-16) would exceed the vehicle emissions threshold for NO<sub>x</sub> of 25 lbs/day.
- The results of the health risk analysis prepared for the proposed project indicate that at the point of maximum offsite exposure, the increase in cancer risk would be approximately 9 in one million. At the location of the nearest residence, approximately 2,500 feet to the southeast, the cancer risk is approximately 1.6 in one million. These

results assumed that anticipated diesel exhaust control technology will be installed on both new and used pieces of equipment within the project.

#### **ES.4.2.7 Visual Resources**

- The stockpiles and equipment at the Processing Area would be visible to travelers on State Route 33. The proposed screening berms would reduce the visual impact over time as the landscaping develops. However, given the harsh climate in the Cuyama Valley, the landscape trees will need a high level of care to reach their intended screening heights. It is likely that without this care, the trees would be dwarfed (if they survived at all) and would not provide the intended screening. Additional measures to improve the screening would reduce the visual impact to less than significant.
- The processing operations could occur until 10:00 p.m. each night and truck loading/hauling operations could occur on a 24-hour basis (as needed) requiring the use of night lighting. The addition of significant nighttime lighting associated with processing operations and truck loading/hauling operations could change the character of the nighttime setting in the Cuyama Valley, including the ability to view the nighttime sky in a rural setting.

#### **ES.4.3 Less than Significant Adverse Impacts (Class III)**

The proposed project would result in a variety of other environmental impacts that were determined to be adverse, but less than significant (Class III). These impacts are summarized in Table ES-1.

#### **ES.4.4 Beneficial Impacts (Class IV)**

The eastern riverbank of the Cuyama River has historically been disturbed by erosion control measures such as tree planting, placement of riprap and old automobiles, and the establishment of berms. Tree planting included saltcedar, an invasive species, and nursery stocked cottonwoods, a desirable species. The applicant is proposing to restore an approximately 1,500-foot long portion of the eastern riverbank. Buried automobiles would be removed and disposed offsite in compliance local ordinances and other applicable regulations. The riverbank would be reconstructed, as necessary, into a stable configuration. The bank would be constructed of on-site materials, free of debris. Existing salt cedar would be removed and an eradication program implemented to ensure they do not become re-established. Existing cottonwood trees currently growing on or near the riverbank would be retained, as feasible. Additional cottonwood trees would be planted along the top of the riverbank or near the toe of the restored bank where large rocks would afford protection from high in-stream flows. Native shrubs and herbs from the region would be established on the stabilized banks by seeding. The proposed bank stabilization and restoration would result in a beneficial impact (Class IV) to wildlife at the project site because it would increase cover and

food sources. Although this restoration would benefit the environment in the long term, it may not be permitted by the resource agencies because of short-term potential impacts to Blunt Nosed Leopard Lizard.

#### ES.4.5 Cumulative Impacts

The proposed project would contribute to the following cumulative impacts associated with the proposed expansion of an existing aggregate mine, the GPS mine, located about 1,000 feet north of the proposed project in the Cuyama River:

- Reduction in sediment transport downstream of the 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
- Increased truck traffic and noise affecting quality of life in the area
- 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 and San Joaquin kit fox from mining activities

There are two other existing aggregate 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. An application to modify the permit for the Ozena mine is being reviewed by Ventura County. 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, the existing truck trips from Lima Gypsum mine, and the existing and additional truck trips from the Ozena mine. 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 combination of new truck trips on this portion of State Route 33 would exacerbate the noise impacts on residents along State Route 33 and the traffic safety concerns associated with the proposed project and have a perceived effect on the quality of life in the area, ~~which can be considered significant and unavoidable.~~ The cumulative effect on the quality of life in the area is considered a potentially significant impact that may be mitigated to a less than significant level.

**ES.5 ALTERNATIVES**

Based on the analyses in the Draft EIR, the proposed project would result in significant, unavoidable impacts (Class I) to air quality and quality of life. Hence, an evaluation of alternatives is required by CEQA. The assessment of alternatives provided in the EIR focuses on how alternatives would avoid significant impacts through their design rather than through the application of mitigation measures.

The following alternatives to the proposed project were evaluated in the EIR:

- No Project Alternative
- Reduced Mining Area Scenario (Shorter Permit Period)
- Reduced Mining Area Scenario (Reduced Annual Production)
- Reduced Mining Depth (and Reduced Annual Production)
- Modified Mine Pit Layout (Lessen Hydraulic Impacts)
- Upland Mine Site Alternative (Use of Agricultural Land)

The No Project Alternative would avoid the significant NO<sub>x</sub> production from operations and would avoid the other significant, but mitigable impacts (Class II) of the proposed project.

The Reduced Mining Area Alternative with the shorter permit period would not avoid or substantially change any Class I or Class II impacts associated with the proposed project because this alternative would still involve mining and processing at the project site, albeit for a shorter period of time.

The Reduced Mining Area Alternative with a smaller mining pit might involve reduced operations to the point that the Class I air quality impact would be avoided. It would not avoid the Class II impacts associated with the proposed project. However, it would reduce these impacts through the nature of the alternative – a smaller mining area and the limits on work days, hours, and throughput for this alternative.

The Reduced Mining Depth Alternative would also not avoid the Class II impacts associated with the proposed project. However, it would reduce these impacts through the nature of the alternative – a smaller mining area and the limits on work days, hours, and throughput for this alternative.

The Modified Mine Pit Layout Alternative would reduce the Class II impact on river hydraulics associated with the proposed project, but would not avoid the other Class II impacts associated with the proposed project.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

The use of the adjacent agricultural lands for the mine pit (Upland Mine Site Alternative) would avoid habitat-related impacts, but would also create a new significant impact by displacing a viable agricultural operation and intensifying visual impacts.

Under the CEQA Guidelines, the EIR must identify the environmentally superior alternative, if it is other than the No Project Alternative. Based on the above analyses, the Reduced Mining Area Alternative with a smaller mining pit and limits on work days, hours, and throughput would be considered the environmentally superior alternative to the proposed project. It would have the same number of Class II impacts as the proposed project, but with lesser habitat impacts and less frequent daily operations impacts related to noise, truck trips, and truck emissions. Depending on the intensity of daily operations, this alternative might avoid the Class I significant and unmitigable air quality impact from the project. From a material production viewpoint this alternative would provide the applicant with a smaller aggregate resource supply, when compared with the proposed project, not significantly different from current supplies.

