

LAS PILITAS RESOURCES LLC has applied for a **LARGE scale quarry operation** and Asphalt and Concrete Recycling Facility @ 6660 Hwy. 58 just 3 miles outside of Santa Margarita, California.

The proposal to extract 500,000 tons of decomposed granite (DG) and granite annually for 30-50 years would **CREATE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS including:**

- An average of 200 truck trips on Hwy. 58 and through Santa Margarita daily as a direct result of this quarry's activities.
- Even more truck trips would be produced by an Asphalt and Concrete Recycling Facility being processed through a WAIVER seeking exemption from existing ordinances.
- Over 20,000 gallons of water are estimated to be used daily for dust control alone.
- Much, much more water would be used to wash aggregate suitable for use in Portland cement concrete (PCC). The need for PCC aggregate is the reason Las Pilitas Resources LLC originally cited for proposing this additional quarry, yet now makes the disingenuous claim to the community that they will not be washing aggregate.
- Explosives- Blasting creates respirable fractured crystalline silica that is not visible in the atmosphere. This is a well known cause of Silicosis.
- Removing large areas of vegetation increases the risk of valley fever to surrounding area residents.

### What can I do to make a difference?

- Participate in what is intended to be a democratic public process.
- Round-up your friends and neighbors to join you.
- Optimistically envision the future community you hope to live in, and present positive ideas to implement that vision.
- Utilize all available avenues for public comment.
- Donate by volunteering your time or by helping fund ongoing financial needs.

**CRITICAL ACTION ITEM:**  
**MAKE WRITTEN COMMENT**  
**ON THE UPCOMING**  
**DRAFT EIR**

## Hwy 58 Quarry Awareness Series

# MAKING EFFECTIVE COMMENT

## on an EIR



GOOD NEIGHBORS  
WORKING TO PRESERVE THE  
LIVABILITY and RURAL CHARACTER  
of Santa Margarita

---

🕒 This material is intended to serve as a quick reference for how to increase the effectiveness of your comments for an Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

🕒 The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et. seq. provides citizens an opportunity to address the impacts of development projects on the environment.

🕒 Environment incorporates both our natural and man-made surroundings. Modifying environment with words like human, social, and economic help provide more accurate definition. Roads, schools, libraries, services, ranches, vineyards, and rural character are all a part of our “environment”.

🕒 Public input is a critical component of the CEQA environmental review process. Members of the community have insight and familiarity with local issues that consultants and planners may not.

🕒 Information provided by citizens and citizen groups who are knowledgeable about the issues and area surrounding a proposed project area can improve the quality of the CEQA review, simplify the job of public decision-makers, and make an important difference in the future livability of their community.

🕒 Better understanding the CEQA process will help citizens make the most effective use of this citizen empowering statute.

**NEVER** let your lack of “expertise” prohibit you from commenting on the concerns you have.

The burden of proof is on the Agency authoring the document, **NOT** the public.

**Tips for Effective EIR comments:**

1. Objectively evaluate the project and be VERY specific with your comments. Generalities can be dismissed with generalities.
2. Always ask a question as it elicits a response. For example, “Why was the assessment of wetlands habitat conducted during the dry summer months?”. Simply making bald statements like “the project will have a negative environmental impact on water quality” can, and usually does, allow the agency to respond with simply “comment noted”.
3. Don’t mix topics. Separate your concerns into clearly identifiable paragraphs or headings and keep a tight focus on each separate issue. Bullet points are a good organizational tool.
4. Avoid beginning your comments with “I support the Oster/Las Pilitas project, **BUT**.....”. Instead, simply list your concerns and issues. It would be unfortunate if your letter were only glanced at and mistakenly classified as a letter of support by the agency.
5. Consider ways to avoid or reduce the severity of the impacts. Quantify your objections wherever possible. For example, if a potentially significant impact has not been adequately identified, or if no mitigation has been proposed, or if the mitigation does not appear to be sufficient or appropriate, then:
  - Identify the specific impact in question.
  - Explain why you believe that the impact would occur.
  - Explain why you believe the impact would be significant, and if applicable,
  - Explain what additional mitigation measures you recommend.
  - Explain why you are recommending changes and support your recommendations.
6. Whenever possible, present facts or expert opinions. If not, provide personal experience or observations.
7. Suggest alternatives for making the project better and describe how those alternatives would meet the requirements of the proposed project’s objectives. Your goal is always to write something that causes response in a future document based on the evidence you have provided.
8. Point out inconsistencies, inaccuracies, and mis-leading information within the document. Call attention to outdated information and especially errors in logic. Try to focus on the sufficiency of the EIR in analyzing the project’s impacts.
9. Include a valid name and address.
10. **SUBMIT BEFORE THE DEADLINE**
11. **KEEP A COPY FOR YOUR RECORDS**