

ROSEMARY'S MOUNTAIN QUARRY

Facilitated Dialogue

October 1, 2008

6:30 – 8:30 p.m.

Rancho Monserate Country Clubhouse

MINUTES

Neutral Facilitators: Susan Garrett, Dennis Sharp and Gail Nugent of Sharp Resolutions

The dialogue began with a discussion of current developments regarding the quarry. The community reported that there is a concern with dust that is being generated on I-76 near the quarry by the road construction contractor, Sukot Construction. Gary Nolan of Granite Construction expressed that Granite has no control over Sukot and that he, too, shared the community's concern. Gary invited community member, Paula Oenning, to join him at a meeting with Sukot Construction on the following day (October 2nd) to raise these concerns.

Next, as is done at every dialogue, an overview of what has occurred since this dialogue process began in early spring was provided: three public information meetings last spring were conducted by Granite Construction with questions from the community facilitated by Sharp Resolutions (regarding general plans and timelines for the quarry's construction and operation, blasting, and dust issues); Facilitated Dialogues between interested citizens of the community and Granite Construction representatives held monthly since June regarding issues relating to the quarry; and, the work of the Dust Monitoring Working Group (Working Group) – made up of interested community volunteers and Granite representatives – that was created at the July Facilitated Dialogue to discuss

the community's health and air quality concerns relating to dust created by the quarry. The remainder of this month's Dialogue focused on the Working Group's efforts thus far to create an agreed upon plan for monitoring dust and hiring an independent, qualified company to do the work.

Specifically, it was reported that following an initial organizational meeting in July, the Working Group brought in outside, independent air experts in mid-August to help the group better understand several technical issues related to air quality monitoring at the quarry. Following this meeting with experts, Gary Nolan created an initial draft Request for Quote (RFQ) for the Working Group to review and revise at its mid-September meeting; this RFQ will be submitted to 4 to 5 independent contractors to bid on the dust monitoring work for 2009. During the September meeting, the Working Group modified the draft RFQ.

Then, Gary Nolan of Granite Construction and Working Group community members, Larry Pearce and Jim Oenning, presented the modified draft RFQ to the community participants attending the Dialogue. Jim Oenning first provided an overview of the RFQ and described the proposed scope of work. He explained that the quarry's development will be in three phrases: (1) the initial site work and construction of the quarry; (2) the operation of a 1.2 million ton per year aggregate crushing and screening plant; and, (3) the addition and operation of an asphalt plant. Jim explained that each phase of development raises different air quality issues that will require different types of monitoring. In the first phase, when the quarry is being constructed – and to which the first RFQ addresses – the air monitoring focus will be on detecting particulates measuring PM10. Based on information obtained from air experts, the RFQ for this phase was designed with two different options for the potential air monitoring contractors to consider when submitting their bids.

The two options may be summarized as follows: one alternative consists of two short intensive testing periods during the worst weather conditions during the year (Option A - Acute Exposure Monitoring); the second alternative entails intensive testing spread out over a one year period (Option B - Long Term Monitoring).

Under Option A, during two selected periods of the year when conditions are predicted to be at their worst, air samples will be taken every other day for 21 days (10 samples of 21 days) Time periods will be chosen

during a Santa Ana condition and hot summer months. This option is designed to capture the worst possible conditions with the thought that if the air levels are good then (i.e., at acceptable levels of PM10 meeting state and federal standards), that air levels can be presumed to be at acceptable levels during other times of the year.

Under Option B, air samples would be taken every 6 days over the year period without regard to conditions. This alternative was designed to allow a comparison with air monitoring conducted by the County in other locations which also do PM10 testing on the same six-day basis. It was suggested that this method would also create baseline measurements for many different weather conditions to compare with future measurements once quarry operations begin (projected for 2012).

Under both alternatives, the bidding monitoring companies in their RFQ's are to provide details on how to accomplish the levels of testing contemplated by the Working Group. Further, the selected contractor will be required to provide a written report of the monitoring and interpretation of the results on a quarterly basis. To help the community better understand the monitoring results, the monitoring company will also be required to attend a quarterly public meeting (or Facilitated Dialogue) to provide an oral presentation of the results and to answer questions the community may have.

Larry Pearce then reported that the community members of the Working Group worked with Granite at its September meeting to revise the draft RFQ. He also informed dialogue participants that the Working Group will meet again on October 7th to incorporate comments, suggestions and changes that are expressed during the dialogue.

Next, the group discussed the draft RFQ in more detail. At the suggestion of someone from the community, a change was made directly to the document on the first page (the word "mining operation" was inserted in one of the project's descriptive paragraphs). There was also a substantial amount of discussion about two concerns raised by community participants: first, regarding whether the monitoring company will be measuring the cumulative effect of dust coming from the quarry (for example, collecting on the ground or elsewhere); second, regarding whether the monitoring could be done outside the quarry perimeter in surrounding neighborhoods (like Lake Rancho Viejo and Rancho Monserate).

The Working Group agreed to incorporate these concerns into questions for the bidding monitoring companies during the interviewing process. These comments and the questions that follow were captured by Sharp Resolutions for the Working Group to take to its next meeting to add to its list for the interviews of responding monitoring companies:

- How does the monitoring company track where the monitors have been after they have moved them?
- How do they determine the levels of dust in surrounding communities? Would putting monitors in these communities assist in determining the levels of dust coming from the quarry?
- Is a baseline needed prior to testing? (Several participants described their concerns that a baseline be obtained as soon as possible.)
- Which option is better – Option A (worst case scenario) or Option B (long term approach)? (note: several community participants spoke to their preference for Option B)
- With respect to Option A, there was a concern raised regarding how the company would ensure that monitoring coincides with the highest levels of work (i.e., when the most dust would be generated at the quarry).
- How does the monitoring company ensure that the “real” story is told to the community and it is not filtered in any way?
- How does the company monitor the cumulative effect of the dust? And, what is the known impact of the cumulative effect of the dust?

The Working Group will take all of these questions and comments to their October meeting and will incorporate them into the interviews of bidding independent monitoring companies.

Because the Working Group will not finish interviewing and selecting the monitoring company until mid-November, it was decided that the next Facilitated Dialogue meeting should be held in December. At that dialogue, we will also check in on any remaining transportation/traffic issues arising out of the September dialogue with Caltrans or Caltrans public meeting in

October regarding the I-76 corridor improvement project, and any other outstanding concerns raised in earlier Facilitated Dialogues.

**The next monthly dialogue meeting will be held
on Wednesday, December 3, 2008 from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.
at Rancho Monserate Country Club.**

Please contact Sharp Resolutions for additional information or if you have any questions at sharpresolutions@yahoo.com or (619) 204-6504.