**TABLE ES-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

Description of Impact by Issue Area	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact Level
<i>CLASS I IMPACTS: SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE</i>		
<i>Air Quality (Class I)</i>		
<p><b>Emissions from Daily Operations.</b> The proposed project would create a new source of NO<sub>x</sub> and ROC emissions at the project site due to on-site mining, on-site hauling, and processing activities. Both the average and peak daily NO<sub>x</sub> <del>and ROC</del> emissions from the mining operations (Tables 3.7-15-62 and 3.7-16-63) would exceed the operations thresholds for NO<sub>x</sub> <del>or ROC</del> (55 lbs/day).</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure AQ-4, listed below in Class II Impacts, may provide some reduction in NO<sub>x</sub> <del>and ROC</del> emissions.</p>	<p>Significant and not mitigable</p>
<i>Cumulative Impacts (Class I)</i>		
<p><del>Cumulative Impacts to Quality of Life.</del> The proposed project could occur simultaneously with the existing and/or proposed mining operations within the Cuyama Valley region. The cumulative effect of the combined mining operations may influence the quality of life in the area. 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), and increase in air quality emissions. Mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce these impacts in a project by project basis. 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 (GPS Mine, Ozena Valley Ranch Sand and Gravel Project, Lima Gypsum mine, and the proposed project) are operating in the area, their combined effects would likely be viewed by some residents as inconsistent with the rural nature of the region. For these reasons, the potential cumulative impacts on the quality of life in the area are considered adverse and unavoidable.</p>		<p>Significant and not mitigable</p>

**TABLE ES-1 (CONTINUED)  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

Description of Impact by Issue Area	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact Level
<i><b>CLASS II IMPACTS: SIGNIFICANT, BUT MITIGABLE</b></i>		
<i><b>Drainage, Erosion and Water Quality (Class II)</b></i>		
<p><b>Impacts on Sediment Transport and Budget.</b> The results of the sediment transport simulation model indicated the proposed Diamond Rock Mine, combined with the existing GPS mine, would create a sediment deficit in the river as mining rates exceed sediment replenishment rates. As the mine pits become larger, there is a potential for a change in river hydraulics, which could result in downstream channel degradation and upstream headcutting. The magnitude of these impacts are expected to be minor, and is not expected to cause bank erosion. None of these hydraulic impacts would affect structures, public infrastructure, or valuable in-channel habitats. Hence, the impacts appear to be less than significant. However, in light of the inherent uncertainty of simulation models and the potential to underestimate these effects, the impacts on river hydraulics and sediment transport due to the Diamond Rock Mine, in combination with the GPS mine, are considered potentially significant, but mitigable.</p>	<p><b>Required Mitigation Measure W-2.</b> The applicant shall survey the river bottom elevations from bank to bank each April and October at three locations: 1) 1,000 feet upstream of the current mine pit; (2) in the middle of the current mine pit; and (3) 1,000 feet downstream of the current mine pit. Elevations of the channel bottom shall be collected at survey points in three transects across the river. The number of survey points shall be sufficient to provide cross sections to compare the channel cross sections from year to year. These data shall be reviewed each year by County P&amp;D, in consultation with County Flood Control District, during the annual SMARA inspections to determine if there is evidence of headcutting or channel degradation. If adverse hydraulic conditions are evident, or appear to be developing, which could result in off-site impacts, County P&amp;D will confer with the County Flood Control to determine modifications to the mining pit layout, width, and/or depth that would avoid these impacts. Given the uncertainty in ascribing these impacts to the presence of the mine pit, an incremental, multi-year approach to address these impacts by mine pit modifications would be implemented by the County P&amp;D.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p><b>Impact on Deer Park Creek.</b> Deer Park Creek is a tributary that will discharge at the mine pit. Significant flows in the creek could cause headcutting which could migrate upgradient to State Route 33. The potential for this impact is expected to be lessened because the proposed project includes a berm at the mouth of the tributary to direct flows into the mine pit in a controlled manner. However, there is a potential for the berm to fail during flood events, which could cause a rapid headcutting of this drainage when <del>the</del> it empties into the mine pit and there is a significant hydraulic jump. The headcutting could quickly migrate upstream to State Route 33.</p>	<p><b>Required Mitigation Measure W-4.</b> The applicant shall include an earthen berm and grade control structure at the outlet of Deer Park Creek at the edge of the river. The berm and structure shall direct flows to the river, downstream of the mine pit, during the initial mining operations. If feasible, the berm and structure shall also direct flows during the full mine pit condition to the river instead of discharging into the mine pit as proposed in order to avoid a hydraulic "jump" that would be created at the edge of the full mine pit. The County Flood Control District shall review the berm and grade control structure design to ensure appropriate materials, size, and depth to prevent failure from channel bed erosion or by-passing flows. The berm and structure shall be included in the SMARA inspections by the County.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

**TABLE ES-1 (CONTINUED)  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

Description of Impact by Issue Area	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact Level
<p><b><u>Flooding at Processing Area.</u></b> The proposed Processing Area may be exposed to localized flooding from two sources during very wet winters with severe runoff conditions: 1) runoff from an old tributary that is parallel to the river, but which may or may not convey the same flow volume as it did prior to land development in the valley; and 2) flow from State Route 33. The former drainage appears to discharge in the center of the Processing Area. Runoff from the highway appears to by pass the Processing Area, but would directly impinge on the proposed screening berms located along the west side of the highway.</p>	<p><b><u>Required Mitigation Measure W-5.</u></b> The applicant shall acquire a floodplain development permit from the Santa Barbara County Public Works Department, Flood Control District, for the facilities in the Processing Area. The application for the permit shall include a drainage report prepared by a registered engineer that delineates the floodplain limits associated with Deer Park Creek and the drainage from the unnamed tributary and State Route 33 (if present). The application shall include floodproofing structures at the Processing Area in accordance with the County Floodplain Ordinance. It shall also include calculations to demonstrate that the proposed spaces between the screening berms would not cause localized flooding along State Route 33, nor exacerbate flooding along Deer Park Creek west of State Route 33.</p>	Less than significant
<b><i>Geologic Hazards (Class II)</i></b>		
<p><b><u>Mine Slope Stability.</u></b> The proposed mining plan would involve mine slopes that would not have suitable factors of safety under seismic or saturated conditions. Although slope failure would not affect any structures or adjacent properties, the potential for failure could affect worker safety. The potential for slope failure associated with the proposed mining plan is considered significant, but mitigable.</p>	<p><b><u>Required Mitigation Measure G-1.</u></b> The mining plan shall be modified per the recommendations in the Hilltop Geotechnical Slope Geological Report, summarized as follows: 1) the width of benches on exterior mine slopes shall be reduced to 20 feet; 2) the width of access roads on exterior mine slopes shall be reduced to 40 feet; 3) no mining shall occur below the water table; and 4) the mine pit shall not be dewatered by pumping for the purposes of resuming mining operations – mining shall only resume after natural drawdown.</p>	Less than significant
<b><i>Biological Resources (Class II)</i></b>		
<p><b><u>Loss of Native Habitat due to Mining.</u></b> The removal of 27 acres of alluvial scrub habitat from the Cuyama River channel during the 30-year mining period, and for an unknown period of time after the cessation of mining, would displace wildlife and reduce the amount of scrub habitat for wildlife use along this portion of the river. However, there is a substantial amount of available habitat in the river channel (upstream and downstream of the project site) and in the surrounding area.</p>	<p><b><u>Required Mitigation Measure BIO-1.</u></b> The proposed riverbank restoration shall be completed and meet the performance criteria within five years of Land Use Permit issuance or before 20 acres are disturbed in the mine pit, whichever comes first. Annual status reports shall be submitted to the County Planning and Development Department (P&amp;D) until the restoration has been completed.</p> <p><b><u>Required Mitigation Measure BIO-2.</u></b> The disturbed portions, estimated to be about 5.35 acres, of the stream terrace adjacent to the river channel (see Figure 3-19) shall be enhanced and restored to provide native alluvial scrub habitat for wildlife use during the life of the permit. The applicant shall submit a restoration plan to P&amp;D for review and approval within 6 months of Land use Permit issuance. The plan shall indicate the enhancement and restoration areas and describe habitat objectives, restoration methodology, performance criteria, and implementation schedule. The overall</p>	Less than significant
<i>Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through -7 would address this impact</i>		

