Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures WQ1 through WQ5 would be implemented for this alternative. As with the Proposed Action, impacts would be reduced to less than significant under this alternative, with the implementation of these mitigation measures.

#### 3.2.4.7 Reduced Quantity Mining Concept Alternative Analysis

Impacts

Although the area of disturbance by mining activity would be reduced under this option all runoff from within the general area to be mined, including some natural areas, will pass through desilting/debris basins prior to discharge to natural drainages. The impact of this alternative on surface water quality would be essentially the same as for the Proposed Action.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures WQ1 through WQ5 would be implemented for this alternative. As with the Proposed Action, impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

### 3.2.5 Noise

#### 3.2.5.1 No Action Alternative

Impacts

With the retention of the site as open space, there would be no mining activity and no associated noise impacts. Ambient noise levels onsite would remain unchanged for the foreseeable future. As other development occurs in the site vicinity, an incremental increase in offsite noise levels would result from additional traffic volumes. There would be no significant impacts of this alternative.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required for the No Action Alternative.

#### 3.2.5.2 Reduced North Fines Storage Area Alternative Analysis

Impacts

Construction Noise Impacts

Construction activities and noise sources related to the development of this alternative would be similar to the Proposed Action. The assumed construction noise level of 89 dBA at 50 feet from the source is applicable to this alternative. Based on the topography of the site and the distance

to potential receptors, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated from construction of this alternative.

Operational Noise Impacts - Blasting

The need to conduct controlled blasting to aid excavation of the aggregate materials is the same for this alternative as for the Proposed Action. The impacts of blasting, in terms of generation of groundborne vibration and air overpressure, are of similar magnitude and geographic projection as the Proposed Action and are significant. The observation of OSMRE standards including a blasting monitoring program (as with Mitigation Measure N1) is needed with this alternative to adequately mitigate the significant impact.

Operational Noise Impacts - Excavation, Onsite Aggregate Handling, and Processing Operations

Because similar types of equipment would be utilized compared to the Proposed Action, this alternative would have similar noise generation characteristics. With this alternative, noise generated from excavation, aggregate handling, and fines disposal would be similar to the Proposed Action in the area of the NFSA and the western end of the mining excavation area (Cut 3). However, it is anticipated that NFSA utilization under this alternative may not begin until approximately the 15th year of mining, and operations may only occur for approximately 5 years, thus reducing the length of time that potential sensitive receptors in the Bee Canyon Mobile Home Park (if that project is constructed) would be exposed to operations on the face of the north slope. Under the Proposed Action, NFSA utilization may begin in the first year of production.

Also, the timing of mining would change in comparison to the Proposed Action. Mining operations would begin at the western end of the site in Year 1 and continue through approximately Year 15. During this period, the equipment would be operating at distances between 1,000 to 3,000 feet from the River's End Trailer Park. Under the Proposed Action, operations in the western portion of the site would be expected to occur from approximately Year 11 through Year 20 of operations. Operations in terms of number of pieces of equipment operating simultaneously would be similar for the Reduced NFSA Alternative and Proposed Action; thus, operational noise would remain at 67 dBA at 1,000 feet. This alternative would require provision of noise attenuating features to protect the noise environment of specific lots in the future Bee Canyon Mobile Home Park if that development is constructed (see Mitigation Measure N2).

Offsite Vehicle Travel

Transportation of aggregate products from the site by truck under this alternative would be the same as for the Proposed Action. As with the Proposed Action, impacts are reduced to less than significant by providing structural noise attenuation along Soledad Canyon Road at the receptor locations (see Mitigation Measure N3).

Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for this alternative are the same as for the Proposed Action (measures are N1, N2, and N3 are applicable). With incorporation of the measures, impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

### 3.2.5.3 Batch Plant Location Alternative Analysis

Impacts

The impacts of this alternative with respect to mine area construction noise, vibration and air overpressure from blasting, and operations noise effects due to excavation and aggregate processing are exactly as those discussed for the Proposed Action (mitigation measures N1 and N2 are applicable). The main difference with this alternative compared to the Proposed Action is that the concrete ready-mix batch plant and associated truck traffic would be located at a remote location.

Construction Impacts

Short-term noise emissions from project construction ranging up to 89 dBA at 50 feet from the source may occur at the batch plant site under this alternative. Surrounding uses are industrial in nature and no significant adverse impacts would occur.

Operational Noise Impacts - Batch Plant

With this alternative, noise generated by operation of the batch plant would be approximately 79 dBA Leq at a distance of 100 feet. Surrounding uses are industrial in nature and no significant adverse impacts would occur from this level of operations.

