

I-29 Lee Bepko

I-29-1 The comment expresses concern over airborne micro debris being released due to blasting and rock crushing. The comment asks if a health impact analysis has been conducted for the project. A study was included as Appendix F to Appendix G, Health Effects of Respirable Crystalline Silica in Blasting Dust. Analyzing the project's potential impacts attributable to crystalline silica exposure, the Draft EIR determined that "[m]aterials that would be blasted at the proposed project are granitic and similar to those blasted at hard rock quarries. The SCAQMD monitored respirable crystalline silica concentrations near the Azusa Rock Quarry and found that average concentrations were 0.5 µg/m³ or six times less than the reference exposure level (REL). This concentration included emissions from blasting and other construction emission sources on-site. Accordingly, concentrations that nearby receptors would be exposed to [with this project] would be considered acceptable." (Draft EIR, p. 2.3-50.)

Further, "because the vast majority of deposited material is too large to be respirable," "[d]ust that is deposited near sensitive receptors is unlikely to result in exposure to respirable crystalline silica." (Draft EIR, p. 2.3-49.) In addition, "there are no existing processes taking place or future processes that would take place as part of the proposed project at nearby receptor locations that would reduce the size of particles deposited making them smaller, respirable particles." (*Ibid.*) Finally, "the small amount of respirable dust that may be deposited would need to be re-entrained into the air in order to be hazardous," which is unlikely to occur in concentrations sufficient to cause a significant impact. (*Ibid.*)

The Draft EIR concluded, on the basis of this evidence, that "deposited crystalline silica is not considered to be a source of significant health risk and impacts would be less than significant." (Draft EIR, p. 2.3-50.) Even though impacts would be less than significant, the Draft EIR provides mitigation measures M-AQ-11 and M-AQ-12 to further control fugitive dust emissions generated during blasting activities and thereby further minimize crystalline silica exposure. Please also see **Topical Response AQ-1**. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.

I-29-2 The comment states that blasting will be totally unacceptable and that they moved to the area for the peace and quiet. See **Topical Response NOI-1** (Construction and Blasting Noise). This comment is included in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

Comment Letter Responses

- I-29-3** The comment states that Bill Horn has a vested interest in this development as he will gain financially from his investment. The County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required because the comment does not raise an environmental issue.
- I-29-4** The comment asks what happened to the General Plan for this area. See **Topical Response LU-1**. This comment is included in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I-29-5** The comment states that the fire danger will increase for everyone and that when trying to evacuate from Hidden Meadows, it is a bottle neck on the 15. See **Topical Response HAZ-1**. This comment is included in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I-29-6** The comment states that there will be higher costs for water and more restrictions. See **Topical Response UTL-2**. This comment is included in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.
- I-29-7** The comment states that they do not want this development. The County acknowledges the comment letter, and notes it expresses general opposition for the project, but does not raise any issue concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR. For that reason, the County provides no further response to this comment. This comment is included in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project.