**TABLE ES-1 (CONTINUED)  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

Description of Impact by Issue Area	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact Level
	<p>objective is to reduce the amount of non-native weeds and increase native shrub cover (using species common to alluvial scrub) in order to enhance conditions for wildlife use. The enhancement and restoration plan shall be independent of the mine reclamation plan. The plan shall include removal of all saltcedar from the stream terrace, including the top of bank areas adjacent to the agricultural field. Salt cedar shall be removed during the period July through February to avoid disruption of any breeding birds. Cottonwood trees shall be planted in patches in suitable locations on the bank or at the toe of the bank between the stream terrace and agricultural field to provide bird roosting habitat. These restoration activities to provide bird roosting habitat shall be completed within 7 years of project approval.</p> <p><b>Required Mitigation Measure BIO-3.</b> The 16.87-acre stream terrace to be protected for blunt-nosed leopard lizard shall be maintained in a protected state during the life of the permit, which shall include measures to prevent unauthorized use by off-road vehicles, dumping, or other habitat damaging activities. No new roads shall be constructed in the area, and no equipment or stockpiles shall be placed within the boundaries. The area shall remain in a protected state until the County has determined that the mining pit and processing area have been fully reclaimed in accordance with the approved reclamation plan and SMARA and County requirements.</p> <p><b>Required Mitigation Measure BIO-4.</b> To minimize the rate and extent of habitat loss as the mine pit is developed, the areas outside the active mine pit shall not be cleared, graded, or otherwise disturbed until such time that excavation is scheduled to begin in these areas. The applicant shall use the proposed perimeter flagging to delineate the boundary of the active mine, haul road, and <del>low flow diversion</del><del>flood-control</del> berm. The applicant shall instruct all equipment operators to remain within the boundary. The applicant shall submit an up-to-date map of the active mine pit and haul road to P&amp;D each year. P&amp;D shall review the annual mining and haul route plan, as well as conduct visual inspections of the mining operations during the annual SMARA site inspections.</p> <p><b>Required Mitigation Measure BIO-5.</b> The applicant shall minimize the disturbance zone associated with the construction and maintenance of <del>low flow diversion</del><del>flood-control</del> berm surrounding the mining pit by employing grading methods that avoid extensive equipment movement in the river channel. Earthwork and equipment travel associated with the construction and maintenance of the berms shall</p>	

**TABLE ES-1 (CONTINUED)  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

Description of Impact by Issue Area	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact Level
	<p>not occur outside the project site boundaries. The applicant shall submit an annual mining and haul route plan to P&amp;D for review and approval which would show the location of the <del>low flow diversion</del><del>flood control</del> berm and describe the construction and maintenance methods. P&amp;D shall review the annual mining and haul route plan, as well as conduct visual inspections of the mining operations during the annual SMARA site inspections.</p> <p><b>Required Mitigation Measure BIO-6.</b> The haul road to the mine pit shall be sited in such a manner as to reduce the number of re-alignments required as the mine pit becomes larger. If possible, the initial haul road alignment shall be maintained throughout the duration of the Phase 1 mining in order to avoid unnecessarily disturbing river channel habitats prior to the expansion of the mine pit during Phase 2.</p> <p><b>Required Mitigation Measure BIO-7.</b> The applicant shall manage aggressive non-native weeds that may periodically colonize the <del>low flow diversion</del><del>flood control</del> berm. Aggressive noxious species, such as Russian thistle and star thistle, shall be removed on an on-going basis using a combination of mechanical means and herbicide application. The cover of non-native aggressive weeds shall not exceed 20 percent of the total plant cover on the berms during the life of the permit. Herbicides shall only be used to manage weeds if: 1) approved aquatic herbicides are used, such as AquaMaster; 2) herbicides are not applied to open water, on saturated ground, or during the winter season when flows could remove applied herbicides (Dec 1 through April 1); 3) Best Management Practices (BMPs) are employed to reduce the amount of applied herbicide, including the BMPs associated with the state-wide aquatic pesticide permit; 4) a weed management plan with the selected BMPs is submitted to, and approved by, Planning &amp; Development prior to issuance of the Land Use Permit; and 5) the applicant has acquired the required. The applicant shall submit a weed management plan to P&amp;D for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Land Use Permit. Annual reports on the status of weed cover on the <del>low flow diversion</del><del>flood control</del> berm shall be submitted to P&amp;D for review and acceptance state and federal permits and approvals for the application of herbicides. P&amp;D shall review the annual weed status reports, as well as conduct visual inspections of the <del>low flow diversion</del><del>flood control</del> berm conditions during the annual SMARA site inspections.</p>	

**TABLE ES-1 (CONTINUED)  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

Description of Impact by Issue Area	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact Level
<p><b>Lag Time in Reclaiming Native Habitat after Mining.</b> The final reclamation plan for the mine pit is to allow it to fill in with sediments transported by the river over time, and to allow the natural plant recolonization process to occur. The time required for mixed alluvial scrub to become established in the river channel and to match pre-mining conditions is unknown, but could require 10 years or more. Observations of the river channel and habitat conditions in the upper Cuyama Valley indicate that the river channel and in-channel habitats will recover over time through natural processes. The lag time required for habitat recovery would delay the habitat restoration associated with final reclamation beyond the life of the permit.</p>	<p>This impact would be mitigated by <u>Required Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-7.</u></p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p><b>Nighttime Lighting Impacts.</b> The nighttime lighting at the Processing Area would adversely affect nocturnal wildlife in the habitat area located to the south. This habitat has a low abundance and variety of wildlife.</p>	<p><b>Required Mitigation Measure BIO-8.</b> Nighttime lighting on the southern perimeter of the Processing Area shall be shielded and directed to reduce light impingement on the habitat area located south of, and adjacent to, the Processing Area.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p><b>Vehicle Strikes of Wildlife.</b> Haul trucks traveling from the mine pit to the Processing Area may inadvertently strike reptiles and small mammals.</p>	<p><b>Required Mitigation Measure BIO-9.</b> A 15-mph speed limit shall be enforced on the access road from the Processing Area to the boundary of the mine pit, wherever it is located at the time. The speed limit shall be posted in both directions, and all haul truck operators shall be informed of the limit which is designed to reduce dust and collisions with wildlife. Speed limit signs shall be indicated on the final plans for the mine and Processing Area which shall be submitted to P&amp;D for review and approval prior to issuance of a Land Use Permit. P&amp;D shall conduct visual inspections of the project site throughout the life of the permit, as necessary to verify compliance. Annual SMARA inspections shall confirm that speed limit signs are in place as required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p><b>Impact on Wildlife Movement.</b> The proposed mining would occur in the Cuyama River channel. Over time, it would extend across most of the channel. Over the life of the permit, the proposed mine pit would dramatically alter the river channel habitats and topographic conditions. The mining operation in the river channel would create potential impediments to wildlife movement in the river channel and force wildlife</p>	<p><b>Required Mitigation Measure BIO-10.</b> The mining plan shall be modified to include a 75-foot setback from the toe of the east river bank to the <del>low flow diversion</del><del>flood-control</del> berm, leopard lizard exclusionary fence, or the top of the mine pit slopes (whichever comes first). This corridor shall be managed as open space with native alluvial scrub. It will allow wildlife to continue to travel uninterrupted through the project site on the east side of the river. No roads or vehicle access shall be allowed. In addition, the proposed <del>blunt-nosed</del> leopard lizard undercrossing for the mine pit</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

