

NAPA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

JANUARY 7, 2015

PUBLIC HEARING ITEM 9A  
SYAR NAPA QUARRY EXPANSION  
AND SURFACE MINING PERMIT PROJECT

---

at

DEY LABORATORIES, INC.  
2751 Napa Valley Corporate Drive  
Napa, California 94558

Reported By:  
JESSICA DUNLAP  
CSR #13990

---

FREEMAN REPORTING  
One Sansome Street, Suite 3500  
San Francisco, California 94104  
(415) 641-1000

January 7, 2015

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

A P P E A R A N C E S

NAPA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSIONERS:

Heather Phillips, Chairman  
Mike Basayne  
Anne Cottrell  
Matt Pope  
Terry Scott

NAPA COUNTY PLANNING, BUILDING AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES:

Donald Barrella, Planner

FOR SYAR INDUSTRIES:

Tom Adams

NAPA COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT:

Steve Lederer, Director

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC:

Susanne von Rosenberg  
Sandra Booth  
Daryl Chinn  
Jim Riley  
Toby Halkovich  
Barry Christian  
David Allred  
Brian Jones  
Mike Costanzo  
Dave Finigan  
Julia Winiarski  
Patrick Gilleran  
Kathy Felch  
Dorothy Glaros  
John Aranson  
Lynn Wyman  
Frederick Parker

January 7, 2015

1 CHAIR PHILLIPS: Before we get started with this  
2 item, I thought we could kind of get an overview of how  
3 this is going to work. And I know that Commissioner  
4 Cottrell, you have a comment to make?

5 COMMISSIONER COTTRELL: Right. I just needed to  
6 state for the record that I rehabilitated myself for the  
7 October 2, 2013 meeting where the Draft EIR was presented.

8 CHAIR PHILLIPS: So I am going to -- so with this  
9 item -- and I know that we have a lot of people that are  
10 looking to speak on this, and I'm going to hand it over to  
11 Mr. Barrella -- but before I do, I'm going to comment that  
12 I have the cards here of speakers, but the way this  
13 normally goes is that the planning staff will do a  
14 presentation on the request, and then they will -- then we  
15 have -- they will speak, and then we will have speakers  
16 from the community. Syar will speak, and then speakers  
17 from the community, and then we come back for deliberation  
18 amongst the Planning Commissioners.

19 But we want to discuss a little bit the timing of  
20 this. So Donald, do you have any input into that?

21 MR. BARRELLA: Well, without starting my  
22 presentation -- I know some of the folks that wanted to  
23 speak have had to leave, and that's a concern with some of  
24 the opponents of the project. So if there's a way maybe we  
25 can start here and get through all those comments and

3

January 7, 2015

1 speakers and then see where that leaves us time-wise to  
2 either take a break or continue or whatever it may be, and  
3 I'll have a little more detail.

4 CHAIR PHILLIPS: Great. So we will start with  
5 the staff presentations and then the comments, and then at  
6 1:00 we'll readdress where we are at in terms of timing.  
7 Okay.

8 MR. BARRELLA: Chair Phillips, Don Barrella with  
9 the Planning and Conservation Division here for the Syar  
10 Expansion Project. With us today we have the consultants.  
11 Here in the audience we have Misha Schwarz, Dennis O'Brien,  
12 James Alcorn and Michael Thill. We also have  
13 representatives from Syar, Jim Syar, John Perry and  
14 Jennifer Gomez, and they're here as well. And before I  
15 give my presentation, but I will really make that short,  
16 there was a couple things I just wanted to clarify.

17 There -- and this is not to diminish any of the  
18 concerns by Skyline Park users, but there is no mining  
19 proposed or will occur in Skyline Park with this proposal.  
20 Skyline Park is its own property, and this project is not  
21 proposing to go into Skyline Park. There is a trail that  
22 has been established on Syar property that would have to be  
23 relocated to accomplish the project in a certain area,  
24 which may have led to that confusion that we're moving  
25 trails to now mine in the park, but it's because the park

4

January 7, 2015

1 trails are encroaching on the Syar property which, even  
2 without this project, could be a liability for them with  
3 public access on a private property that has a quarry  
4 operation on it. So even without the project, we'd have to  
5 consider something with the trails.

6           You have several correspondence that we just  
7 received in the last couple days that kind of break out  
8 into two categories: General opposition to the project. I  
9 think we received somewhere near 100 e-mails in that  
10 context. Then we also have letters from people that had  
11 commented on the Draft EIR and their concerns with a  
12 response to comments. So you should have all those in  
13 front of you. Based on the number of comments that we have  
14 and being able to respond to those, we may not be able to  
15 do that at this meeting. So as with our original  
16 recommendation -- and I kind of want to touch on the  
17 purpose of the meeting as well as Charlene mentioned  
18 earlier -- this is a noticed public hearing to consider the  
19 EIR and look at certifying the EIR as well as look at the  
20 merits of the project itself and the Surface Mining Permit.

21           Our original recommendation was to certify the  
22 EIR because we believe it has all the information necessary  
23 to make an adequate determination, with adequate evidence  
24 for you to consider the EIR, and then continue to  
25 January 21st in an effort to really clarify all the

January 7, 2015

1 mitigation measures, conditions, make sure they did  
2 everything they needed to do, so when we brought it back to  
3 you at that later date, everything would be clean and  
4 understandable.

5           At this point, given all the comments we have and  
6 giving those their due consideration as well as the number  
7 of speakers we have, we still believe you can certify the  
8 EIR. You may not feel comfortable at that point doing that  
9 today, but we feel we're there at this point. But also, in  
10 looking at all these comments, you may have questions and  
11 other things you need clarification to get to a point of  
12 certifying the EIR as well as moving on to acting on the  
13 Surface Mining Permit. So our recommendation is similar to  
14 what we had in the staff report. However, we are looking  
15 to continue to a date certain that once we get through  
16 comments and deliberations, that's comfortable with you.

17           I know Syar has a longer presentation that  
18 explains the project possibly a little bit better than I  
19 can do in a quick minute or two, but essentially the  
20 project itself is a 124-acre expansion, primarily, as you  
21 can see back here, this purple area in the northeast corner  
22 and then also in the far eastern area here. And this area  
23 here is the Pasini Knoll, which a few have concerns with.  
24 So Syar's proposing to expand in those areas above and  
25 beyond what they've already mined and are entitled to mine

6

January 7, 2015

1 from previous approvals.

2           And one other clarification. I know hours of  
3 operation has come up. Syar's not proposing to mine 24/7  
4 and have equipment running 24/7. It's more to accommodate  
5 off-hour projects that may occur at midnight or need to  
6 supply asphalt to certain projects. So there will be  
7 really limited use past the typical hours of operation that  
8 are shown in their proposal, which is typically Monday  
9 through Friday, 7:00 to 4:30/5:00. Anything outside that  
10 is really going to be limited to asphalt production,  
11 loading, off-hauling and material off-hauling. So they  
12 won't be in the quarry pits blasting and moving material  
13 around at 3:00 in the morning.

14           Our original recommendation was looking at  
15 approving the project with the reduced production  
16 alternative. We felt with the reduced production  
17 alternative and the mitigation measures that would mitigate  
18 all the significant impacts associated with the project and  
19 we could move forward with that. However, as noted in the  
20 staff report, the alternatives -- you can discuss options  
21 among that, if you feel that the current project or the  
22 alternative that we're suggesting is not appropriate  
23 through that.

24           With that, this figure back here shows the  
25 reduced footprint alternative. The areas hatched out and

7

January 7, 2015

1 up here and here and down in the corner are what would be  
2 the areas coming out in the reduced footprint alternative  
3 that was identified in the EIR. So those are some areas --  
4 and I know we had some comments that it wasn't shown, and  
5 we developed that figure.

6 And with that, I believe Steve Lederer is going  
7 to give a quick presentation as well. With that, I'll turn  
8 it over. I know it's kind of short, but I think Syar's  
9 presentation will kind of shed a better light on their  
10 project and all the components of it.

11 MR. LEDERER: Thank you, Don. Steve Lederer,  
12 County's Public Works Director. A presentation is way  
13 beyond what I had in mind. Just wanted to make a comment  
14 that I want to make to clear that I'm speaking as the  
15 County's Public Works director. I'm not here as your staff  
16 on this project.

17 From the County perspective, The County Public  
18 Works is responsible for maintaining the County's roads,  
19 and you can't build roads without rock. And Syar is  
20 obviously an important supplier to us. Also, the cost of  
21 rock often has much more to do with transportation than it  
22 does with the rock itself, so having a local quarry is very  
23 important to us.

24 The cost of road maintenance is largely a general  
25 fund, local cost, so it's our citizens' tax dollars, and

January 7, 2015

1 obviously the cheapest we can do it, the better off. So I  
2 don't want to in any way minimize anyone else's concerns or  
3 suggest that you overlook impacts or whatnot, but I do just  
4 want to point out that there is value, a lot of value, to  
5 having the quarry locally. So we'd like to see that  
6 continue. I'm also here representing Michael Kirn of  
7 Calistoga, Calistoga's Public Works director, who wanted me  
8 to just voice a "me too" from him.

9 CHAIR PHILIPS. Thank you, Mr. Lederer. I'm  
10 going to invite Syar, then, to come and give their  
11 presentation. Oh, thank you. Opening the public hearing.

12 MR. ADAMS: I guess good afternoon, Commissioners  
13 and Chairman. I'm Tom Adams. I represent Syar Industries.  
14 And we're kind of -- it's been prolonged to get here, but  
15 we're excited to be here in front of you to kind of discuss  
16 the project and address some of the concerns that have been  
17 raised by the public. As Don kind of briefly described,  
18 the project is really the issuance of a Surface Mining  
19 Permit for the expansion of the mine to allow us to access  
20 necessary aggregate. The 124-acre expansion will be  
21 occurring on Syar property, so it's not an off-property  
22 expansion.

23 It also includes other elements, one of which I  
24 think -- you know, we've talked about increased annual  
25 production, which is the maximum production rate, and we'll

9

January 7, 2015

1 get more into that. But also the fact that there's a  
2 reclaimed asphalt pavement component to this that will  
3 allow Syar to take a lot of the recycled concrete and  
4 rubble -- and asphalt rubble that they receive and to  
5 incorporate that into their asphalt products as a way to  
6 recycle that material, take advantage of it, as opposed to  
7 placing it in landfills. And again, we'll also be  
8 relocating the portions of Skyline Trail. And like Don  
9 said, that's going to happen irrespective of whether this  
10 project moves forward because they are currently on Syar's  
11 property.

12           So I think it's important to spend just a moment  
13 to go to the site history here. And when you look at this  
14 -- you know, this is a longstanding land use in the  
15 community that really began not only in the early 1900s,  
16 but actually the late 1800s, based on Jim Syar. And it was  
17 originally Basalt Rock Quarry. And Jim Syar was a  
18 shareholder in the Basalt Rock going back to 1958. Syar  
19 actually purchased the property in 1986, and it was  
20 designated by the State as a Mineral Resource Zone 2 in  
21 1987 by the California Geologic Survey. And then that  
22 designation was recently expanded in 2013 to include the  
23 Pasini parcel and some additional property to the east of  
24 the current quarry.

25           The main minerals on the property -- and I

10

January 7, 2015

1 provided samples for you guys. We have basalt, ryolite and  
2 tufa. And those -- the highest quality and most valuable  
3 mineral is the basalt, and that provides industrial  
4 concrete and asphalt mineral resources, so that's  
5 incorporated into asphalt and mineral and concrete products  
6 that are very valuable for construction and industrial  
7 applications. The ryolite is used for riprap, landscaping,  
8 and also for construction aggregate. And the tufa is  
9 primarily used for engineered fill. And this is really the  
10 only significant quarry in Napa County, which -- the  
11 importance of which I'll get into in a minute.

12           So the project purpose is really to -- as you  
13 probably are aware is to extend the life of the quarry for  
14 35 years. And right now, the current permits don't have a  
15 termination date. So when we talk about extending the life  
16 of the quarry for 35 years, the idea is to take the entire  
17 quarry and bring it under a modern, up-to-date use permit  
18 that will have a 35-year life, so it will terminate in 35  
19 years, unless extended, and also to provide the necessary  
20 access to the mineral resources necessary to continue  
21 operations at the site, to provide the aggregate products  
22 to the local community.

23           And the high quality basalt is almost -- is  
24 primarily located on the Pasini property, and that's why  
25 that area is part of the proposed expansion. We are also

11

January 7, 2015

1 asking to increase the annual maximum permitted servable  
2 quantity of aggregate. This is something that -- the  
3 amount of aggregate sold in any given year is dependent on  
4 the market, and this will be the maximum allowed. So in  
5 some years we would sell much less than this, and others we  
6 would hope to achieve the maximum. But generally, the  
7 maximum would be achieved in years where there are major  
8 Public Works projects or the need to respond to natural  
9 disasters, such as the recent earthquake.