Offsite Vehicle Travel

This alternative would slightly reduce truck traffic volumes and associated vehicle noise levels along the stretch of Soledad Canyon Road between the plant site and the SR-14 interchange. Ready-mix concrete truck traffic would be reduced by about 164 ADT under Phases 1 and 2. Overall, noise impact contours from vehicular sources at receptor locations on Soledad Canyon Road would be slightly reduced by this alternative. Vehicular noise impacts would remain significant requiring implementation of mitigation measure N3.

Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for this alternative are the same as for the Proposed Action (measures N1, N2, and N3 are applicable). With incorporation of the measures, impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

### 3.2.5.4 Addition of Water/Reclaimed Water Alternative Analysis

Impacts

The impacts of this alternative with respect to mine area construction noise, vibration and air overpressure from blasting, operations noise effects due to excavation and aggregate processing, and product vehicular transportation impacts are exactly as those discussed for the Proposed Action (mitigation measures N1, N2, and N3 are applicable). The main difference with this alternative compared to the Proposed Action is that either a water supply pipeline would need to be constructed from either a reclaimed source or other freshwater source, to the Project site, or water would be trucked to the site.

Noise impacts would be associated the construction of a water pipeline to serve the project site. However, such activities are both short-term and transient. Construction in existing roadways would be required to comply with City of Santa Clarita and County of Los Angeles standard conditions relative to noise generation and would be considered less than significant.

If water is trucked to the site, noise impacts from increased on-road vehicular sources at receptor locations located along Soledad Canyon Road would be increased by this alternative. It is estimated that as many as 456 truckloads of water (912 truck trips) would be required on a daily basis. Under this alternative, Project-generated traffic would raise vehicle noise along Soledad Canyon Road by an additional 4 dBA over the Proposed Action (8 dBA over the No Action Alternative) for Phase 1 and by 3 dBA over the Proposed Action (8 dBA over the No Action Alternative) for Phase 2.

Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for this alternative would include the same as for the Proposed Action (measures N1, N2, and N3 are applicable). With incorporation of the measures, impacts may not be able to be reduced to less than significant for receptor locations on Soledad Canyon Road.

### 3.2.5.5 Product Transportation Alternative Analysis

Impacts

The impacts of this alternative with respect to mine area construction noise, vibration and air overpressure from blasting, and operations noise effects due to excavation and aggregate processing are exactly as those discussed for the Proposed Action (mitigation measures N1 and N2 are applicable). The main difference with this alternative compared to the Proposed Action is that a rail spur and loading facility would be constructed south of Soledad Canyon Road and loading of rail cars with aggregate would be an operational aspect of the alternative.

Construction Noise Impacts

Activities involved with constructing a rail spur and aggregate loading facility would create a short-term noise impact which at times could reach the approximate project construction level of 89 dBA at 50 feet from the source. Residential receptors in the vicinity include the residence

on Capra Road and the residence on Soledad Canyon Road east of the proposed site entrance. However, these receptors are more than 1,500 feet from the main loading area. The short-term impacts would not be significant, in that the construction activity is a substantial distance from the receptors and would comply with the County Noise Ordinance.

Offsite Vehicle Travel

Noise impacts from on-road vehicular sources at receptor locations located along Soledad Canyon Road would be reduced by this alternative due to reducing total truck traffic volumes. For this alternative, as much as 95 percent of the aggregate could be hauled out by rail reducing traffic on Soledad Canyon Road. The additional truck travel associated with the Project would not raise noise by the 5 dBA criterion and does not create a significant impact. Therefore, no noise wall would be required proximate to the River's End Trailer Park. A similar volume of trucks to that needed to move aggregate along Soledad Canyon Road would be needed to transport aggregate from the central railroad drop-off point(s) in the Los Angeles area. While the exact location of the central distribution facility is not determined at this time, there is the potential that sensitive receptors proximate to this (these) points could experience significant noise impacts.

Another potential area of impact associated with this alternative is that from the operation of the trains. Based on the volume of material to be moved, it is estimated that as many as two train loads per day would be required for Phase 1 while four loads would be required for Phase 2. As noted in Section 3.1.5.1, both SP (now UP) and the Metrolink each run eight operations per day though this area. The addition of the three operations associated with Phase 1 and five operations for Phase 2 could increase railroad noise by approximately 1 to 2 dBA CNEL.

The noise associated with the train while maneuvering and loading could present a potential noise impact to that receptor located along Capra Road, and potentially those at the River's End Trailer Park, depending on where the railroad spur would lie and how and when loading operations would be conducted. Similarly, rail car unloading noise has the potential to create significant noise impacts where product is off-loaded. Thus, impacts are considered to be potentially significant for this alternative.

Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for this alternative are the same as for the Proposed Action (measures N1, N2, and N3 are applicable). With incorporation of the measures, impacts would be reduced to less than significant. In addition a noise study would be required to evaluate the potential noise impacts and required mitigation associated with the site loading facility and the central distribution facility in the Los Angeles area. Residual impacts may be potentially significant for this alternative.

### 3.2.5.6 Alternative North Fines Storage Area Analysis

Impacts

The impacts of this alternative with respect to mine area construction noise, vibration and air overpressure from blasting, operations noise effects due to excavation and aggregate processing, and product vehicular transportation impacts are exactly as those discussed for the Proposed Action (mitigation measures N1 and N3 are applicable). The main difference with this alternative compared to the Proposed Action is that noise associated with fines placement would occur on alternate sites easterly of the designated NFSA.

Construction and Operation Noise Impacts

Operations in terms of number of pieces of equipment operating in the fines storage area would be similar for this alternative as the Proposed Action. It is anticipated that operational noise would attenuate to approximately 67 dBA at 1,000 feet from the fines storage activities. Due to the proximity of the freeway on the north of the alternative sites and the nonexistence of sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the alternative storage sites, noise impacts are less than significant. Fines storage subarea C and the proposed storage site (a portion of which may be utilized for fines storage under this alternative) may require provision of noise attenuating features to protect the noise environment of specific lots in the future Bee Canyon Mobile Home Park if that development is constructed (see Mitigation Measure N2).

Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for this alternative are the same as for the Proposed Action (measures N1, N2, and N3 are applicable). With incorporation of the measures, impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

### 3.2.5.7 Reduced Quantity Mining Concept Alternative Analysis

Impacts

Construction Noise Impacts

This alternative will require about the same level of construction activity as Phase 1 of the Proposed Action, which includes preparation of the NFSA and other preproduction activities. Consequently, noise sources resulting from construction of this alternative would be similar to the Proposed Action on a daily basis. The assumed construction noise level of 89 dBA at 50 feet from the source is applicable to this alternative. Based on the topography of the site and the distance to potential receptors, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated from construction of this alternative.

Operational Noise Impacts - Blasting

Controlled blasting to aid excavation of the aggregate materials would be conducted under this alternative. However, this alternative differs from the Proposed Action in that blasting

frequency would remain at twice per week for the duration of the contract period. The impacts of each blasting event, in terms of generation of ground borne vibration and air overpressure, are of similar magnitude and geographic projection as the Proposed Action and are significant. The observation of OSMRE standards including a blasting monitoring program (as with Mitigation Measure N1) is needed with this alternative to adequately mitigate the significant impact.

Operational Noise Impacts - Excavation, Onsite Aggregate Handling, and Processing Operations

This alternative would have somewhat different noise characteristics compared to the Proposed Action, although similar types of excavation and processing equipment would be utilized. By reducing the quantity of material to be mined by approximately 43 percent, proportionally less activity by excavation and processing equipment would take place compared to the Proposed Action. As mentioned previously, the extension of Cut 3 to the west would be limited and lowering the northeast-southwest ridgeline through the extension of Cut 4 to the north would be avoided. In addition, this alternative is assumed to require only one semi portable rock crusher and excavator. This alternative would reduce the footprint of the 65 CNEL operations noise contour, particularly on the western side of Cut 3.

Because Cut 3 is still utilized under this alternative, the potential noise impacts on Bee Canyon Mobile Home Park are similar to the Proposed Action. This alternative would require provision of noise attenuating features to protect the noise environment of specific lots in the future Bee Canyon Mobile Home Park if that development is constructed (see Mitigation Measure N2).

Offsite Vehicle Travel

Transportation of aggregate products from the site would be by truck under this alternative. The daily traffic generation under this alternative is approximately equal to the Phase 1 traffic under the Proposed Action, that is 60 ADT by employees and others, and 694 ADT by trucks, or a total of 754 ADT. As with Phase 1 of the Proposed Action, this alternative would increase the noise exposure level at the River's End Trailer Park by 5 dBA and is considered a significant adverse impact. However, further increases in noise levels that would occur under Phase 2 of the Proposed Action are avoided under this alternative. The noise impacts can be reduced to less than significant by providing structural noise attenuation along the roadway at the receptor locations as discussed under the Proposed Action (see Mitigation Measure N3).

Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for this alternative are the same as for the Proposed Action (measures are N1, N2, and N3 are applicable). With incorporation of the measures, impacts would be reduced to less than significant.