**TABLE ES-1 (CONTINUED)  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

Description of Impact by Issue Area	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact Level
to find new travel corridors.	access road (see Section 2.5.1) shall be installed and maintained even if future studies indicate that the lizard is not present at the project site in order to provide passage across the road for all other reptiles and small mammals.	
<p><b>Impacts on Leopard Lizard.</b> The endangered blunt-nosed leopard lizard occurs on the terrace adjacent to the river channel. The occurrence of this species in the river channel where mining will occur is unknown. The proposed project includes a leopard lizard impact avoidance plan designed to avoid take of the lizard during mine operations. The plan and additional mitigation measures included in this document will reduce impacts to less than significant levels.</p>	<p><b>Required Mitigation Measure BIO-11.</b> The applicant shall conduct field investigations to determine if the blunt-nosed leopard lizard <u>or California horned lizard</u> is present in the river channel <u>or other areas to be disturbed</u> at the project site. The field investigations shall be conducted by a qualified biologist approved by Planning &amp; Development, using survey protocols approved by the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) <u>and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)</u>. The field investigations shall occur during each of the first five years of project operations. The results shall be provided to Planning &amp; Development and USFWS <u>and CDFG</u> for review and acceptance. If the results demonstrate that lizards are absent from the river channel and unlikely to ever be present, Planning &amp; Development will consult with USFWS <u>and CDFG</u> to determine if the use of exclusionary fence around the mine pit is still considered necessary. Planning &amp; Development shall amend the conditions of approval related to the fencing in this situation. If the results indicate that <u>blunt-nosed leopard lizards or California horned lizards</u> are present in the river channel areas to be mined <u>or other areas to be disturbed</u>, the applicant shall acquire necessary permits and approvals from USFWS <u>and CDFG</u> to remove and relocate lizards from <del>future undisturbed</del> areas to be mined <u>or disturbed</u>. The applicant shall provide Planning &amp; Development with a copy of an approved <del>leopard</del> lizard relocation plan and necessary permits prior to implementation.</p> <p><b>Required Mitigation Measure BIO-12.</b> The applicant-proposed exclusionary fence around the <u>blunt-nosed</u> leopard lizard protection area adjacent to the mine site shall be modified as follows. A permanent fence shall not be placed around the <u>blunt-nosed</u> leopard lizard protection area as planned. Instead, the exclusionary fence to prevent <u>blunt-nosed</u> leopard lizards from entering the mine pit or crossing the access road to the mine pit shall be placed along the perimeter of these work areas, and shall be moved as necessary as the mine pit is enlarged and the access road location is moved. This approach will allow <u>blunt-nosed</u> leopard lizards to move freely between the river channel and the protected area, as shown on Figure 3-21 for the Phase 1 mining layout. The exclusionary fence shall be temporarily removed during the period 1 December through 1 April of each year in locations that may be susceptible to winter river flows. The exclusionary fence shall also be placed</p>	Less than significant

**TABLE ES-1 (CONTINUED)  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

Description of Impact by Issue Area	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact Level
	along the perimeter of the Processing Area, if the survey results from Mitigation Measure BIO-11 indicate a need.	
<i>Traffic (Class II)</i>		
<p><b>Impact of Peak Traffic on SR 33 Ojai-Casitas Springs Ventura Area.</b> The proposed project would involve truck traffic on State Route 33 from the project site to Ventura. If all or a substantial amount of truck trips were directed to Ventura, the project would potentially have a significant impact to State Route 33 <u>south of SR 150 by adding more than 10 trips per day to a roadway with LOS E (Santa Barbara County threshold) or in Ventura County</u> due to the addition of <u>one</u> or more peak hour trips <u>to State Route 33 between Ojai and Casitas Springs southbound during the a.m. peak hour and northbound during the p.m. peak hour</u> based on applying Ventura County's thresholds of significance.</p>	<p><b>Required Mitigation Measure TR-1.</b> Truck operations that involve travel on State Route 33 south of Highway 150 <u>to Casitas Springs</u> shall be restricted as follows: 1) No southbound truck trips shall be allowed <u>at this location</u> during the a.m. peak period (6:30 a.m. to 9:00 a.m..) during Monday through Saturday; and 2) No northbound truck trips shall be allowed <u>at this location</u> during the p.m. peak period (3:30 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.) during Monday through Saturday.</p>	Less than significant
<p><b>Impact of Site Access on SR 33.</b> The State Route 33/project driveway intersection at the project site is forecast to operate at LOS "A" with vehicles experiencing less than 10 seconds of delay. However, Caltrans has requested a northbound left turn lane on State Route 33 to reduce future conflicts with turning trucks and fast-moving traffic. Caltrans stated that this facility would be necessary to ensure the operational integrity of the highway.</p>	<p><b>Required Mitigation Measure TR-2.</b> The applicant shall design and construct a northbound left-turn lane on State Route 33 at the entrance to the project site. The applicant shall coordinate as necessary with Caltrans to acquire the necessary approvals for this facility. The turn lane shall be completed prior to initiation of <u>contract sales of material from the</u> processing operations. <u>This condition may be modified or delayed by the County if evidence of Caltrans approval of a modification or delay is provided.</u></p>	Less than significant
<i>Noise (Class II)</i>		
<p><b>Noise Impacts on Nearby Residences.</b> The projected ambient noise levels at residential receptors near the project site during mining and processing operations would be less than 65 dBA for daytime and nighttime conditions, and would not exceed the County's 65 CNEL significance threshold. However, the increase in daytime, nighttime, and CNEL levels would range from occasionally audible (around 3 dBA) to clearly audible (6 to 9 dBA). The latter increase during the day or night,</p>	<p><b>Required Mitigation Measure NS-1.</b> To reduce impacts of mining operations on nearby residential receptors, the following noise attenuation measures shall be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sound barriers at least 10 feet high shall be installed along the southern property line adjacent to the Processing Area to reduce noise emissions from truck loading and movements in the Processing Area that would affect the nearby residences at the Los Padres National Forest Ventucopa Work Camp, particularly at night. The preferred sound barrier would be constructed</li> </ul>	Less than significant

**TABLE ES-1 (CONTINUED)  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

Description of Impact by Issue Area	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact Level
<p>and during occasional Sundays, could cause a nuisance to nearby residences, and is considered a potentially significant impact based on the County's threshold in which a significant effect may also occur when ambient noise levels affecting sensitive receptors increase substantially but remain less than 65 dB(A) CNEL.</p>	<p>of landscaped berms, or a berm-wall combination, but other materials may be acceptable if the berms are infeasible. The proposed site layout shall be modified to provide for the barriers. An example is provided in Figure 3-35.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>All diesel engines and other enclosed machinery associated with crushing and screening at the Processing Area shall use electric motors or have manufacturer's mufflers and other noise reduction measures to minimize noise levels on diesel engines. Localized barriers or curtains shall be used to shield and reduce noise levels from truck loading activities, acoustic blankets or shrouds to reduce vibration of, and contact amongst, metal surfaces associated with the crushing and screening equipment</del></li> <li>• <del>All trucks that load material from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. shall have rubber mats in the bed of trucks to reduce noise when material is dropped from a hopper or loader into the truck bed. This measure applies to trucks owned by the applicant, as well as independent truckers.</del></li> <li>• <del>The applicant shall use a hopper to load trucks during the period 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. rather than a front end loader to reduce the number of equipment operating at night</del></li> <li>• <del>The applicant shall offer to retrofit windows at any of the nearby residences with noise attenuating windows, if agreed to by the property owners at any time during the life of the permit</del></li> <li>• <del>Processing and truck loading shall be limited on Sundays to 12:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.. Exceptions may be granted on a case by case basis by the County P&amp;D Director and shall be limited to situations of emergency construction or repairs by Caltrans or utility companies, or other similar situations that may warrant an exception for the public interest</del></li> <li>• Trucks shall be prohibited from parking, staging, or queuing along State Route 33 shoulders at or near the entrance of the Processing Area</li> <li>• The use of jake brakes is prohibited when entering the Processing Area</li> </ul>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p><b>Haul Truck Noise Impact Along SR 33.</b> If all mine production was hauled to Ventura County, the additional daily truck trips along State Route 33 south of the project site and north of Ojai would increase</p>	<p><b>Required Mitigation Measure NS-2.</b> To reduce noise impacts of haul trucks on residential receptors along State Route 33 from the project site to Lockwood Valley Road, the following noise attenuation measures shall be implemented:</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