10           So just briefly going to touch upon SMARA, which  
11 is the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act, that was adopted  
12 in 1975 by the State in recognition of the importance of  
13 mineral extraction to the State's economy. And it was  
14 created to maintain an effective and comprehensive policy,  
15 to mitigate environmental impacts, and to encourage the  
16 production and conservation of mineral resources in the  
17 state. And part of SMARA requires that state geologists  
18 conduct a statewide inventory of the mineral resources  
19 available to ensure that these mineral resources are  
20 identified and protected for future extraction so that  
21 local agencies have the benefit of understanding where the  
22 resources are located in their community and can make land  
23 use decisions based upon that.

24           And as I already mentioned, the Napa quarry's  
25 been designated as a Mineral Resource Zone 2 by the State,

12

January 7, 2015

1 including the Pasini parcel in 2013. And what that means  
2 is it's an area of regional and statewide significance  
3 related to the fact that it has significant mineral  
4 resources present on the property. Obviously, SMARA also  
5 has other requirements that require reclamation of the mine  
6 land and financial assurances to be put in place so that  
7 when the mining is completed, the land is reclaimed. I  
8 also provided you with a handout, which is Special Report  
9 205, plates 2-C. It shows the recently adopted expanded  
10 MRZ-2 designation that includes the Pasini parcel.

11           So SMARA, like CEQA, is implemented by the  
12 County, and that's why we're, in large part, here today.  
13 And what SMARA requires is that the lead agency, in  
14 accordance with the State policy, establish mineral  
15 resource management policies in its general plan that  
16 recognize the State geologists' mineral classifications and  
17 insist in the -- to allow the agency to manage its land  
18 use, decisions that affect access to areas of statewide and  
19 regional significance, like the Syar quarry. Emphasis is  
20 placed on conservation and development of the identified  
21 mineral deposits.

22           Napa County's General Plan does this in General  
23 Plan Policy Con-37, ensuring long-term production and  
24 supply of aggregate, and recognizing that agriculture and  
25 open space are compatible land uses with mineral

13

January 7, 2015

1 extraction. The County General Plan in its "Mineral  
2 Resources" section talks about three mines. They're  
3 identified as the Napa Quarry, Pope Creek Quarry and the  
4 American Canyon Quarry. Of these three, one, the American  
5 Canyon Quarry, has been closed, and its reclamation was  
6 already commenced in 2007, so there's no aggregate  
7 production going on in that facility now. And the Pope  
8 Creek Quarry, which is located in Pope Valley, is a very  
9 small production. It was stated in the General Plan an  
10 average of 8,000 tons per year, which is probably what Syar  
11 does in a day.

12           So here there is an acknowledgement in the  
13 general plan of the fact that the Syar quarry is the only  
14 significant quarry in the county. And, you know, why is  
15 that important? Well, the State, as part of its SMARA  
16 obligations, went ahead and published Special Report 205,  
17 finalized in 2013. It's the same report that extended the  
18 designation of MRZ-2 to include the Pasini parcel for the  
19 Napa Syar Quarry.

20           And some interesting facts were included in that  
21 report, and it looked at the north San Francisco Bay  
22 consumption and production region, which includes Sonoma,  
23 Napa, Marin and West Solano counties. And in that report,  
24 it provided information related to the fact that the per  
25 capita allocation for aggregate resources in this region is

14

January 7, 2015

1 8.9 tons per person per year, and that's the amount of  
2 aggregate on average of a 50-year period that's necessary  
3 per person to provide us with the infrastructure that we  
4 enjoy and the development that occurs in the various  
5 counties.

6           Current permitted reserves of aggregate in the  
7 San Francisco Bay production and consumption area are only  
8 projected to last through 2023, which is only 22 percent of  
9 the 50-year projection. Other mines within the region  
10 serve very specific markets, and a large reason for that is  
11 due to the hauling costs and the demand within those  
12 specific regions for the product. The report actually  
13 identifies the alternate source of aggregate from outside  
14 the region as Canada. So I think that was an interesting  
15 point.

16           So some examples of local projects that rely on  
17 the Napa Syar Quarry is the topic of this next slide. And  
18 I think it's important to recognize the benefit that the  
19 community at large receives from the quarry. And we've got  
20 earthquake repair and retrofit construction, which is  
21 significant in Napa. We've got the Highway 12 Improvement  
22 Project, which we've all benefitted from. The Napa County  
23 Measure T Road Maintenance Act, which the Public Works  
24 director referred to as the Local Streets and Road  
25 Maintenance Program. Napa Creek and River Flood Protection

15

January 7, 2015

1 Program, which saves the City and County millions of  
2 dollars; the Napa Pipe Project -- these are future uses --  
3 Napa County Jail, Napa Sanitation District, MST and  
4 Carneros Reclaimed Water Pipeline Project. Napa Unified  
5 School District utilizes the quarry. American Canyon  
6 Highway 29 improvements in the future would also be able to  
7 access the aggregate provided by the quarry as well.

8           And also, finally, what's been talked about and  
9 the reason for, you know, the push to try to get our  
10 climate action plan adopted is the potential sea level rise  
11 related to climate change that's going to require a large  
12 amount of aggregate for riprap and walls and whatnot to  
13 address the mitigation that will be required to deal with  
14 sea level rise. And so the Napa quarry as a local resource  
15 keeps the cost low of aggregate and reduces environmental  
16 impacts related to the increased hauling distances required  
17 if you have to bring aggregate from outside the area.

18           And just recently, our chairman of the Board of  
19 Supervisors, Diane Dillon, identified the numerous  
20 earthquake repair projects not identified in the County's  
21 budget or its Capital Improvement Plan as a major issue  
22 facing the County. And she discussed the fact that funds  
23 were going to have to be diverted from other programs in  
24 order to pay for a lot of these repair projects. And  
25 having a local source of aggregate, as the Public Works

16

January 7, 2015

1 director mentioned, has a huge cost savings on these  
2 projects.

3           Now, why is that? So when you look at aggregate,  
4 it's important to know that, you know, it's a -- basically  
5 it's rock. So we have low unit value with high bulk weight  
6 commodity, so the cost is largely driven by transportation  
7 costs and haul distances. So haul distances of 25 to  
8 35 miles will double the cost of aggregate and this  
9 aggregate. So when you're budgeting a road improvement  
10 project or a pavement project or a bridge project, you  
11 could see how this could increase your costs significantly.

12           Some of the benefits associated with not having  
13 the longer haul distances are related to reduced GHG  
14 emissions, decreases in road deterioration because fewer  
15 trucks are traveling longer distances, decrease in road  
16 accidents, so an increase in road safety. You also  
17 experience project delays when you have to bring in  
18 aggregate from outside the area, and, of course, there's  
19 also the higher costs associated with that.

20           So Caltrans in 2008 and 2011 sent out  
21 transportation partner letters to lead agencies, including  
22 Napa County, with responsibilities for implementing SMARA,  
23 urging them to assist them in permitting local aggregate  
24 resources to meet the region's statewide demand for and  
25 need for aggregate to support transportation, flood

17

January 7, 2015

1 protection and public and private -- public facility  
2 projects. Part of that was also the State's recognition of  
3 the fact that by reducing haul distances from an average of  
4 50 miles to 35 miles, that that would help the State  
5 achieve its greenhouse gas reduction targets identified in  
6 AB-32.

7           So the involvement and review process.  
8 Obviously, this isn't all about SMARA and aggregate  
9 production. Syar recognizes the need to move forward in an  
10 environmentally responsible manner, and that's what the  
11 California Environmental Quality Act is all about, as you  
12 guys are well aware. The application was submitted in  
13 2008, so over six and a half years ago. And so this has  
14 been a long process, like many large projects require.

15           And the CEQA document that has resulted is the  
16 product of the County's foresight in actually going beyond  
17 what's required in CEQA and providing for multiple scoping  
18 meetings for the public in the initial study and notice of  
19 preparation stage, so before the Draft EIR work was  
20 undertaken. These occurred in July and September of 2009,  
21 and these meetings were used to shape the issues that were  
22 to be analyzed in the EIR. And there was a lot of  
23 involvement at that time from the public, and then later  
24 there were hearings on the Draft EIR, two hearings, one in  
25 the morning, one in the afternoon. Those occurred in

18

January 7, 2015

1 October of 2013.

2           So as a result of the scoping and the work that  
3 went into that, there were a number of environmental  
4 studies undertaken, and here's a list of them. As you can  
5 see, these are not atypical, but what these studies did do  
6 is they provided the basis for the analysis and the  
7 conclusion in the EIR. So these are the scientific  
8 technical reports that provide the substantial evidence  
9 that we were discussing earlier to support the conclusions.  
10 They started back in 2009.

11           These studies identify the surrounding land uses  
12 as sensitive receptors, so the residences, schools, Skyline  
13 Wilderness Park. And assume the worst case scenario with  
14 mitigating for the worst case scenario, which was full  
15 production of 2 million tons per year. And, you know,  
16 that's significant in that that's not something that  
17 necessarily is going to occur even if 2 millions tons of  
18 production was approved.

19           The maximum production is intended to provide  
20 occasional high demand -- for occasional high demand due to  
21 large Public Works projects and natural disasters, in fact.  
22 And you should note that the reduced production  
23 alternative, which is the environmentally superior  
24 alternative identified in the EIR, would go further in  
25 reducing air quality noise, traffic and GHG, which are

19

January 7, 2015

1 greenhouse gases, of the project beyond the mitigation  
2 already identified in the EIR.

3           So mitigation measures. Again, there are a  
4 number of mitigation measures that resulted as part of the  
5 EIR. These reduced the impacts to less than significant,  
6 other than greenhouse gases, which we'll discuss in a  
7 minute. But, again, you know, these analyzed the sensitive  
8 receptors and addressed those. There was a health -- there  
9 was a recent -- a health assessment was conducted to assess  
10 the risk to the public. So this is called the Health Risk  
11 Assessment, and this is a very expansive study that is  
12 intended to protect the public from health risks associated  
13 with air quality impacts of the quarry.

14           There -- also there was a provision that was  
15 included to require that there is no additional pumping of  
16 groundwater allowed. So the project will pump no  
17 additional groundwater from what it currently does. And  
18 there are also noise and vibrations monitoring that was  
19 conducted, obviously, and mitigation measures imposed to  
20 provide for the appropriate level of reduction and noise  
21 for the surrounding land uses.

22           The one thing that is significant, I think, in  
23 this project that we don't typically see in the County is  
24 the fact that the conditions of approval provide for  
25 additional project oversight, in that you actually have --

20

January 7, 2015

1 this is a very heavily regulated industry already with  
2 Regional, State and Federal oversight. And the County is  
3 now requiring that the -- which is not currently a  
4 requirement -- that the quarry actually submit an Annual  
5 Compliance Plan that is basically a self-reporting document  
6 that requires the quarry to basically monitor compliance  
7 with mitigation measures and to report the status to the  
8 County on an annual basis for its review and any -- so that  
9 it can take any necessary action that may be required.

10 And in addition to that, there's also a condition  
11 of approval that requires that the project be back in front  
12 of the Planning Commission at a publicly-noticed hearing  
13 every five years to review the effectiveness of the  
14 conditions of approval and to modify them as necessary.

15 The EIR process had a significant impact on the  
16 project, and it reduced the scope of the project with the  
17 idea of minimizing impacts to less than significance. The  
18 original expansion area was 291 acres. That was reduced by  
19 Syar to 124 to avoid environmental impacts, so that was  
20 reduced by more than half. In addition to that, the EIR  
21 actually requires that there be 327 acres of avoidance  
22 on-site. And there's figures that we can look at later, if  
23 you'd like, to show that.

24 Now, finally, the EIR gets to the topic of  
25 alternatives. So in addition to mitigation measures, the

January 7, 2015

1 EIR's required to look at alternatives to the project that  
2 also meet the project objectives and reduce the significant  
3 impacts and are feasible to obtain. So you have the no  
4 project alternative, which, as I mentioned, is the  
5 continued operation of the quarry without up-to-date use  
6 permit and without the level of oversight that would occur  
7 under this use permit. Of course, we wouldn't have access  
8 to the aggregate we would need for long-term production.

9 But we have the reduced footprint conservation  
10 alternative, which a lot of the comments addressed. And  
11 this alternative slightly reduces the amount of available  
12 aggregate -- or excuse me, significantly reduces the amount  
13 of available aggregate. It does reduce biological and  
14 cultural impacts, but the problem is is that when you look  
15 at the area that would be taken out of the expansion, it  
16 doesn't provide long-term aggregate supply and prevents  
17 Syar from moving forward with the ability to provide enough  
18 aggregate to meet the local demand over the next 35 years,  
19 and it doesn't meet the project objectives or General Plan  
20 policy of protecting the long-term aggregate supply.