**TABLE ES-1 (CONTINUED)  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

Description of Impact by Issue Area	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact Level
<p>daytime and nighttime noise levels at residences along this rural highway, many of which are located within 100 feet of the road. The increased noise levels would be moderate (~5 dBA) relative to the existing ambient noise levels, and would not exceed 65 CNEL.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Truck trips on State Route 33 south of the project site on Sundays shall be limited on Sundays to 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.. Exceptions may be granted on a case by case basis by the County P&amp;D Director and shall be limited to situations of emergency construction or repairs by Caltrans or utility companies, or other similar situations that may warrant an exception for the public interest.</li> <li>• No more than 33% of the allowable daily truck trips shall occur during the period 10:00 p.m. to 5:00 a.m. Exceptions may be granted on a case by case basis by the County P&amp;D Director and shall be limited to situations of emergency construction or repairs by Caltrans or utility companies, or other similar situations that may warrant an exception for the public interest.</li> <li>• Trucks shall be prohibited from parking, staging, or queuing along State Route 33</li> <li>• Truck caravans to and from the mine site on State Route 33 south of the project site shall be prohibited</li> <li>• The use of jake brakes shall be prohibited on applicant-owned and independent trucks between Ozena and the project site</li> </ul>	
<p><u>Air Quality (Class II)</u></p>	<p>The applicant shall post and maintain a phone recording complaint line to report possibly violations of these restrictions by residents. Trucks owned by the applicant shall be readily identifiable by a placard with a unique number that is sized and located on all four sides of the vehicle in order to be clearly visible to individuals wishing to make a complaint against an individual driver. Since the applicant has no direct control over the vehicles used by independent truckers, the applicant shall use the truck trip logs and the complaint logs (i.e., especially the time and date) to identify truckers against whom a complaint has been made and to resolve complaints.</p>	
<p><u>Vehicle Emissions from Peak Production.</u> The peak daily NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from project traffic in Santa Barbara County (32.4 lbs/day, Table 3.7-16) would exceed the vehicle emissions threshold for NO<sub>x</sub> of 25 lbs/day.</p>	<p><u>Required Mitigation Measure AQ-3.</u> Daily truck trips at any time of the year shall not exceed 100 <del>round</del> trips (50 exit loads) in order to reduce vehicular emissions below the County and APCD impact threshold for on-road NO<sub>x</sub>. This limitation may be adjusted upwards if the County Planning &amp; Development and County APCD approve an applicant-prepared haul truck emissions mitigation plan that demonstrates that higher daily truck volumes would not exceed the 25 lbs/day threshold in Santa</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

**TABLE ES-1 (CONTINUED)  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

Description of Impact by Issue Area	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact Level
<p><b>Diesel Emissions from On-Site Operations.</b> The results of the health risk analysis indicate that at the point of maximum offsite exposure, the increase in cancer risk would be approximately 9 in one million. At the location of the nearest residence, approximately 2,500 feet to the southeast, the cancer risk is approximately 1.6 in one million. These results assumed that anticipated diesel exhaust control technology will be installed on both new and used pieces of equipment within the project.</p>	<p>Barbara County. This measure does not limit the total annual production directly, but would likely reduce the total annual production to about 540,000 tons per year due to limitations on truck size. The 100 truck <del>round</del>-trip limitation does not apply to the concrete recycle operations. However, the maximum annual concrete recycle deliveries shall not exceed 25,000 tons per year in order to ensure additional emissions are not created.</p> <p><b>Required Mitigation Measure AQ-4.</b> In order to minimize diesel exhaust from on-site operations and <u>to ensure that minimize excess cancer risk levels from diesel exhaust remain below 10 in 1 million</u>, the project shall incorporate a combination of measures to achieve at least an 85 percent reduction in diesel exhaust particulate matter <u>or other controls that achieve the same limitation on excess cancer risk</u>. One or more of the following methods may be uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purchasing new engines/equipment (Tier 2 or better)</li> <li>• Adding controls to existing equipment (diesel particulate filters)</li> <li>• Electrification</li> <li>• Other methods, <u>based on newer technology</u></li> </ul> <p>The applicant shall prepare a revised health risk assessment based on the final inventory of engines to be operated and current Health Risk Assessment Guidelines, for review and approval by the County prior to <u>occupancy or the start of operationsissuance of the land use (grading) permit. The effectiveness of any alternate control measures shall be confirmed by SBAPCD</u></p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p><b>Visual Resources (Class II)</b></p>		
<p><b>Visual Impact of Processing Area.</b> The stockpiles and equipment at the Processing Area would be visible to travelers on State Route 33. The proposed screening berms would reduce the visual impact over time as the landscaping develops. However, given the harsh climate in the Cuyama Valley, the landscape trees will need a high level of care to reach their intended screening heights. It is likely that without this care, the trees would be dwarfed (if they survived at all) and would not provide the intended screening. If the screening trees died or did not perform as</p>	<p><b>Required Mitigation Measure VIS-1.</b> The applicant shall develop and implement a monitoring and maintenance plan for the landscaping on the screening berms, and along the southern property boundary, to ensure the growth and health of the landscaping.</p> <p><b>Required Mitigation Measure VIS-2.</b> Additional screening shall be provided on the south side of the processing area to screen views from northbound viewers on State Route 33. The applicant shall modify the site layout (if necessary) and landscaping plan to provide a windrow of irrigated perennial trees between the haul road and the southern property boundary that extends at least 500</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

**TABLE ES-1 (CONTINUED)  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

Description of Impact by Issue Area	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact Level
<p>expected, project impacts would be considered significant. Additional measures to improve the screening would reduce the visual impact to less than significance.</p>	<p>feet from the driveway to the location of the security trailer. The screening trees may include non-invasive ornamentals if no native trees would be effective in this application and location. Tamarisk shall not be used. See Mitigation Measure NS-1, Item 1) and Figure 3-35 for noise attenuation berms on the southern boundary that may provide visual screening under this measure.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p><b>Nighttime Lighting Visual Impacts.</b> The processing operations could occur until 10 pm each night and truck loading/hauling operations could occur on a 24-hour basis (as needed) requiring the use of night lighting. The addition of significant nighttime lighting associated with processing operations and truck loading/hauling operations could change the character of the nighttime setting in the Cuyama Valley, including the ability to view the nighttime sky in a rural setting.</p>	<p><b>Required Mitigation Measure VIS-3.</b> Lighting installed at the Processing Area shall have a low glare design, and shall be hooded to direct light downward onto specific areas of the Processing Area. Light fixtures shall be shielded so that neither the lamp nor the related reflective interior surface shall be directly visible outside the Processing Area, and light levels at the property boundary shall not exceed 0.5 foot candles.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p><i>Cumulative Impacts (Class II)</i></p>		
<p><u>Cumulative Impacts to Quality of Life.</u> The proposed project could occur simultaneously with the existing and/or proposed mining operations within the Cuyama Valley region. The cumulative effect of the combined mining operations may influence the quality of life in the area. 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), and increase in air quality emissions. Mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce these impacts in a project-by-project basis. 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 (GPS Mine, Ozena Valley Ranch Sand and Gravel Project, Lima Gypsum mine, and the proposed project) are operating in the area, 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, the cumulative impacts on the quality of life in</p>	<p><u>Mitigation measures as required for other topics.</u></p>	<p><u>Less than significant</u></p>