21 Now, the reduced production alternative, which  
22 the EIR identified as the environmentally superior  
23 alternative, significantly reduces annual production from 2  
24 million to 1.3 million tons per year and reduces noise  
25 impacts, air quality impacts, greenhouse gas impacts,

22

January 7, 2015

1 traffic impacts, further than the EIR mitigation currently  
2 does, and it also has the benefit of allowing Syar to  
3 access the needed aggregate to continue operations, and  
4 provide the benefit to local projects, most of which are  
5 Public Works projects. And it minimizes impacts on the  
6 residences to the north and the highest number of the  
7 Skyline Wilderness park users. Because if Syar wasn't able  
8 to access the Pasini parcel to the far east of the project,  
9 it would have to focus its mining activities on State Blue,  
10 which is the closest proximity to Skyline Wilderness Park  
11 and the residents to the north and other sensitive  
12 receptors.

13           So Skyline -- this whole process has evolved, and  
14 the project has evolved along with it. The original  
15 project asked for 2 million tons of production, and as much  
16 as Syar would like to be able to have the flexibility to  
17 provide that level of production to meet potential demand  
18 in the future, after reviewing the Draft EIR and the Final  
19 EIR, response to comments and the other comments that have  
20 come in, consistent with the County staff's recommendation,  
21 Syar supports the reduced production alternative, which is  
22 the environmentally superior alternative identified in the  
23 EIR, based on two main reasons.

24           One is that it continues to allow Syar to have  
25 the access to the mineral resources that it needs to

23

January 7, 2015

1 continue its operations into the future, and secondly, it  
2 has the benefit of mitigating noise impacts, traffic  
3 impacts, greenhouse gas impacts and air quality impacts  
4 beyond those mitigation measures that are currently  
5 identified in the EIR and with the biggest benefit to the  
6 largest number of people in the vicinity.

7           So, I guess, finally, as reflected in the general  
8 plan, the quarry is a longstanding and important part of  
9 the local economy, and as such, the quarry and adjacent  
10 Mineral Resource Zone 2 designated land deserves protection  
11 for continued and future aggregate extraction for the  
12 benefit of the public at large. And we feel that the EIR  
13 process has worked and has successfully balanced the need  
14 for environmental protection with the need for a  
15 sustainable long-term aggregate resource here in our local  
16 community.

17           With that, I think I'm going to end my  
18 presentation. I would just ask for the opportunity for  
19 rebuttal at the end of the public hearing.

20           CHAIR PHILLIPS: Yes. That's our standard, yes.  
21 Thank you, Mr. Adams.

22           MR. ADAMS: Thank you.

23           CHAIR PHILLIPS: Okay. Are there any questions  
24 from Commission?

25           If not, I'm going to continue to accept comments

24

January 7, 2015

1 from the public. All right. So I want to thank everybody  
2 for sticking through this and remaining to participate.  
3 And we want to make sure that everyone is heard.

4           So that being said, I'm going to call the cards  
5 that I have, and if you don't have a card, you're able to  
6 speak after that. If you come to the microphone, please  
7 give your name and your address. I'm not -- I don't think  
8 the light here works, so please keep to -- as close to  
9 three minutes as possible, and then also, to be as  
10 effective as possible, for everyone to please try to not  
11 repeat other points that the public has made, but to try to  
12 keep focused on new and relevant points.

13           So our first speaker card is for Susanne von  
14 Rosenberg.

15           MS. VON ROSENBERG: Good afternoon,  
16 Commissioners. Susanne von Rosenberg, 2168 Penny Lane.  
17 And in order to keep to the three-minute limit, I'm going  
18 to just focus on one impact area, that's aesthetics. I  
19 submitted a four-page comment letter, which is only a  
20 summary of the comments that I really need to provide.

21           I wanted to say that the Final EIR was a big  
22 disappointment. The comment responses were very  
23 dismissive. I'm not the only one, I think, who feels that  
24 they were, at times, insulting in their level of  
25 dismissiveness. And part of the reason, like I said, I

25

January 7, 2015

1 only put together a summary is because each one of those  
2 lacking responses needs a detailed response in and of  
3 itself. So you'll get that from me at some point. So  
4 focusing on this one particular issue -- I actually put  
5 together a little presentation for you. And you'll be glad  
6 to know that I don't make my living as a graphic artist.  
7 All right.

8           So the Draft EIR did not address foreground  
9 visual impacts. It only looked at impacts from mid -- far  
10 mid ground and the far ground. And I specifically  
11 requested a foreground view, and it was not done. It was  
12 dismissed as not being important because only 15 percent of  
13 the project area's visible from the foreground. That  
14 didn't take into consideration that currently zero percent  
15 of the project area is visible from the foreground. And  
16 maybe we can lower the lights because it's very hard to see  
17 the image.

18           So what I did here -- this is a Google Earth  
19 image of the northern part -- do we have a pointer?

20           CHAIR PHILLIPS: Susanne, can you be sure you're  
21 speaking into the microphone so everyone is able to --

22           MS. VON ROSENBERG: Yeah. I'm sorry.

23           So right here -- that's the northern part of the  
24 State Blue Pit. This is Imola Avenue up here, and Penny  
25 Lane is here. So I took three photos. Don, if you could

26

January 7, 2015

1 advance. So here's the first view, then if you'll show the  
2 second view is little bit further west, and then the third  
3 view is from the Department of Education parking lot. So  
4 then the document doesn't provide a view from this area in  
5 the aesthetics analysis. It ignores this view. And so I  
6 had to cobble together from various figures in the document  
7 what might actually be the visual impact. So that's the  
8 next.

9           So first, I had to try to transfer onto my Google  
10 Earth image the approximate boundary of the excavation area  
11 in the State Blue Pit. So that's that red line is the  
12 western boundary of that, as best as I can tell. And you  
13 can -- where's my -- this is the water tank here. So if  
14 you'll move on to the next image. Then I had to overlay on  
15 that a -- actually, you can't see it, it's not big enough  
16 -- the topographic contours, which are a separate figure.  
17 We don't actually have a figure that shows the before and  
18 after in a way that's usable in the document. And none of  
19 it overlays the actual excavation area figure, that  
20 expansion area figure, with the purple shading. Next  
21 figure.

22           So that's my best guess. That's what's going to  
23 disappear. All right? Now, I may be off a little on the  
24 eastern and northern boundary, but that's about what it's  
25 going to look like. Now, you tell me that was an adequate

27

January 7, 2015

1 impact analysis without looking at that foreground view.  
2 That's one example of how this EIR is deficient. And I do  
3 some of this work for a living. In my opinion, this  
4 document is not defensible. So I want to let you guys know  
5 that as well. So you can have this, or you can have that.  
6 Thank you.

7 CHAIR PHILLIPS: Our next speaker is Sandra  
8 Booth.

9 MS. BOOTH: Hi. My name is Sandra Booth, 2100  
10 Seville Drive in Napa. And I had something else prepared  
11 to present, but I had a wonderful discussion with one of  
12 your members here today, and so I'm just going to say a few  
13 short things.

14 Even though Syar quarry is adjacent to the City  
15 of Napa, nowadays, this sort of operation would not be  
16 allowed next to a city of this size or next to a city,  
17 period. The State and Napa County say Syar quarry is in  
18 compliance and does not need to mitigate their pollution  
19 problem any more than they are. So for Napers like myself  
20 who know there is quite a big pollution problem, a  
21 carcinogenic pollution problem, I need to come up with,  
22 I've been told, with another argument.

23 But I don't have one today, so I would just like  
24 to say I don't think the operation, the expansion -- and  
25 the expansion of the operation should go forward, which

28

January 7, 2015

1 will double the 70 years of carcinogenic dust into 35 years  
2 going forward. New modern control measures would be put in  
3 place to reduce the current large load of pollution created  
4 by Syar quarry if they would live up to their mission  
5 statement which currently rings hollow to the neighborhood  
6 adjacent to Syar.

7           And I didn't bring their mission statement with  
8 me, but it says what a good steward they are, essentially,  
9 and that they care about their employees and their  
10 neighbors and they want to do what is right by their  
11 neighbors and their employees. But it truly rings hollow.  
12 And so what I would ask them is to prove it, upgrade the  
13 operations beyond what the State and County guidelines say  
14 are good enough, because in truth they aren't good enough.  
15 Thank you very much.

16           CHAIR PHILLIPS: Thank you, Ms. Booth. Our next  
17 speaker is Daryl Chinn, and after that, so they can be on  
18 deck, is Jim Riley.

19           MR. CHINN: My name is Daryl Chinn, and I feel  
20 literally dwarfed by that presentation of megatons of  
21 product -- and powerful presentation. I feel that what I'm  
22 about to say is too little and too late and I'm just too  
23 small. My wife and I purchased our home on Kreuzer Lane,  
24 115, in 1996, like our other neighbors on Imola Avenue,  
25 Penny Lane, Fourth Avenue, Curry Lane, Kreuzer Lane, abuts

29

January 7, 2015

1 Skyline Park. We love our home because of its proximity to  
2 Skyline Park and the quiet of our bucolic setting. We hike  
3 the magnificent trails of Skyline Park and enjoy its peace  
4 and its views.

5           The proposal by Syar Industries to increase its  
6 production over the next 35 years and to expand the  
7 blasting and excavation to its most northeast boundary is  
8 disheartening. Even with its current operation, it is not  
9 unusual for us to hear noise that disturbs our peace. And  
10 the current proposal by Syar Industries as stated in  
11 Mr. Barrella's report to your committee states the proposed  
12 project has the potential to exceed allowable noise levels  
13 established by the general plan which would result in  
14 significant noise impacts. So that this would occur and  
15 this would drone on for the next 35 years is sad.

16           So I implore the members of the Committee, Madame  
17 Chairwoman and fellow commissioners to consider the  
18 concerns of the residential neighbors. And I will hope you  
19 would seriously consider the reduced footprint alternative.  
20 And I would ask you to ask yourself the question, what is  
21 the purpose of your general plan and its establishment of  
22 allowable noise levels if an entity, no matter how well  
23 meaning, can ignore it? Thank you.

24           CHAIR PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chinn.

25           Jim Riley. Great. And then next up will be Toby

30

January 7, 2015

1 Halkovich.

2 MR. RILEY: Commissioners, Jim Riley, Operating  
3 Engineers, Vacaville, 1500 Locke Road. I grew up in Napa  
4 Valley as a kid, witnessed Basalt Quarry and Kaiser Steel  
5 and quite a mecca of industry in this area. And I moved  
6 away in high school and recently have come back and am  
7 surprised by the development and the construction and the  
8 wine industry growth and the interconnection of quarry and  
9 construction and -- I'm losing my track here a little bit,  
10 but my new perspective as a business agent has allowed me  
11 to get a very unique perspective to construction and to see  
12 that this quarry here feeds an infrastructure, not only the  
13 viticulture, but construction everywhere, bridges, you name  
14 it.

15 The community where people are complaining from,  
16 their sidewalks are built from Syar rock. Their streets  
17 are, you know. Where are you going to get this from? Are  
18 we going to ship it in from some other place, Canada? I  
19 get disturbed that the lack of vision from our own  
20 community to just keep pushing things on the outside and  
21 not embracing what's here on the inside. This is an  
22 amazing place. It's got an amazing history. It's got an  
23 amazing amount of people that work there.

24 Syar Industries is a class act, in my opinion.  
25 They pay prevailing wages. They follow all MSHA standards,

31

January 7, 2015

1 OSHA standards. Noise pollution is a big consideration.  
2 They can't exceed levels of noise. They're highly  
3 scrutinized. Mining is probably the most scrutinized  
4 industry. So I'm disturbed that kind of lack of  
5 introspection or the ability to understand that we live in  
6 a very dynamic, interdependent, you know, society here.

7 I represent the Workers Operating Engineers, and  
8 we have some third generation individuals out here. One is  
9 Mr. Jeff Bean (phonetic). He's a third generation Syar  
10 hand, and his family has worked for Syar for three  
11 generations and raised families and put their monies back  
12 into the economy of Napa County, and I'd like to see that  
13 continue. Again, they pay prevailing wage where prevailing  
14 wage seems to be very scarce in this area. And I sure  
15 would hate to see the Napa Quarry turn into a Kaiser Steel,  
16 a virtual ghost town and have Napa County reap the  
17 disappearance of a big economy. Anyway, thanks for hearing  
18 me.

19 CHAIR PHILLIPS: Thanks, Mr. Halkovich. Oh,  
20 Mr. Riley, sorry. Toby Halkovich is next. Right.

21 MR. HALKOVICH. Good afternoon. I'm Toby  
22 Halkovich with Cakebread Cellars, 8300 St. Helena Highway.  
23 I'll hold my comments to two specific items that we have  
24 concerns about. Cakebread Cellars, we form the two parcels  
25 immediately south of the current quarry operation. The two

32

January 7, 2015

1 concerns I'd like to talk about is dust control and  
2 groundwater. The issue of dust control -- I'm actually on  
3 both sides of this. In viticulture operation, dust has a  
4 negative impact on us, but we do activities that do  
5 generate dust, so I have sympathy for that.

6           One of the things in reading through the  
7 mitigation measures, particularly 4.32b states any blasting  
8 within 1,000 feet of vineyard operations would be  
9 restricted to speeds below 25 miles an hour. So I went  
10 through and I looked at our weather data. Since 2011,  
11 we've had five days where we've had wind speeds over 25  
12 miles an hour. It's not very restrictive. We're not  
13 asking for excessively restrictive. But I know that in  
14 that time we've had some extremely windy days that we  
15 didn't get over 25 miles an hour.