**TABLE ES-1 (CONTINUED)  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

Description of Impact by Issue Area	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact Level
<p><u>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.</u></p>		
<p><b>CLASS III IMPACTS: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT</b></p>		
<p><b>Drainage , Erosion, and Water Quality (Class III)</b></p>		
<p><b>Hydraulic Impact of In-Channel Berms.</b> The proposed project includes low berms around the mine pit in the Cuyama River to prevent flooding from low flows. The berms will create a hydraulic barrier during low to moderate flow events which will alter the hydraulic conditions of the river, possibly causing localized backwater effects, channel bed scouring, and sediment mobilization. These conditions would extend only a short distance upstream of the mine pit and would not damage any structures, flood control improvements, or bank protection. Changes in the river channel conditions at the project site would be temporary. The river channel would return to pre-mining conditions after significant flood events in which the berms are overtopped and the mine pit is filled.</p>	<p><i>No mitigation required under CEQA. However, the following Condition of Approval is suggested, and will be considered by the Planning Commission.</i></p> <p><b>Suggested Condition W-1.</b> The proposed mining plan shall be modified to reconfigure the southwest corner of the proposed mine pit to allow for a 900-foot wide open channel area between the west bank of the Cuyama River and the berm surrounding the pit. An example of the overall intent of the modified mining plan is provided on Figures 3-8 and 3-9. The applicant shall monitor river flows for the first three winters after mining has been initiated (with the use of low flow berms in the river channel). The applicant shall document the effect of the low flow berms on river flows during these winters through the use of on-ground photographs, maps, diagrams, and/or notes from personal observations. This information shall be provided to County P&amp;D at the end of each winter (April) for review. County P&amp;D will review this information and determine if the additional channel width under this mitigation measure is considered necessary to avoid adverse hydraulic impacts in the river channel such as excessive berm erosion, river bank erosion, and channel scouring. The applicant shall coordinate with P&amp;D staff prior to the first monitoring year to ensure that the information to be provided is sufficient for evaluation purposes. At the end of three years of monitoring, if there are sufficient data, P&amp;D will determine if the modification of the mining pit boundary shall be continued while more monitoring data is collected, shall be considered a permanent limit, or shall be rescinded and the original proposed boundary reinstated.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p><b>Hydraulic Impact of Mine Access Road.</b> The initial mine pit would be situated in the middle of the river channel. The proposed berms would divert low to moderate flows to one or both sides of the mine pit. Flows that are diverted to the east side of the mine pit would directly impinge</p>	<p><i>No mitigation required under CEQA. However, the following Condition of Approval is suggested, and will be considered by the Planning Commission.</i></p> <p><b>Suggested Condition W-3.</b> The access road from the Processing Area to the Phase 1 mining pit shall include culverts or other provisions to allow winter river flows to pass along the east side of the</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

**TABLE ES-1 (CONTINUED)  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

Description of Impact by Issue Area	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact Level
<p>on the access road to the mine. These flows could damage or remove the mine pit access road. The road would need to be reconstructed after any damage, based on the need to access the mine pit for product. Certain road repair could cause minor but adverse local hydraulic impacts.</p>	<p>mine pit. The low berm around the initial mine pit shall not extend across the open river channel between the mine pit and the Processing Area.</p>	
<p><b>Impact of Accidental Spills.</b> The proposed mining operations would involve the use of gasoline and diesel powered equipment and vehicles, both at the mine pit and at the Processing Area. Several types of hazardous materials will be stored and used at the Processing Area. An accidental spill or leakage of fuels, lubricants, or hazardous materials would contaminate the soil and possibly surface water and groundwater. No significant impact is anticipated due to the precautions in the required Spill Containment Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Plan.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required, and no suggested conditions of approval are suggested.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p><b>Stormwater Pollution.</b> The proposed mining operations would generate pollutants that could be mobilized and conveyed off site by stormwater runoff from precipitation or runoff from adjacent up-gradient areas. These pollutants include sediment, oil and grease, and heavy metals. A significant impact to water quality would be avoided by the Best Management Practices in the required Industrial Stormwater Permit for the project.</p>	<p><i>No mitigation measures are required because the impact is less than significant. To ensure that the proposed percolation swale is effective, suggested Condition of Approval W-6 would reiterate need for design criteria and maintenance requirements to ensure proper sizing and functioning of the swale over time. The following Condition of Approval is suggested, and will be considered by the Planning Commission.</i></p> <p><b>Suggested Condition W-6.</b> The final design of the proposed stormwater percolation swale shall include the following elements:</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The size, volume, and retention time of the percolation swale shall be designed in accordance with the design guidelines and criteria in the Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) prepared in accordance with the County's NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit.</li> <li>2. The percolation swale shall be maintained on a regular basis to ensure the design percolation rates are achieved. Maintenance shall include periodic removal of fines.</li> <li>3. Vegetation shall be established in the swale if it will increase the percolation rate, without</li> </ol>	

**TABLE ES-1 (CONTINUED)**  
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

Description of Impact by Issue Area	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact Level
	<p align="center">significantly reducing storage volume and retention time.</p> <p>In addition, excess fines shall not be placed in the mine pit that contain flocculants or that have not been washed of the flocculants prior to discharge to the mine pit.</p>	
<i>Groundwater and Water Use (Class III)</i>		
<p><b>Effects on Groundwater Quality.</b> Groundwater would be located below the proposed maximum mining depth under most conditions. However, groundwater levels can rise during years with high runoff and percolation in the river alluvium. Under these conditions, groundwater could be exposed in the mine pit at depths of 40 to 50 feet. The historic range of groundwater levels at the project site indicates that high groundwater levels would be exposed in a fully excavated mine pit. Exposed groundwater is subject to evaporation and the resultant increase in total dissolved solids. The process would further degrade the existing groundwater quality which is very poor due to naturally high total dissolved solid levels. This impact is considered <b>adverse, but not significant (Class III)</b> for several reasons. First, the frequency of occurrence for high groundwater that would result in prolonged exposure is considered very low based on observations of the project site wells. Second, the time of exposure during these wet conditions would be very short as groundwater percolates through the Cuyama River alluvium. Exposed groundwater may only be present for weeks to several months during these wet years. Third, the surface areas of exposed groundwater would be vary small relative to the entire Cuyama River channel, and the volume affected would be very small compared to the groundwater stored in the basin. Together, these factors indicate that any changes in groundwater volume or quality caused by temporary exposure in the mine pit would be very small and would likely be indistinguishable from normal seasonal variations.</p>		