16           So one of the things we'd like to consider is  
17 that that be reduced to 25 miles an hour specifically. I  
18 understand this. We restrict our spray operations below 10  
19 miles an hour, and where we have neighbors, we restrict our  
20 cultivation to below 15 miles an hour. These are self  
21 imposed. They're not County. But we feel as neighbors  
22 it's the right thing to do. We don't need to be that  
23 restrictive, but I think 20 miles an hour would be somewhat  
24 of a compromise.

25           On the issue of groundwater, I think that the WAA

January 7, 2015

1 discussion we had before this was very pertinent. It's  
2 difficult to predict what changes in use in topography are  
3 going to do to your neighbors. So in that vein, we would  
4 like to propose somewhat of an if/then type of mitigation  
5 measure. I don't know the hydrology report they presented  
6 is incorrect. It may be correct, and there may be no  
7 changes in the water. And if that's the case, then what  
8 I'm proposing won't have any impact. But currently, as  
9 it's written, the neighbors of this project are the ones  
10 who are going to bear all the risk on our water supplies.

11           What we'd like to propose is that modern wells be  
12 established. We have modern wells on our property. We'd  
13 be more than willing to share that data and put that into  
14 this process. I'd like to establish some agreed upon  
15 protocols for measuring groundwater, and then a trigger  
16 point that if we cross that trigger point, if we can  
17 determine that groundwater has been affected, what is Syar  
18 going to do to make it whole? What are they going to do to  
19 make sure that we can have the water that we had in the  
20 past so that we can continue our operations?

21           This may all be moot. It may very well -- and  
22 again, if they have confidence in the hydrology report, it  
23 doesn't mean anything. But our question is is we can't  
24 guarantee that, and if it does, what's going to be done to  
25 prevent the neighbors of this project from bearing all of

34

January 7, 2015

1 the risk and all the burden when it comes to groundwater?

2 Thank you.

3 CHAIR PHILLIPS: Thank you, Toby. Up next is  
4 Barry Christian, and the speaker after that will be David  
5 Allred.

6 MR. CHRISTIAN: Thank you. Barry Christian,  
7 American Canyon, 105 Landana Street. I'm on the Park  
8 District -- Napa County Regional Park District Board of  
9 Directors, representing District 5, which is where this  
10 project's located. And I'm also a member of the -- part of  
11 the -- Board of the Bay Area Ridge Trail Council. I'm just  
12 speaking on my own behalf and maybe in general terms.

13 A few years ago during a candidate's race for  
14 governor, one of the candidates stated that she only had  
15 three things she was going to focus on: jobs, economy and  
16 education. And those are popular priorities, very  
17 important for quality of life. If you don't have a good  
18 job, it affects your quality of life. If the economy's  
19 bad, that affects your quality of life. But they're not  
20 the only thing.

21 And so if you take it to the extreme -- I'm not  
22 saying the project will do this, but just in terms of  
23 setting priorities in balance -- what if you wake up one  
24 day, you had a great job, the economy's humming, your taxes  
25 are low, you're making money, great education, but you

35

January 7, 2015

1 can't drink the water or you can't breath the air or you  
2 don't have a nice place to go take a walk? So those are  
3 quality of life issues too. And I'm looking for some  
4 balance here with the end result being quality of life for  
5 us and for future generations.

6           So the Pasini Knoll, if that comes down and gets  
7 taken out, that affects the quality of that trail, the  
8 Skyline Trail, it's a ridge trail and in Skyline Park.  
9 This is a wilderness park on the doorsteps of City of Napa,  
10 one of the largest -- the largest population center in Napa  
11 County. People can walk to that park. And so I was hoping  
12 maybe for the reduced footprint alternative that would  
13 leave Pasini Knoll there. Because taking that down exposes  
14 that area to dust, to noise. And once it's down, it's down  
15 forever. You can't mitigate that. You can't put that  
16 back.

17           So I'm asking for a balanced approach that looks  
18 at preserving our quality of life for everyone on a larger  
19 scale for us and future generations. Thank you.

20           CHAIR PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Christiansen  
21 (sic). David Allred.

22           MR. ALLRED: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My  
23 name is David Allred, and I'm from Alta Heights, 214 East  
24 Berna Avenue, and I'm representing my neighbors who didn't  
25 know about the meeting because they were outside the

36

January 7, 2015

1 notification range. But if they had known, I think all  
2 these chairs would have been filled from what I've found  
3 out in the last 48 hours. But I want to begin by thanking  
4 the Commission for being so patient. I've been calling you  
5 and talking to you and watching you this morning. And I'm  
6 a teacher at an elementary school, and I thought I had  
7 patience. I think you guys set the bar.

8           One cannot overstate the impact that Skyline Park  
9 has had on my life and the life of my family. But when my  
10 friends and my family members come from out of town, that's  
11 when you really see what a special resource and an asset  
12 that it is. They cannot believe that we have such a  
13 thriving community. We have such access to food and wine  
14 and dancing, and we also have this amazing, pristine  
15 natural setting, which most places don't. And as well,  
16 it's analogous to Mt. Tam and it's proximity to San  
17 Francisco is what makes it so special.

18           If you've been hiking in Skyline Park, you know  
19 that that Skyline Trail drops you into a valley that is  
20 completely insulated visually from the city, from  
21 civilization. Despite this I think very optimistic and  
22 clearly biased Environmental Impact Report, that experience  
23 would be drastically changed. You can't mitigate sound and  
24 pollution that is right over the ridge resulting from a  
25 destruction of hillside, because that is what quarrying

37

January 7, 2015

1 does, it destroys a hillside. For example, there's a  
2 police shooting range down in the bottom of kind of that  
3 quarry area. And I have nothing against shooting, I think  
4 it sounds fun. But you can hear the gunshots echo all  
5 through the valley. So the sounds that that quarry would  
6 produce will not be mitigateable.

7           That being said, I know that quarries are  
8 absolutely necessary. We need decomposed dirt, we need  
9 these things, and these guys need jobs. They're good  
10 people. The problem is that this contract should have  
11 never been granted in 1986. If they walked in right now  
12 and said, hey, we would like to use this land, and we would  
13 like to quarry this land which is adjacent to the wild  
14 area, 850 acres of pristine hills, that is also adjacent to  
15 the main artery by which tourists enter our beautiful  
16 valley, we'd laugh them out of the office. But we cannot  
17 let that error metastasize into something that threatens  
18 one of Napa's greatest assets.

19           On Monday, I called Don Barrella, and he told me  
20 I was the first member of the public to call him. I was  
21 surprised. So I sent an e-mail out, and now a hundred  
22 people have responded to me saying "What? We didn't know  
23 about this," to the point where my wife made me turn off my  
24 phone because it was pinging so much it was driving her  
25 crazy. But I think we need to allow ample time for us to

38

January 7, 2015

1 measure the will of the aggregate community before we move  
2 forward in something as drastic as this that will impact us  
3 for 35 years.

4           And I'm just going to leave you with this. Napa  
5 received 2.94 million tourists -- this is according to the  
6 North Bay Business Journal. They spent \$1.4 billion.  
7 That's \$10,000 per Napa resident. The number two reason  
8 they came here was wine. The number one reason was the  
9 scenic beauty of Napa Valley. And that does not mean  
10 looking through the window as your drive through. That  
11 means being able to park your car, get a bottle of wine and  
12 a picnic and hike off someplace gorgeous. Skyline is that  
13 place.

14           So I appeal to the Commission's excellent  
15 judgment to consider the long-term vision of the Napa  
16 expansion for tourists and residents alike, and I have  
17 confidence that you'll do that.

18           CHAIR PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Allred. Next is  
19 Brian Jones, and after that will be Mike Costanzo.

20           MR. JONES: Thank you, Lady Chair. I normally  
21 don't speak publicly. I would like to thank the gentlemen  
22 of Syar for coming. I was born and raised in Vallejo. I  
23 was born in 1973 there. 711 Minahen, by the way.

24           I remember growing up and watching Syar, the  
25 gentlemen getting there at 5:00 in the morning and not

January 7, 2015

1 getting off until the afternoon, working really, really  
2 hard. I've seen that. But I remember also watching Blue  
3 Rock Springs change as I was a kid. Golf courses that  
4 weren't there, I remember they were gopher holes. I don't  
5 want to see that happen to what we call Skyline. I don't  
6 want to see it demolished and become flatlands and become  
7 somebody's privileged golf course, because that's exactly  
8 what it could be.

9 I really wish Harry Martin was here. He would  
10 have some definite things to say about this. I wish Jim  
11 Big Bear King of the Suscol Council was still alive and Ed  
12 Sullivan, the ex-mayor, former mayor. He would have  
13 something to say about this also.

14 One thing I haven't heard mentioned about if  
15 we're going to be expanding quarrying and mining, we're  
16 also affecting mountain lion habitat and raptor habitat.  
17 Now, what that could do is it could affect something very  
18 much like what happened with Mt. Tam where people are  
19 deciding to build their homes. They want to build homes  
20 higher and higher and higher. They want that view.

21 Mountain lions are going to be driven over the  
22 hills into Rockville or decide that they want to come into  
23 the City of Napa. They're losing habitat. That's what  
24 happens. Somebody moves you off your land, you go farther.  
25 That's what happens. Same thing will happen to them.

40

January 7, 2015

1 We're going to subject campers to unnecessary silicon  
2 dioxide, which I understand is a carcinogen. Is that true?  
3 We'll find out, hopefully not too late.

4 I would encourage the men of Union 3 to continue  
5 work. Go to work every single day and do the best jobs you  
6 can, but really process this in your heads. Is this what  
7 you would have next door to your homes or your kids'  
8 schools? This is in our backyard. And we understand you  
9 need to make a living, but we need to live here too, and it  
10 was never meant to be like this.

11 One of the things that I saw on the map here that  
12 was kind of concerning was Arroyo Creek, and they said they  
13 mitigated part of the site. Water doesn't care about your  
14 boundaries. It's going to absorb the carcinogens and move  
15 it down Arroyo Creek. That doesn't sound like it's a good  
16 idea either.

17 My grandfather would say something along the  
18 lines of just because you can do it doesn't mean that you  
19 should. He would say a lot of things, things that I can't  
20 really say in public forum. He would also say something  
21 along the lines of once you do something, you cannot ever  
22 go back. You can't. There's no way of going back.

23 I think you can go up and down the Valley, you  
24 can go to the Mayacamas mountain ranges and the redwood  
25 trees that are barely coming back that built Portland, San

41

January 7, 2015

1 Diego, San Francisco. They're barely coming back, and it's  
2 120 years later. That land will not grow back. It doesn't  
3 have a seed. It is what it is. It's important to  
4 understand with pens and ties. It's very important to  
5 understand.

6           Syar is a guest in our community, and they're a  
7 welcomed guest. We want them here. As my right and  
8 honorable friend said, mining is not a terrible thing. We  
9 need it. People light matches. You need sulfur. You want  
10 to build roads. You need concrete. But it's very  
11 important how we explore these minerals and how they enter  
12 the air, how they enter our water, how they enter the  
13 animals, the animals that we may even consume some day.  
14 It's very important to think of.

15           I think another thing to look at is that from my  
16 notes when I was looking back and forth here, it seems that  
17 Syar is losing the American Canyon Quarry, which means they  
18 need to compensate for the next 35 years of profits.  
19 That's what we saw up here. That's not a lie. The lawyer,  
20 the fellow representing Syar, also mentioned something  
21 along the lines of climate change. If you take down some  
22 of those hillsides and some of those trees, you introduce  
23 climate change. It's true. And no matter how much we try  
24 to distort the facts or say that it's in the name of profit  
25 or that we need more roads, I don't think the gentlemen

42

January 7, 2015

1 understand that there's parts of the roads of Browns Valley  
2 that have never even been touched. They're still cracked  
3 since the Martin administration, the Harry Martin  
4 administration.

5           So with that known and understood, people don't  
6 really react very well when you start dipping into their  
7 profits. I understand this. Men need to work. Children  
8 need to go to school. The other gentleman made the right  
9 point, though. How are you going to do any of that if  
10 you're poisoned? I don't know if many of you live in Napa.  
11 Sounds like some of you live outside of town. My concern  
12 is what happens to us who live here in town and who don't  
13 live on the outskirts? We have to live here.

14           Napa's very privileged. Napa's very privileged.  
15 But the one thing that we're the most privileged of is the  
16 land that we live on. And you can't get that back. We beg  
17 you. We ask you for your wisdom. The Council that stands  
18 here, we ask you to please review this. Look it over.  
19 Look it over three times. Look it over 100 times. No  
20 matter how many times they do this with their pens, we beg  
21 you for your wisdom. Thank you.

22           MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Jones. Mike  
23 Costanzo.

24           MR. COSTANZO: Good afternoon. I'm Mike  
25 Costanzo. I'm with the Napa County Bicycle Coalition, and

January 7, 2015

1 you're probably wondering what possibly would bring us  
2 here. And it's really very simple. By the way, I don't  
3 envy you, this kind of decision you have to make. It's  
4 very complicated on all sides, pluses and minuses. I don't  
5 envy you.

6           Anyway, the reason why I came here and am taking  
7 a few minutes of your time is to suggest, if it is your  
8 decision to move forward with this in some fashion that  
9 accommodates the best interest of the community, that there  
10 is another potential mitigation that would really benefit a  
11 broad range of the community, and that is to perhaps work  
12 into this agreement an easement for the Vine Trail to  
13 connect Kennedy Park to the Napa Pipe Project, which is  
14 going to be the -- which is the alignment.

15           And I know the folks at Syar have been approached  
16 about this easement, and they may well have already decided  
17 to grant it. But it's super important. There's lots of  
18 benefits. There's economic, traffic and health benefits  
19 for the community, having this kind of protected bikeway.  
20 So that's why I'm here. Here's a way to have something  
21 really good for the community come out of this if, indeed,  
22 the Commission decides to move forward with this. Thank  
23 you.

24           CHAIR PHILLIPS: Thank you. Mr. Dave Finigan,  
25 and after that will be Julia Winiarski.

44

January 7, 2015

1 MR. FINIGAN: Thank you. My name is is Dave  
2 Finigan. I'm the current chair of the Napa County Regional  
3 Park and Open Space District. I'm here representing the  
4 board. We did review the Draft EIR and we also reviewed  
5 the comments on our comments on the Final EIR. And so the  
6 board prepared a letter which I signed which you have, and  
7 I'm here to speak on that. I'm not going to go through the  
8 whole letter. I'm just going to comment on a few points  
9 that I think are important.

10 Quickly -- this is not about Syar in terms of how  
11 we feel. They're an outstanding operation. This is not  
12 about their jobs. They will have their jobs. This is not  
13 about their intent to try to expand. They should be  
14 allowed to expand. What this is about is the scope and the  
15 amount of expansion that they need to do that reflects the  
16 interests of them and the property owners and the Napa  
17 residents. And that's why I want to talk about the  
18 adequacy of the Final EIR, which is the item which is  
19 before you tonight, as opposed to the project at this time  
20 and some of the other issues that I know are important that  
21 will also be raised.

22 It's important to remember that the Skyline  
23 Regional Wilderness Park with it's 880 acres, 800 of which  
24 are in pristine wilderness area, is Napa Valley's Yosemite.  
25 We don't have any other regional park, and we will never

45

January 7, 2015

1 have another regional park of that size and scope in Napa  
2 County because of the way the county is already bought out  
3 and its dedication to agriculture. And that's fine. We  
4 understand that. But this is it, and so it becomes our  
5 Yosemite Valley here that we obviously feel very strongly  
6 about protecting and minimizing any impact it would have.

7           Again, as I had said, we're not necessarily  
8 opposed to this proposed expansion. We are opposed to the  
9 lack of information in the EIR on alternatives and the fact  
10 that we don't feel the Final EIR is adequate at this time.  
11 And that primarily revolves around the massive removal and  
12 quarrying of material on Pasini Ridge and other ridge line  
13 areas which will have certainly a dramatic impact upon  
14 Skyline Park.

15           You are all aware that CEQA requires you to look  
16 at the environmental impact of projects. Crucial to that  
17 process is you need to identify projects that will reduce  
18 the environmental impact of a project on its surrounding,  
19 and you also, obviously, are required to identify an  
20 environmentally superior alternative. That was done to a  
21 very limited extent in the Final EIR, but what has been  
22 done there is extremely inadequate. The reduced footprint  
23 is shown, but there is no information, no quantitative  
24 information in the amount of options that could occur in  
25 that, how much less production would come from that, maybe

46

January 7, 2015

1 some alternative footprints that would impact Pasini Ridge  
2 and some of the other ridges in a less  
3 environmentally-adverse fashion. There's nothing except a  
4 note of that and some very dismissive comments on our  
5 comments on that. That is -- the impact of Pasini Ridge  
6 and other ridges is the key to dealing with the  
7 environmental impacts of this proposed expansion of the  
8 quarry operation.

9           There's no -- there's no extensive mapping of any  
10 alternative outside of the preferred one and there's no  
11 quantification or any information that would allow you, as  
12 well as anybody else, to even determine if there is a  
13 better option other than what is proposed by the developer.  
14 And that is the reason why our board, when we reviewed  
15 this, got stuck. Because we aren't necessarily opposed to  
16 the expansion, you know, of the Syar quarry operation, but  
17 the report or the proposed Final EIR provides no  
18 information upon which to evaluate different options in  
19 order to determine if that is the best option in terms of  
20 their proposal. And that's why we're here.

21           There's a few other areas I'll also mention. You  
22 know, and again, it gets back to how our comments were  
23 responded to. There's going to be significant noise  
24 impacts throughout the area from an expansion of quarry  
25 operation. There's no way to get around that. The

47

January 7, 2015

1 proposed Final EIR before you to approve indicates that.  
2 It says yes, there's going to be significant noise impacts  
3 and its major mitigation, in order to do that, is  
4 acoustical shielding, which, of course, is provided by the  
5 Pasini Ridge. Except the project is planning to get rid of  
6 the Pasini Ridge before it's done. And the only other  
7 noise impacts in there, frankly, are quiet machines and  
8 monitoring, which is not going to be effective at all.

9           Finally, we also raised the issue of mitigation.  
10 You know, if you're going to mitigate taking woodlands  
11 away, it should be done somewhat near the project, and it  
12 should be done in a timely basis when the project is being  
13 done. And the response to us was it doesn't have to be  
14 done ever, you know. There's nothing that says it has to  
15 be done during the project, and there's nothing that says  
16 it has to be anywhere near the project or done in a timely  
17 basis. It's kind of like -- and so I guess there will be  
18 no mitigation.

19           So I really feel, and the basis for being here,  
20 is that this Final EIR is not ready for your final review  
21 and not ready for approval because it provides no  
22 significant information, no information that anybody can  
23 use to evaluate this project with some other alternatives  
24 and make a good decision on what the real project will be.  
25 Because this project will have, obviously, environmental

48

January 7, 2015

1 impacts throughout the area, even what's mitigated. And so  
2 we all have to be as careful as we can to do that.

3 So in conclusion, we feel the Syar quarry can be  
4 expanded in scope and operation in the manner that is  
5 economically beneficial to the applicant, but also  
6 protective of the wilderness area of Skyline Park and be a  
7 benefit to the 140,000 residents in Napa County. But it is  
8 impossible to identify and achieve this goal with the Draft  
9 Final EIR that is before you for consideration at this  
10 time. Thank you for your time.

11 CHAIR PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Finigan. And I  
12 would like to -- rebutting the letter that had been  
13 submitted by Mr. Finigan, there was one point that I was  
14 going to ask for further staff clarification on, which is  
15 the zoning of the Pasini property. And we can address that  
16 later, but I wanted to add that to the list.

17 Julia Winiarski and then Patrick Gilleran is  
18 after that.

19 MS. WINIARSKI: Hi. Good afternoon. Julia  
20 Winiarski, 9 Bonita Avenue in Alta Heights. I'm here as a  
21 member of the Advisory Board of the Wildlife Rescue Center  
22 of Napa County. It's the only licensed permitted wildlife  
23 rescue center in the county. Just wanted to express our  
24 concern for the wildlife that may be affected by this  
25 through habitat removal, noise, dust, increased traffic,

49

January 7, 2015

1 really, the increased industrialization in an area adjacent  
2 to the wildlife, the wilderness park. I'd also like, just  
3 as a private citizen, an individual, to say -- express my  
4 concern for the air quality issues. We already have so  
5 many days of poor air quality in the North Bay, and I  
6 really have concerns about that increasing with time.

7           And my main point that I'd like to make is about  
8 the statement in the Environmental Impact Report that says  
9 there will be significant and unavoidable greenhouse gas  
10 emissions from this operation. It's my understanding that  
11 the County is in the process of working on a climate action  
12 plan. As far as I understand, that hasn't been completed  
13 yet, and I would just really like to request that that be  
14 completed first before a long-term commitment, 35-year  
15 permit, is made to an industry that is a greenhouse gas  
16 emitter. Thank you very much.

17           CHAIR PHILLIPS: Thank you, Ms. Winiarski.  
18 Patrick Gilleran.

19           MR. GILLERAN: Yes. Patrick Gilleran, 2164  
20 Patton Avenue. And I too found the EIR comments very  
21 dismissive. Just wanted to say that right off the top.  
22 But I'm here as an individual today who's going to be  
23 affected by this project, and I take issue in the EIR on  
24 the Exhibit A on Mitigation Measure 4.3-2b, the fugitive  
25 dust. I, you know, really didn't know much about fugitive

50

January 7, 2015

1 dust until I started researching it and, in particular, I  
2 started researching other approved projects throughout the  
3 state. It turns out that there's other -- that 4.3 --  
4 there's a total of six items. It really falls short of  
5 being an effective program for dust, fugitive dust.

6           When I look at Marin's EIR on the quarry over in  
7 San Rafael, there's eight pages in the EIR on mitigating  
8 fugitive dust. I think it's really important that, you  
9 know, the standard of any observed fugitive dust means that  
10 you should stop and do something. There has to be these  
11 measures spelled out in the -- to mitigate this problem.  
12 The other thing I noticed, too, is that there's nothing  
13 about -- I know the South Coast Air Quality Management  
14 District, Rule 403, they referred to best available  
15 management practices, and there's no wording in there. And  
16 that wording allows the authorities having jurisdiction to  
17 come in and say "Are you actually doing the best  
18 available?" and requires them, in their program, to do the  
19 best available.

20           I think it's really important that language is  
21 placed into the fugitive dust mitigation measures that will  
22 protect the residents north -- especially north of the site  
23 itself, because the prevailing winds blow the dust in that  
24 direction. I've lived at the location now on Patton for  
25 16 years, and prior to that I lived up in Rutherford,

51

January 7, 2015

1 pretty much behind the Grange Hall up there, almost in a  
2 vineyard. And I swear I had more problems with dust at my  
3 house than I did ever in Rutherford. I drive by, and I see  
4 plumes of dust coming off the quarry. You know, something  
5 has to be done to protect any sensitive receptors such as  
6 the Chamberlain High School, the Head Start Daycare Center.

7 Yes, a time weighted average of exposure probably  
8 doesn't hurt them, but I know in Marin County, where the  
9 residents were concerned, the County went in and did air  
10 sampling near the point of a residential area to be  
11 definitive about whether or not the exposure was acceptable  
12 and not just some modeled -- you know, computer model that  
13 looked at prevailing winds and possible potential dust  
14 leaving the area. I think it's really important that the  
15 County step forward and does some forward thinking on this.  
16 Because as I see it, you know, it's a done deal. The  
17 quarry's got to be there, but the County has to take some  
18 responsibility in leading the way for the future of the  
19 citizens of Napa. Thanks.

20 CHAIR PHILLIPS: Thank you. So I'm going to  
21 pause here for a moment. That is all the speaker cards  
22 that I have. Can I see a show of hands of who has not yet  
23 spoken but would like to speak? So there's five people.  
24 So why don't we hear those speakers, and then we will take  
25 a five-minute break, comfort break, and then come back. So

52

January 7, 2015

1 I'll let you all come to the speaker on your own.

2 MS. FELCH: I won't be shy. My name is Kathy  
3 Felch. I am here today speaking in three capacities,  
4 really. I am the closest resident. Our home, we  
5 understand, is the closest residence to the project. I am  
6 a trained historian holding degrees in history, and I am an  
7 attorney. I experience Syar on a daily basis. The hill  
8 that we saw a picture of is the view out our family  
9 window -- family room window and our kitchen window and our  
10 yard. We will not see that hill if we live long enough to  
11 see it torn down.

12 We hear Syar. And I really encourage you not to  
13 fall into the trap of thinking of my comments as mere  
14 anecdotes. They aren't. In the language of an attorney, I  
15 am a percipient witness to the activity of Syar. What I  
16 have to say is important and not merely anecdotal. I hear  
17 it 24 hours a day. They will tell you they do not operate  
18 at night when we complain and they come out. But in the  
19 documents that you have already they say, "Well, when it's  
20 an emergency or when a customer needs product, we operate  
21 at night."

22 We know that to be the case because we hear the  
23 backup beepers. We hear the trucks. We hear the grinding.  
24 I have asked to be put on the list to be notified when  
25 there's blasting. I asked years ago for this. Never once

53

January 7, 2015

1 have I been notified, and I can tell you they've been  
2 blasting since then. I work a lot at home. I sit at my  
3 desk. I can feel the blasting. I can see the materials  
4 around my desk moving when they blast. So it's just not an  
5 anecdote. This is real.