**TABLE ES-1 (CONTINUED)  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

Description of Impact by Issue Area	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact Level
<i>Biological Resources (Class III)</i>		
<p><b><u>Disturbance to Wildlife.</u></b> The proposed mining and processing activities will introduce new disturbances to the project site which could adversely affect wildlife activities in the adjacent habitats. These disturbance factors include: Noise from processing equipment at the Processing Area, haul trucks moving between the mine pit and the Processing Area, and excavation activities in the mine pit; dust from excavation activities in the mine pit and from haul trucks moving between the mine pit and the Processing Area; human activity in the Processing Area and in the mine pit; and nighttime lighting at the Processing Area.</p>	No mitigation measures are required, and no conditions of approval are suggested.	Less than significant
<p><b><u>Disturbance to Adjacent Habitat.</u></b> The Processing Area is located adjacent to a large undisturbed area to the south that contains well developed scrub habitat. The noise, dust, and human activity at the Processing Area would affect wildlife using this habitat due to the close proximity of the Processing Area. As such, wildlife use in a portion of this habitat area could be reduced over time. This habitat has a low abundance and variety of wildlife.</p>	No mitigation measures are required, and no conditions of approval are suggested.	Less than significant
<p><b><u>Impacts to Kit Fox.</u></b> The endangered San Joaquin kit fox occurs in the region and could utilize portions of the project site for travel, foraging, and denning. The most likely den location would be in the alluvial scrub on the stream terrace adjacent to the river channel. However, it is possible that dens could be constructed on older terraces in the river channel where the mine pit would be located. The proposed project includes a kit fox mitigation plan designed to avoid take of the fox during mine operations. The plan will be implemented pursuant to approvals or permits from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, independent of the County permits.</p>	No mitigation measures are required, and no conditions of approval are suggested.	Less than significant

**TABLE ES-1 (CONTINUED)  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

Description of Impact by Issue Area	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact Level
<p><b>Impacts to Nesting Birds.</b> The loggerhead shrike and Lawrence's goldfinch are considered special interest species that could potentially nest at or near the mine site. Nesting could be affected by the noise, dust, truck traffic, and human activity at the nearby Processing Area and mine pit. The magnitude of the disturbance factors (noise and dust levels) at the potential nesting area would be very low due to the great distance from the mining and processing activity centers.</p>	No mitigation measures are required, and no conditions of approval are suggested.	Less than significant
<p><b>Impacts to Special Interest Wildlife.</b> Noise, dust, traffic, and human activity at the project site could adversely affect several species of special interest that may occur at the project site in the future, including western spadefoot toad, California condor, Golden eagle, California horned lark, Brewer's sparrow. These species do not occur at the project site, and their occurrence in the future is remote and speculative.</p>	No mitigation measures are required, and no conditions of approval are suggested.	Less than significant
<p><b>Impacts to Horned Lizard.</b> Noise, dust, traffic, and human activity at the project site could adversely affect the California horned lizard, which is likely to occur in the native habitats at the project site.</p>	No mitigation measures are required, and no conditions of approval are suggested.	Less than significant
<i>Traffic (Class III)</i>		
<p><b>Impacts on Highway Capacity.</b> The proposed project would increase truck traffic on highways in Santa Barbara, Kern, San Luis Obispo, and Ventura counties as trucks travel to various markets. The peak daily project traffic would not significantly affect roadway operations and capacity on State Routes <del>33-33</del><u>north of Ojai</u> and 166 based on Santa Barbara County impact criteria. The same conclusion applies when including 2020 cumulative traffic volumes.</p>	No mitigation measures are required, and no conditions of approval are suggested.	Less than significant
<i>Noise (Class III)</i>		
<p><b>Truck Noise Impacts along SR 166.</b> The additional project-related truck trips on State Route 166 would contribute to the noise generation</p>	No mitigation measures are required, and no suggested conditions of approval are suggested.	Less than significant

**TABLE ES-1 (CONTINUED)**  
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

Description of Impact by Issue Area	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact Level
<p>from existing traffic on this state highway, and possibly affect adjacent rural residences near the highway in Cuyama. This impact would be negligible because of the relative small contribution of project truck trips and the already high ambient noise levels along SR 166, and because most residences are located more than 100 feet from the highway.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required, and no suggested conditions of approval are suggested.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p><b>Truck Noise Impacts along SR 33 South of Ojai.</b> The additional project-related truck trips on State Route 33 from Ojai to Casitas Springs would contribute to the noise generation from existing traffic on this state highway and affect residences adjacent to the highway, often within 100 feet. This impact would be negligible because of the relative small contribution of project truck trips on this busy highway segment, and the already very high ambient noise levels along SR 33.</p>		
<b><i>Air Quality (Class III)</i></b>		
<p><b>Construction Related Emissions.</b> Construction of the Processing Area would result in temporary emissions of combustion pollutants and fugitive dust (PM<sub>10</sub>) from: 1) haul trucks, employee vehicles, and supply trucks; 2) earthmoving equipment that are engaged in excavation, backfilling, and compacting at the project site; and 3) construction equipment involved in concrete, welding, painting, and hauling materials.</p>	<p><i>No mitigation measures are required. However, the following Suggested Conditions of Approval are recommended and will be considered by the Planning Commission.</i></p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p><b>Suggested Condition AQ-1.</b> The following measures would reduce fugitive dust emissions during the construction of the Processing Area facilities. They are based on the standard dust mitigation measures of the APCD.</p> <p>a) Areas subject to clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation shall be kept sufficiently moist, through use of either water trucks or sprinkler systems, to prevent dust from leaving the site. Water trucks or sprinkler systems shall also be used to keep on-site roads (paved and unpaved) damp enough to prevent dust raised from leaving the site. At a minimum, this shall include wetting down these areas in the late morning and after work is completed for the day. At the end of the day, areas with disturbed soil shall be sufficiently moistened to create a crust. Increased watering frequency shall be required whenever the wind speed exceeds 15 mph. These areas must also be kept moist during weekends and days when no construction activities are occurring.</p> <p>b) Stockpiles and barren areas at the project site that would be disturbed on a periodic basis (at</p>		

**TABLE ES-1 (CONTINUED)  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

Description of Impact by Issue Area	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact Level
	<p>least once every 5 days) shall be kept sufficiently moist by the use of water trucks or sprinklers to prevent dust from leaving the site.</p> <p>c) Stockpiles and barren areas at the project site that would remain undisturbed for more than 5 days shall be stabilized by the use of tackifiers, soil binders, or other measures. These stabilization agents shall be replenished throughout the dry season on an as-needed basis to prevent dust emissions.</p> <p>d) On-site vehicle speeds shall be limited to 15 miles per hour or less.</p> <p>e) Gravel pads or similar devices shall be installed at the project entrance to prevent tracking of mud on to public roads.</p> <p>f) Highway 33 shall be inspected daily (midday and at the end of the day) during periods of truck hauling to determine if there is an accumulation of silt on the road that could cause fugitive dust. The highway shall be kept clean of such silt by the use of a street sweeper or watering truck.</p> <p>g) Trucks transporting fill material to and from the site shall be tarped from the point of origin, <u>or loaded in a manner that provides sufficient freeboard to prevent visible dust plumes from being emitted.</u></p> <p>h) The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust offsite. <del>Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress.</del> The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the APCD prior to initiation of construction. All dust control requirements shall be shown on grading and building plans.</p> <p><b><u>Suggested Condition AQ-2.</u></b> The following measures would reduce NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from construction equipment and associated truck trips during the construction of the Processing Area facilities. They are based on the standard mitigation measures of the APCD.</p> <p>a) Heavy-duty diesel-powered construction equipment manufactured after 1996 (with federally mandated "clean" diesel engines) should be utilized wherever feasible.</p> <p>b) The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size.</p>	