6 Now, as to the draft. I agree with previous  
7 commenters that this is not ready for your decision. There  
8 are so many inconsistencies in this document that it just  
9 drove me crazy trying to go through it and patch it  
10 together. I simply didn't have time to do all of it. But  
11 I'm going to give you a couple of examples, and I encourage  
12 you, when you read the document again after hearing our  
13 comments, that you keep an eye on this.

14 I want to address a couple of items in the  
15 mitigation monitoring and reporting program. This relies  
16 almost exclusively on the applicant's self reporting,  
17 including groundwater use, even though it's going to be  
18 metered. This is self reporting. Self reporting we all  
19 know is no monitoring. It's simply not effective. On the  
20 air quality -- and I'd also like to say that the mitigation  
21 monitoring and reporting program relies heavily on  
22 maintaining logs. The applicant is going to maintain logs.  
23 Those logs are only produced to the County if the County  
24 asks for them.

25 So basically what's going to be happening is the

January 7, 2015

1 data that's collected, assuming that the data is accurate,  
2 it's accurately and timely collected, will never make it  
3 into public's view because it's dependent on the County  
4 making a request for it. What do we as citizens do if the  
5 County says "You know, I just don't think we need that data  
6 now"? What do we do? We have no recourse. We need more  
7 monitoring and oversight. It looks to me, quite frankly --  
8 I'm going to be very candid here. My opinion is this is a  
9 done deal. It's going to be approved. Because I think  
10 it's going to be approved -- and I hope I'm wrong, but I  
11 don't think I am -- we need some actual, effective  
12 oversight of the project, not just applicant keeping logs.  
13 That's, quite frankly, silly.

14           If you look at the draft conditions of permit, as  
15 the lawyer for the applicant advised you, and you should  
16 know by reading this the condition will come up for review  
17 every five years. Okay, well, let's look at the air  
18 quality mitigation. That requires that the applicant keep  
19 their logs, but they only have to keep them for two years.  
20 So let's say the applicant is diligent in their records  
21 destruction policy. They keep them for the first two  
22 years, destroy them. Keep them the second two years --  
23 we're now four years into the first five-year period --  
24 destroy them.

25           What do you, as the County Planning Commission,

55

January 7, 2015

1 have when you're looking at your five-year review? One  
2 year of data, assuming that the data is accurate as well,  
3 because it's kept by the applicant with no other oversight.  
4 So please, I urge you to look carefully at the mitigation  
5 monitoring and reporting program as to what really is the  
6 oversight that this project will have.

7 I too want to echo the previous comments on the  
8 responses to our previous comments being dismissive. My  
9 comment letter, which I reassert -- all my comments in my  
10 original comment letter to the Draft EIR I assert here.  
11 And in addition to their being dismissive, in one area,  
12 it's clearly erroneous. The County adopts the position,  
13 the County staff, with all due respect, that since the  
14 quarry was here before all the other operations, well,  
15 that's too bad. You started your operation, the school --  
16 the County started the schools after the quarry started,  
17 the residents built the residences after the quarry was  
18 here.

19 Well, that fact is not true as to our property  
20 and our residence. Our residence, which is on the corner  
21 of Penny Lane and Imola and goes down to where the two old  
22 barns are from the 19th century. If you go down Penny  
23 Lane, you'll see a herd of dairy goats. Those are our  
24 goats. That has been a farming operation and residence  
25 since the 1870s. It predates Syar, Basalt and any other

56

January 7, 2015

1 quarry operation that was over there. And we have had our  
2 property studied by the Napa Historical Society, and we  
3 have a report to that effect. And it offends me greatly  
4 that the County would just say "Oh, well. Oh, well. They  
5 were here first, so they get to do what they want." That  
6 is wrong. Not only were the comments dismissive, but as to  
7 our property, they're just plain wrong.

8           And another comment. I'm sorry, I could go on  
9 all day, but I won't. We don't use a single thing that  
10 Syar produces. Quite the contrary, we have maintained our  
11 property without using concrete. We do not add cement. We  
12 do not cover over the earth. We are re-farming our  
13 property as it was in the 1870s, and we intend to keep it  
14 that way. We don't have sidewalks, and the roads outside  
15 our house are used heavily by trucks. We've had thousands  
16 of trucks go by this year carrying product for Syar. Not  
17 one of those trucks was -- carried a covered load. Not  
18 one.

19           I've had the CHP out to look at it. They say  
20 "Oh, yeah, you're right, but we don't have the staff to  
21 monitor it and to enforce the rule." Who's going to  
22 enforce this air quality rule about the trucks going by  
23 with uncovered loads? Who? The Sheriff doesn't have the  
24 staff to have people out there. We've talked to them. CHP  
25 doesn't have the staff. Are we going to rely on the

57

January 7, 2015

1 applicant to do it when they're not doing it now?

2 I frankly think that this project should not be  
3 approved at all, but if it is, I urge you to take a closer  
4 look at what will really happen and the enforcement  
5 mechanisms that you have in place in this right now and  
6 strengthen them so it will mean something to those of us  
7 who live near it. Thank you. I'll stop nattering on.  
8 Thank you.

9 CHAIR PHILLIPS: Thank you. Is there anyone else  
10 wishing to speak?

11 MS. GLAROS: So I prepared a speech with a good  
12 morning, but I think I should say good afternoon. And I  
13 certainly appreciate the dedication of everyone here  
14 forging through with this, and I appreciated all the  
15 speakers ahead of me. I learned some new and interesting  
16 things.

17 My name is Dorothy Glaros. I am the president of  
18 Skyline Wilderness Park Citizens Association. I've been  
19 involved as a volunteer and in the governance of this park  
20 for most of the 30 years we've been open to the public.  
21 I'm also a lifelong Napa resident, involved in non-profits,  
22 and four generations of my family have lived on the same  
23 parcel on Silverado Trail. I have reviewed the FEIR, and  
24 I'm very concerned about many serious issues which do not  
25 seem to have received appropriate consideration in terms of

58

January 7, 2015

1 the substantial negative impact which will be caused if the  
2 Syar project is approved as presented to this Planning  
3 Commission. I'm going to cover six brief items.

4           Number one, a little history. Syar is a  
5 non-profit 501(c)(3), run by volunteers, non-paid, no  
6 money, volunteers who drive no financial benefit. We do  
7 this for the benefit of the tens of thousands of -- is this  
8 on -- tens of thousands of visitors to our beautiful Napa  
9 Valley each year. Just think how much money that brings  
10 into Napa.

11           Skyline Wilderness Park was first thought up by a  
12 group of citizens 36 years ago. There was nothing there  
13 but a garbage dump with tin cans and some concrete  
14 stanchions that used to house the old State Hospital  
15 chicken barns and cow barns. Everything you see there was  
16 created by us, everything, except for the social center  
17 which was a dirt floor barn. It's been created by, built  
18 by, maintained by, improved by a volunteer force with a  
19 small paid staff. We function without one penny of  
20 taxpayer money. It is truly due in credit to its founding  
21 fathers, mothers and volunteers, and it is certainly worth  
22 preserving.

23           Second, I want to be very clear. Although  
24 Skyline is a neighbor of Syar, we are not a nimby. We are  
25 a community asset. It is used not only by Napa County

59

January 7, 2015

1 residents, but also many visitors to Napa Valley who use  
2 our park as a home base to camp, hike, ride their horses  
3 and bikes. We have visitors that come across the United  
4 States play in our 18 hole -- our accredited 18 hole disc  
5 golf range, and I welcome you to come and try it.

6           It is not unusual on any specific weekend to have  
7 in our park people staying from England, Finland, Germany  
8 and Australia all at the same time. It puts our rangers on  
9 their toes to try to speak to them. So if I say we are  
10 speaking for visitors worldwide in addition to the wildlife  
11 in the park, I'm not exaggerating. We are advocating for  
12 many who have enjoyed Skyline Park in the past and have  
13 expectations of being able to experience it again in its  
14 current state as a wilderness park in the future.

15           Third and most importantly -- which is what you  
16 want to hear and why we are here today -- is the FEIR is  
17 incomplete and has inadequately responded to many of our  
18 concerns presented in the DEIR. There are quite simply too  
19 many inadequate responses within the FEIR, including at  
20 times a total lack of mitigation for me to review within  
21 the time allotment granted today.

22           Let me just give you one example. There's two  
23 items in 23. The second one specifically says, and I  
24 quote, "Because of the potential impact on trail users,  
25 especially equestrians riding the trails, the association

60

January 7, 2015

1 requests notification be given to the park 24 hours in  
2 advance of blasting so trail users, hikers, bikers and  
3 especially equestrians and campers be notified in advance,"  
4 unquote.

5           If you're here camping from a foreign country and  
6 you're sleeping calmly in your tent or you're hiking up on  
7 the trail, let's say, up above the -- along Skyline Trail  
8 next to the property line and you're enjoying -- and it's  
9 beautiful, it's bucolic, and all of a sudden blasting  
10 occurs and scares the pants off you, is that a way for us  
11 to live?

12           If you're an equestrian and you're riding a green  
13 horse -- and I don't mean a horse of the color green. I  
14 mean when it's not trained really well -- and you're  
15 working with Skyline Park, and you stop a minute and you're  
16 enjoying the scenery, you're enjoying the wildlife, you're  
17 enjoying the peace and quiet, and that blasting goes off  
18 and your horse jumps and you get thrown off and you get  
19 hurt. This is a safety issue.

20           We were pretty specific about what we asked Syar  
21 to do, which was notify us 24 hours in advance so we can  
22 notify these other people. Because if I had a green horse  
23 and I knew there was going to be blasting going on today in  
24 Skyline Park, I wouldn't ride today. I'd ride tomorrow,  
25 save myself falling on the ground.

61

January 7, 2015

1           We also asked for the blasting to be contained,  
2 not before 9:00 a.m. and hopefully not after 2:00 p.m. We  
3 could actually go later. Because if you look in that  
4 document it says that they can start from 6:00 a.m. until  
5 10:00 p.m. You're sleeping in your tent and dynamite goes  
6 off at 6:00 a.m. So we ask that very specifically, pretty  
7 specific in 23. Shall I tell you what the response was?  
8 Quote, "Comment noted," unquote. That's a non-response and  
9 a complete and total lack of disregard for the safety of  
10 our park users and the enjoyment of people who come to our  
11 park worldwide.

12           The whole document is fraught with non-responses,  
13 non-answering concerns, giving the wrong information or  
14 changing the information. And another example of  
15 inaccuracies. Go back to your 1973 EIR. The winds at that  
16 time came from the southwest. In today's document they  
17 come from the south. How wind direction could change from  
18 '73 to now is curious. However, it does not change the  
19 fact that dust and noise will be carried by that wind in  
20 the direction of Skyline Park, which, by the way, is  
21 situated to the north and east of the Syar property and  
22 directly in the path of whatever blows, vibrates or  
23 resonates in its direction. But this contradicts the  
24 assumption that's made in the EIR because they said we're  
25 not going to be impacted. I don't think it's exactly

62

January 7, 2015

1 correct information.

2           Fourth, to the Napa County Planning Commissioners  
3 who are charged in making the decision on this project. I  
4 have learned through life experience to never ask a  
5 question you don't already know the answer to. So I'm  
6 going to ask you, how many of you have been out to Skyline  
7 Park. I know you've been out to Syar. How many of you  
8 have been out to Skyline Park, met with our trail master  
9 who is here today and has an invitation for you, myself,  
10 any of the other staff and volunteers and said "Show me  
11 what this project or this EIR -- how is this going to  
12 affect your park?" Wait, I can answer that question  
13 because I know the answer. None of you. None of you.  
14 Doesn't mean we shouldn't have offered you the invitation,  
15 but we believed in the process, and oh, my, were we  
16 surprised when we saw this FEIR.

17           As stewards of the Napa Valley, don't you have a  
18 responsibility to come out and check this out on your own  
19 before you put your okey-dokey on this FEIR? Shouldn't you  
20 understand the impact of the project before you approve it?  
21 Don't you want to see firsthand the negative impact that  
22 excavating the Pasini Ranch at that area is going to cause  
23 us? I know I would. Because if you pass this FEIR today,  
24 then in essence you're saying I'm okay with this FEIR and  
25 the project. That's the message you're sending.

63

January 7, 2015

1 Fifth, a little bit of education. The Pasini  
2 Ranch was not part of the original purchase when Syar  
3 bought out Basalt Rock, nor, by the way, was it in the  
4 original 1973 EIR. It's been a recent purchase. And I am  
5 sure Mr. Pasini is now rolling over in his grave thinking  
6 of what's being proposed for his ranch. Because if any of  
7 you know the name Bill Bishop, Sr., who, by the way, got a  
8 National Vaquero Award -- one of four given out in the  
9 United States -- ran cattle there. A lot of history in  
10 that Pasini Ranch, none of which means going down and  
11 digging out the rock.

12 So the reduced footprint option of leaving out  
13 Pasini Ranch, which we threw in, was never really addressed  
14 in the EIR. It was asked to be addressed. If due  
15 diligence was actually part of the drafting of the FEIR,  
16 why were no lesser alternatives explored as a potential  
17 mitigation of this overreaching project?

18 Sixth and final point. How much development for  
19 the sake of adding a few more jobs is too much? These  
20 questions were recently asked you concerning the Walt  
21 Ranch, and I know you spent a lot of time on a Saturday  
22 listening to them. I'm hoping that you will give us the  
23 same consideration to that today. Syar was quoted in the  
24 newspaper as saying it might create some part-time seasonal  
25 jobs with this. Does the possibility of maybe creating a

64

January 7, 2015

1 few part-time jobs offset the destruction of some  
2 incredibly beautiful wilderness and the enjoyment of tens  
3 of thousands of visitors worldwide? I certainly hope you  
4 say no because the County obviously wants rock for their  
5 roads.

6 I don't think that's a reason you should approve  
7 this project. I think, just stating that, it sounds like  
8 the County of Napa has a vested interest in this or a  
9 conflict of interest, and I am deathly afraid of that.  
10 There's an elephant in the room, and that means there's a  
11 lot of big money in here. I get it. I get it. Syar wants  
12 to continue their business. But guess what? Skyline want  
13 to continue their business too.

14 So in the immortal words of my hero, John Wayne,  
15 you can say, "Woah, hold on there a minute." Please do not  
16 give this ill-conceived project a rubber stamp of approval.  
17 It needs to be sent back to your staff and other  
18 professionals for some real answers and reasonable  
19 mitigation measures. I ask you to not certify this EIR  
20 today, this FEIR today, as it stands. This document before  
21 you was not prepared according to CEQA, or at least the  
22 CEQA I know of. I invite you to come to Skyline Park and  
23 see firsthand what will happen to our unique park and your  
24 unique park if you include all of this into the Syar  
25 Expansion Project.

65

January 7, 2015

1           One thing I learned from Mr. Isul (phonetic) when  
2 I worked in the Napa City General Plan is when you pave  
3 over something, when you walk over something, it's gone.  
4 You'll never get it back. When you take down our  
5 mountainside, when you make a gravel pit out of it, that  
6 part of the wilderness will be gone forever. It will never  
7 ever be replaced for the sake of a few dollars. Your  
8 children, your grandchildren, your great grandchildren,  
9 will never be able to experience that because someone has  
10 made a few dollars.

11           Lastly, why not consider saving Skyline Park from  
12 the ravages of ill-conceived planning and assist Napa  
13 residents to place the Pasini property into the Regional  
14 Parks and Open Space District or add the property directly  
15 to Skyline Park as a mitigation for the rest of the project  
16 at a reasonable cost. That was proposed to me by many  
17 people, including some County officials. It's a very  
18 interesting thought indeed and worthy of your consideration  
19 for future generations who have not yet experienced a  
20 wilderness park.

21           This truly is a unique park. I don't know of any  
22 other park like this in the State of California and  
23 probably maybe not in the United States. And all of this  
24 is put out. It's a wilderness park. We have wonderful  
25 stuff, all done by volunteer citizens who have no financial

66

January 7, 2015

1 gain on this, for the benefit of how many people each year.  
2 I implore you, please do not approve this FEIR without all  
3 the mitigations in place first because they're certainly  
4 not mitigations that have been put in place yet. Thank you  
5 for your time.

6 CHAIR PHILLIPS: Thank you. Okay. Is there  
7 anybody else -- and now in light of the time, if we really  
8 could keep -- okay, thank you. And new points and the  
9 three minutes would be --

10 MR. ARANSON: Hi. My name is John Aranson. I  
11 live in Marin County but I work at Skyline Park, and I'm  
12 the trail coordinator at the park. And I'm here to talk  
13 mostly about process and also to talk to you about Skyline  
14 Park. I live in a county where I have two national parks,  
15 five state parks, five county parks, an open space district  
16 and a water district.

17 And one thing that's really sad to me about Napa  
18 is that we don't have a lot of open space. We have an open  
19 space district that's just been formed. They've done an  
20 incredible job acquiring property, but with the viticulture  
21 in Napa, Skyline Park is one of the few places that people  
22 can go and play disc golf, ride their horse, go for a hike  
23 and go for a mountain bike ride. It's one of the most  
24 unique parks, like Dorothy said, that I've ever come  
25 across.

67

January 7, 2015

1           So I'm talking about process. And the Syar  
2 Industry -- I've worked with Mr. Perry on redesigning the  
3 Skyline Trail which is also part of the Bay Area Ridge  
4 Trail, which I'm also a trail planner for. I work part  
5 time for the Ridge Trail as well. And I'm intimately  
6 knowledgeable about the CEQA process when it comes to trail  
7 design and trail planning. And there was no comments made  
8 at all about the redesign of the Skyline Trail, which is a  
9 regional trail, part of the Bay Area Ridge Trail, and no  
10 comments were made at all on that particular realignment.  
11 I have the map here. I think the map was submitted to the  
12 Planning Commission, so I would urge you guys to please  
13 look at that again.

14           Just quickly, again, I really would love to take  
15 you guys up to the Pasini Knoll. The Pasini Knoll drops  
16 off very steeply, and it's one of the most pristine parts  
17 of our park. You can see three different counties from  
18 that park. You can see Mt. Tam, Mt. Diablo, the Napa  
19 River. And the noise coming up from that valley is going  
20 to be significant.

21           The last thing I'd like to say is I understand  
22 the importance of rock to improve our infrastructure to  
23 keep jobs and maintain the quality of life that we have  
24 here in Napa, but I also understand the importance of open  
25 space, and I also understand the importance of regional

68

January 7, 2015

1 parks and regional trails to the culture of everybody who  
2 lives here in Napa. So I would just ask you to really take  
3 consideration about making comments to the realignment and  
4 to look closely about what's happening at Pasini Knoll and  
5 also to take my invitation to take you on a guided hike of  
6 that area. Okay? Thank you.

7 CHAIR PHILLIPS: Thank you for the invitation.  
8 Okay.

9 MS. WYMAN: Lynn Wyman, Green Valley Road, Napa.  
10 Thank you, Madame Chairman and members of the Commission  
11 for taking our comments today. You're entrusted to protect  
12 the health, safety and welfare of the Napa citizens and  
13 visitors to the county. This entails making difficult  
14 decisions.

15 Napa County has significant volcanic rock which  
16 contain silicate. Silicate is like asbestos. When it is  
17 released to the air, it is dangerous. When excavated, dust  
18 with silicate will be released and becomes airborne.  
19 Silicate particles can then travel several miles. When  
20 inhaled by people and animals, the particulates become  
21 embedded in the lungs and cannot be expelled. A lung  
22 disease called silicosis causes inflammation and reduced  
23 lung function. The University of California at Davis has  
24 done -- conducted an extensive study of silicosis in  
25 equines. It causes demineralization of a horse's bones,

69

January 7, 2015

1 leading to catastrophic fractures.

2           Syar expansion with blasting and excavating will  
3 release silicate into the air and can be carried miles.  
4 This rock mining excavation is no longer an appropriate  
5 land use adjacent to residential areas, schools and  
6 recreation areas. Please make the difficult decision to  
7 protect the health, safety and welfare of your citizens and  
8 deny Syar's request to expand its mining operations.

9           CHAIR PHILLIPS: Thank you.

10           MR. PARKER: My name is Frederick Parker. I'm  
11 here on behalf of the Skyline Wilderness Park. I'm the  
12 assistant to the trails manager. I live at 2732 Azalea  
13 Street.

14           Napa is my home and birthplace. Skyline Park is  
15 my backyard. It is my garden. It is just that to all who  
16 come to enjoy it. As it stands today and now, all of the  
17 world comes to enjoy this park. We did not foresee the  
18 expansion of Syar onto Pasini Ranch when the park was  
19 founded. Pasini Ranch was not designated as a mineral  
20 resource area then, and the Final EIR is inadequate and  
21 does not answer all of the questions proposed.

22           Who is to assume the cost of the restoration of  
23 Skyline Park when we move the Skyline Trail away from the  
24 blasting area and away from the ridge that's going to be  
25 created? That was not addressed. If it's not addressed,

70

January 7, 2015

1 who is to assume the cost? It's not a mitigation of the  
2 EIR, and it is incomplete. The proposed project threatens  
3 this very sanctity of the park. Our garden -- as it is  
4 destructive, blasting, drilling, machinery and shipping  
5 noise would be present along with the dust, reducing the  
6 good quality of air around that area immediately.

7 All of the equestrian riders of this park will be  
8 in danger during the blasting time periods. The tent  
9 campers in the area will, of course, feel the effects of  
10 blasting, along with our neighbors as well. We also hold  
11 races in the park. This will be affected as well by  
12 blasting along with moving the Skyline Trail or rerouting  
13 it. This project will certainly displace wildlife, along  
14 with extremely old oak trees. I don't know if any of you  
15 know how long it takes for an oak tree to get as large as  
16 they do, but when you look around at this wilderness, there  
17 is many oak trees that are conceivably over 50 to 100 years  
18 old, and you're going to destroy those lives.

19 It imposes not only upon the people and the  
20 visitors of Skyline, but the wildlife will suffer as well.  
21 I've seen the whole of the bottom of Skyline Trail. I'm  
22 not sure what that place is called. I heard it called the  
23 Blue-something or other. It sits as an open wound in the  
24 earth, and they mean to turn Pasini Ranch or that Pasini  
25 Knoll into the same wound. The trail runs the border of

71

January 7, 2015

1 the new operation. It is part of the viewpoint. There is  
2 multiple viewpoints along this trail, and that quality will  
3 be diminished as well with the excess dusts in the air,  
4 along with the removal of the earth.

5 To advance this way only gives profit to Syar.  
6 But Skyline, Napa itself, the people who live here, the  
7 children of Napa, your children and theirs, they will see  
8 and feel the loss of this beauty. California in itself and  
9 visitors from all over the world, they will experience the  
10 loss of this beauty with us. They will see and hear the  
11 destruction, and we are representing Napa in this way, and  
12 it is all brought to you by this expansion. All life  
13 around this project will suffer.

14 I ask you to ask yourself, is this right? Is  
15 this just? You grant Syar the expansion, and you will only  
16 take from yourselves. This is your home too. This is your  
17 children's home. This garden, this park, belongs to the  
18 children of tomorrow. Let us keep it pristine as it stands  
19 today, now. I hope you'll take the invitation to come  
20 visit Skyline Park and view what this destruction may cause  
21 us to lose. Thank you.

22 CHAIR PHILLIPS: Thank you. Okay. I am going to  
23 close the public comment period and oh -- actually, Syar,  
24 you were going to speak again. So I'm reopening it.

25 MR. ADAMS: Hello again. Tom Adams from Syar.

72

January 7, 2015

1 It's really -- you know, it's good to see people out and  
2 interested about the project, but I think there's been a  
3 little bit of misinformation out there, and I think it  
4 would do everyone a lot of good to take a step back and  
5 let's look at the facts.

6 I've got figures here. Bear with me. Here's one  
7 that I think's interesting. You can see the red outline.  
8 That's the property, quarry property. Let's see if I can  
9 get this pointer going. This area right here is Pasini.  
10 You can see the exclusion areas highlighted in the lighter  
11 green and dark green. These are the 327 acres of exclusion  
12 areas that have been required to be avoided in order to  
13 mitigate impacts to oak, woodlands and other biological  
14 resources. This area right here, Pasini, is where most of  
15 the basalt is located. The other areas right here, much  
16 closer to Skyline Park, this is State Blue.

17 Currently this is an operating quarry. We are  
18 blasting today. It is -- not literally, but this is not a  
19 new project that's being proposed, and I think that's  
20 important to note. And in fact, if we weren't allowed to  
21 go into Pasini, which is here, again, we'd be focusing on  
22 State Blue, much closer to the park users, and it would  
23 have much greater impact. And it should be noted that  
24 Pasini Knoll is actually on Syar's property and is not part  
25 of the park. So when you're on the Pasini Knoll, you're

73

January 7, 2015

1 actually on Syar's property.

2           This is a figure -- all these figures are in the  
3 EIR. This one is in particular that shows the impacts to  
4 the trail that were stated as not being addressed in the  
5 EIR. As you can see through the insets, it shows where the  
6 trail is encroaching on Syar's property. This is Skyline  
7 Trail. Skyline Trail is one trail out of many on the park.  
8 There are over 25 miles of trail in the park. Less than a  
9 mile are encroaching onto Syar's property.

10           This is Skyline Trail, and if anyone's been on  
11 Skyline Trail and Upper Skyline Trail, you know it's one of  
12 the steeper trails and probably receives probably the  
13 lowest level of use, just due to the difficulty associated  
14 with the trail. In fact, I've -- equestrians may use  
15 Skyline Trail, but I've never seen an equestrian up on  
16 upper Skyline Trail. I've seen them on Buckeye. What was  
17 the question?

18           CHAIR PHILLIPS: We can focus on --

19           MR. ADAMS: So as you can see, out of the  
20 25 miles of trail, more than 25 miles of trail, on Skyline  
21 Park, the ones that are on Syar's property make up less  
22 than a mile.