**TABLE ES-1 (CONTINUED)  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

Description of Impact by Issue Area	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact Level
	<p>c) The number of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any one time.</p> <p>d) Construction equipment shall be maintained in tune per the manufacturer's specifications.</p> <p><del>e) Construction equipment operating onsite shall be equipped with two to four degree engine timing retard or pre-combustion chamber engines.</del></p> <p><del>f) Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible.</del></p> <p><del>g) Diesel catalytic converters, diesel oxidation catalysts, and diesel particulate filters, or other measures, as certified and/or verified by EPA or California shall be installed as required by future rules, if available and if determine to be reasonable and feasible by P&amp;D.</del></p>	
<p><b>PM<sub>10</sub> from Operations.</b> The average and peak daily PM<sub>10</sub> emissions from the mining operations (Tables 3.7-15 and 3.7-16) would not exceed the operations threshold for PM<sub>10</sub> (80 lbs/day).</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required, and no suggested conditions of approval are suggested.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p><b>Vehicle Emissions from Average Production.</b> The average daily NO<sub>x</sub> and ROC emissions from project related traffic in Santa Barbara County (Tables 3.7-15 and 3.7-16) would not exceed the vehicular emissions thresholds for NO<sub>x</sub> or ROC (25 lbs/day).</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required, and no conditions of approval are suggested.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p><b>Annual Vehicle Emissions.</b> There are no significance thresholds for annual emissions.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required, and no conditions of approval are suggested.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p><b>Daily Haul Truck Emissions in Ventura County.</b> Project related traffic (haul trucks, employee vehicles) using State Route 33 within the limits of Ventura County would increase daily NO<sub>x</sub> and ROC emissions in Ventura County. The average and peak daily NO<sub>x</sub> and ROC emissions from vehicular emissions along State Route 33 both inside and outside the Ojai Planning Area would not exceed Ventura County's thresholds for NO<sub>x</sub> or ROC for areas inside and outside of the Ojai Planning Area.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required, and no conditions of approval are suggested.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

**TABLE ES-1 (CONTINUED)  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

Description of Impact by Issue Area	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact Level
<p><b>Diesel Emissions – Workers.</b> Although workers at the project site will be exposed to diesel exhaust fumes in their everyday activities that involve mobile equipment and trucks, conforming to OSHA worker safety regulations and practices would reduce exposure to diesel exhaust. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant because the exposure would be minor.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required, and no conditions of approval are suggested.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p><b>Diesel Emissions – On Road.</b> The additional haul trucks from this operation will contribute to existing diesel particulate emissions along the public roads where haul trucks will travel. The roadway risk assessment results indicate that the increase in cancer due to project related truck traffic would be well under one in one million.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required, and no conditions of approval are suggested.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p><b>Impact on Valley Fever.</b> Certain mining operations may disperse spores of the valley fever fungus, which is endemic to the region. Susceptible people may be infected with the fungus upon inflation. The proposed project is not expected to have a measurable effect on the level of valley fever in the region as explained in the EIR text.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required, and no conditions of approval are suggested.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p><b><i>Cultural Resources (Class III)</i></b></p>		
<p><b>Archeological Impacts.</b> There are no known cultural resources at the project site based on an archival record search and a field survey. The proposed mining operations would not affect the adjacent historic property on the south side of the project site. While no prehistoric archeological sites are known to be present at the project site, there is a very small possibility that previously unknown artifacts or deposits could be encountered during preparation of the Processing Area on the terrace above the Cuyama River. Hence, the impacts to cultural resources is considered less than significant.</p>	<p><i>A standard mitigation measure to evaluate unexpected archeological remains during the site preparation for the Processing Area is recommended:</i></p> <p><b>Suggested Condition CR-1.</b> In the event archaeological remains are encountered during grading, work shall be stopped immediately or redirected until a P&amp;D qualified archaeologist and Native American representative are retained by the applicant to evaluate the significance of the find pursuant to Phase 2 investigations of the County Archaeological Guidelines. If remains are found to be significant, they shall be subject to a Phase 3 mitigation program consistent with County Archaeological Guidelines and funded by the applicant..</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

**TABLE ES-1 (CONTINUED)  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

Description of Impact by Issue Area	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact Level
<i><b>Agriculture (Class III)</b></i>		
<u><b>Impacts on Adjacent Agricultural Fields.</b></u> The Processing Area is located directly adjacent to cultivated fields. There is a potential for fugitive dust to be deposited on these fields, particularly if there are high winds. This impact is expected to be less than significant due to the proposed fugitive dust controls at the Processing Area which will reduce dust emissions to the extent practicable.	No mitigation measures are required, and no conditions of approval are suggested.	Less than significant
<i><b>CLASS IV IMPACTS: BENEFICIAL IMPACTS</b></i>		
<i><b>Biological Impacts (Class IV)</b></i>		
The applicant is proposing to restore an approximately 1,500-foot long portion of the eastern riverbank. Buried automobiles would be removed. The bank would be reconstructed, as necessary, into a stable configuration. Existing salt cedar would be removed and an eradication program implemented to ensure they do not become re-established. Existing cottonwood trees currently growing on or near the riverbank would be retained, as feasible. Additional cottonwood trees would be planted. Native shrubs and herbs from the region would be established on the stabilized banks by seeding.	Not applicable	Not applicable
<i><b>ISSUE OF CONCERN</b></i>		
State Routes 33 and 166 have sufficient capacity to convey the project related traffic without a significant effect on overall roadway operations. In addition, these highways are designed for the truck sizes and types to be used for the proposed project. As state highways, these facilities are available for all vehicles and trucks that meet state and federal (Department of Transportation) size and safety requirements. Caltrans monitors accident rates for all state facilities, including these two highways, and makes safety improvements as accident rates increase to	<i>The following condition to address traffic safety concerns will be considered by the Planning Commission.</i> <u><b>Suggested Condition TR-3.</b></u> The following measures shall be implemented to increase truck safety along State Routes 33 and 166: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>All applicant-owned trucks and independent truckers shall use headlights during the day when traveling to and from the project site along State Routes 33 and 166 (from Santa Maria to Ventura).</li></ul>	NA

**TABLE ES-1 (CONTINUED)  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

Description of Impact by Issue Area	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact Level
<p>certain thresholds. As a local jurisdiction, the County can only ensure that its land use decisions do increase traffic volumes on nearby state highways beyond their current capacity. The County cannot apply roadway safety mitigation measures on these highways. Nevertheless, the County recognizes that traffic safety is a major concern to residents of Cuyama Valley, and that this and other mining projects in the region, could increase this concern.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During the school year, truck trips on State Route 33 in Ojai shall be prohibited from the following time periods to avoid conflicts with pedestrians and drivers at Nordhoff High School in Ojai during lunch and afternoon breaks: 7:00 am to 8:00 am, and 2:30 pm to 3:15 pm.</li> <li>• Trucks shall be prohibited from parking, staging, or queuing along State Route 33 shoulders</li> <li>• Truck caravans to and from the mine site on State Route 33 south of the project site shall be prohibited</li> <li>• The applicant shall post and maintain a phone recording complaint line to report possibly violations by residents. Trucks owned by the applicant shall be readily identifiable by a placard with a unique number that is sized and located on all four sides of the vehicle in order to be clearly visible to individuals wishing to make a complaint against an individual driver. Since the applicant has no direct control over the vehicles used by independent truckers, the applicant shall use the truck trip logs and the complaint logs (i.e., especially the time and date) to identify truckers against whom a complaint has been made and to resolve complaints.</li> </ul>	