23           These are the current operations. This is the  
24 map that shows what is currently going on at Syar. And you  
25 can see that the main production facility is down in this

74

January 7, 2015

1 area, asphalt plant, all the processing. These areas out  
2 here are where the mining occurs to transport that material  
3 to the processing center, so that's why the blasting would  
4 occur in those areas.

5 It should also be noted that when you get to the  
6 visual simulation that was included in the EIR -- oh, and I  
7 should also note that the -- I think the, you know, I guess  
8 attempt by Ms. von Rosenberg to try to recreate a visual  
9 simulation of the view from -- of what she called the  
10 foreground impacts actually showed the removal of a portion  
11 of the Skyline Park property, which is totally off property  
12 for Skyline. That block that she showed being removed is  
13 not even Syar's property.

14 But what we have here is -- so what they did is  
15 they looked at over 200 specific viewpoints throughout the  
16 community to determine what the impact of the quarry would  
17 have on different parts, you know, the parks and  
18 residential communities, et cetera. And they also included  
19 Skyline Park. And these ones are right here. These are  
20 here on Skyline Park. And if you look closely at this  
21 figure that's in the Draft EIR, Figure 4.3-4, you'll see  
22 that the figures -- I think it's 8 -- viewpoints 8, 9 and  
23 10, where they did the viewshed simulation, are actually  
24 taken from Syar's property.

25 So they're taken from trail segments within that

75

January 7, 2015

1 less than a mile of the trails that are on Syar's property,  
2 looking from Syar's property onto Syar's property. So when  
3 the trail is realigned off Syar's property, that's a very  
4 good opportunity to place the trail not only on Skyline  
5 Park's property, but also in an area where the viewshed  
6 impacts would be minimized. But let's look at what those  
7 impacts are, because they were evaluated in EIR, and they  
8 went to the effort of creating these simulations.

9           So site C8, Skyline Park, existing conditions,  
10 the bottom one. That's what it looks like. See it on the  
11 top? That's what it's going to look like in 35 years. C9,  
12 existing conditions, looking from Skyline Trail on Skyline  
13 -- or on Syar's property into the quarry. This is what  
14 it's going to look like in 35 years. C10, this is looking  
15 into Pasini. That's existing, that's future. Existing,  
16 future. So there are going to be impacts. And here's  
17 another one, Skyline Park. Top is existing, bottom is  
18 future.

19           So there obviously are going to be some impacts  
20 on Skyline Park, and we don't want to minimize those. But  
21 I think it's important to note that the EIR does identify  
22 that as an issue and thoroughly analyzed it. Now, an EIR,  
23 as we've all experienced in the CEQA process in general,  
24 typically does not always make everyone happy, and it's not  
25 required to be a perfect document. It's required to make a

76

January 7, 2015

1 good faith effort to take a hard look at what the impacts  
2 of the project are going to be based on substantial  
3 evidence and then evaluate what the impacts are and  
4 mitigate those as feasible to a level of less than  
5 significance using established thresholds of significance,  
6 which the County has done. This isn't a Syar document.  
7 The County published this document.

8           So there are a lot of topics raised, but I'll  
9 just go over some of these generally. Important issue that  
10 addresses a lot of the comments that were made is the  
11 health risk assessment that was undertaken. This is a  
12 highly regulated industry. It is very well documented and  
13 known that quarries have the potential to create health  
14 risks. That is not disputed. In fact, that is clearly  
15 discussed in the EIR, and that is the reason why a health  
16 risk assessment was undertaken.

17           The health risk assessment looked -- you know,  
18 using Bay Area Air Quality Management District thresholds  
19 of significance that are intended to protect the health of  
20 the public, USEPA, California Resource Board and County  
21 General Plan Policies, it looked at impacts associated with  
22 diesel exhaust, mobile emissions, fugitive dust, the  
23 asphalt plant, et cetera, and it concluded that mitigation  
24 measures were required at the 2 million ton per year  
25 production level, and it proposed mitigation measures that

77

January 7, 2015

1 would reduce that to less than significant. And those  
2 mitigation measures addressed NOx, fugitive dust and  
3 emissions associated with health risk.

4 Now, what we're proposing is that we acknowledge  
5 that people are concerned. And so the EIR concludes that  
6 even at 2 million tons, it's less than significant. But  
7 what Syar -- and I believe to be in agreement with the  
8 County is saying that we'll take 1.3. If we can get down  
9 to 1.3, we fall well below what the EIR analyzed as being  
10 -- as mitigated less than significant to address the health  
11 issues associated with air quality, GHG, traffic, et  
12 cetera.

13 So, again, these are real issues, and they were  
14 identified, and it's serious. This was a  
15 six-and-a-half-year process with millions of dollars spent.  
16 And, you know, a lot of these same comments were heard  
17 early on in the process, and they were taken into  
18 consideration. And I know -- you know, I use Skyline Park.  
19 My family does. And I know that there will be some impact.  
20 But to be quite honest, the quarry is something that has  
21 been there for 100 years. I don't think it will have the  
22 negative impacts that a lot of people think that it may,  
23 especially given that the current operations are currently  
24 blasting and creating a lot of the concerns as we heard  
25 from one of the speakers right now. And those aren't

78

January 7, 2015

1 subject to the mitigation measures and the oversight that  
2 this use permit -- or this permit process was put in place.

3           Noise and vibration, another big topic for the  
4 EIR. They had long-term and short-term monitoring  
5 formalities, measurements. They identified five locations  
6 around the property as sensitive receptors, including the  
7 equestrian area. Again, could there have been more  
8 locations? Probably. But at some point you rely on  
9 professional judgment to determine what the appropriate  
10 number of locations are to reflect the overall impacts,  
11 their representative, and you use that information to  
12 analyze what the impacts are going to be on the various  
13 surrounding land uses.

14           Blasting was also analyzed, and there was  
15 monitoring that took place south of Imola on the park at  
16 Penny Lane and in addition to the blasting measurements and  
17 monitoring that was conducted independently, Syar also did  
18 their own additional monitoring to address concerns because  
19 they've heard from a number of these neighbors in the past,  
20 and so they've gone out and investigated, and there have  
21 been mitigation measures that have been required for noise  
22 and blasting.

23           And the conclusion is that if you look at the  
24 levels of significance established by the County, the  
25 impacts are less than significant. And people may want to

January 7, 2015

1 debate that, but, I mean, that's what the professionally  
2 prepared report states, and I have no reason to doubt that  
3 it's accurate. Maybe people aren't happy with the  
4 standards and thresholds that are in place, but I have  
5 confidence that the methodology was correct.

6 Water quality. The State just recently adopted a  
7 new general industrial storm water permit that applies to  
8 Syar that is much more onerous than the previous industrial  
9 storm water permit, and that requires a lot of reporting  
10 and also modification of its best management practices for  
11 water quality when certain thresholds are exceeded, and so  
12 they have to continuously go in.

13 As you should be aware, there was actually -- you  
14 know, I mean, there was a lawsuit filed against Syar, and  
15 they settled that lawsuit, and part of that settlement was  
16 compliance with the new storm water permit requirement and  
17 basically allowing this third party, the Baykeeper, to be a  
18 third party reviewer of the data. So they have to be  
19 involved. So they're -- in addition to the County and to  
20 Syar and to the State, now we have another third party  
21 reviewing the data and having input on how effective Syar's  
22 water quality measures are. So that's another measure  
23 that's in place, in addition to what we've already talked  
24 about about the additional compliance.

25 And as far as the concern about recordkeeping, I

80

January 7, 2015

1 don't think Syar has any problem with submitting all of its  
2 logs with its annual reports. That was a condition of  
3 approval, maybe oversight. Whether there's any  
4 inconsistency between the time necessary to, you know, keep  
5 your records versus the five-year annual reporting or  
6 hearing process. Because that's pretty unusual. I mean,  
7 no other projects in Napa are subject to an ongoing  
8 five-year review that I'm aware of. Let's see. . .

9 CHAIR PHILLIPS: And I want to be respectful that  
10 we were trying to limit people's time, and you've already  
11 had one opportunity to speak, so. . .

12 MR. ADAMS: Well, thank you for your time.

13 CHAIR PHILLIPS: Okay. Now that we've heard all  
14 the comments, I'm not closing the public comment period.  
15 Because of the recommendation for continuation we will  
16 leave that open. But I am going to recommend a five-minute  
17 break and then bring it back to the Commission for  
18 discussion and motion.

19 (Short recess.)

20 CHAIR PHILLIPS: So thank you, everyone, for  
21 remaining today. And thank you for the -- all of the  
22 comments. And I am now going to -- actually, I think, to  
23 ask for some clarification on now what -- to focus the  
24 discussion to bringing it back to Planning Commission.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. We received, as you

81

January 7, 2015

1 know, a lot of testimony today. We also received written  
2 testimony leading up to today, and I think it would behoove  
3 staff to go away for a bit and make some minor tweaks in  
4 response to some of those comments as well as bring back  
5 some additional information related to the alternatives.  
6 If I could, I could recommend a date of February 18th.

7 CHAIR PHILLIPS: And what would also be, I think,  
8 clarifying to both the public and the Commission of what  
9 those -- the two alternatives are that we are looking at.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. The two  
11 alternatives that we discussed today is the preferred or  
12 the environmentally superior, which is the reduced  
13 production from 2 million to 1.3, and the other is the  
14 reduced footprint alternative.

15 CHAIR PHILLIPS: Which includes the reduced  
16 production number as well as --

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

18 CHAIR PHILLIPS: No? It's just taking -- regards  
19 -- with regards to the Pasini property?

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's correct.

21 CHAIR PHILLIPS: Okay. So thank you for that  
22 clarification, and I am going to then bring it back to the  
23 Commission for comments.

24 COMMISSIONER POPE: Yeah. I would obviously  
25 support staff's recommendation for the continuance, and I

82

January 7, 2015

1 think -- I think we stand to, you know, lose very little by  
2 waiting a little bit longer. And I think we stand to  
3 perhaps engender a little bit more public trust in the  
4 process by holding out. So I would certainly be in support  
5 of a continuance.

6           And, you know, just saying it as an aside, I'm  
7 happy as a Commissioner to come and meet with anybody who  
8 wants to talk about their projects, and we appreciate the  
9 invitation today. You know, again, it probably bears  
10 repeating, none of us do this -- well, today I guess it  
11 becomes a full-time job, but none of us do this full time.  
12 None of us are professional planning commissioners. We  
13 mostly do this as an advocacy. And, you know, I've  
14 certainly been to Skyline Park myself a number of times and  
15 enjoy it regularly as somebody who appreciates the  
16 outdoors.

17           So, you know, I think we've got a situation here  
18 where all sides are coming from a place of good faith.  
19 Let's just spend a little bit more time to answer some  
20 questions, bolster public confidence, give staff a little  
21 time to address some of the things that were brought up in  
22 the last, you know, 24 hours or so and see where we stand  
23 on the 18th.

24           CHAIR PHILLIPS: Are there any other Commissioner  
25 comments or a motion?

83

January 7, 2015

1           COMMISSIONER BASAYNE: Well, I just -- just  
2 wanted to make a few comments. I think it's a great idea  
3 just to go back to the wheel and just take a little bit  
4 more time to fine tune. I think that's a good suggestion.  
5 We heard some important and significant perspectives today,  
6 and I absolutely want to commend the applicant's  
7 representative for his presentation, but I also want to  
8 commend citizens who came today to speak their minds and  
9 their hearts about this project.

10           And it's -- you know, again, it's an existing  
11 project, but we're proposing expansion that certainly may  
12 impact some folks here significantly. So it is worth our  
13 efforts to go back, to reevaluate, to retool. And, you  
14 know, I do believe you can't build roads without rock. You  
15 absolutely do need product here in the community. We do  
16 need the product that Syar produces. And having been a  
17 former banker, I am sensitive to the issue of increasing  
18 costs whenever it comes to a project, but I've also hiked  
19 the trails of Skyline Park, and I absolutely would be open  
20 to the invitation to go up, to take a look at the perceived  
21 impacts, and I would certainly recommend that to my fellow  
22 commissioners as well. So we have some time to do that.

23           But to Commissioner Pope's point, I think that  
24 this is a process that hopefully will create and engender  
25 some trust here, certainly on the part of the community.

84

January 7, 2015

1 And I also want to say that I do believe that Syar is an  
2 outstanding operation, that they've been sort of churning  
3 for the last six and a half years with this. And so this  
4 isn't a new concept. It's something they've put a lot of  
5 money into and worked hard to try to come to some kind of  
6 outcome that's positive. So I look forward to seeing that  
7 positive outcome with the recommendations from staff.

8           COMMISSIONER SCOTT: I too am comfortable with  
9 the continuance. I think we've heard a lot of information  
10 from different folks here, some of it new, much of it  
11 concerns that have existed for some time. I'd like the  
12 opportunity as well to visit Skyline Park. I've been there  
13 before at one of the changes or, if you will, proposals  
14 that was made a number of years ago. And unfortunately I  
15 wasn't with Mr. Aranson or a guide. I just climbed up to  
16 the top myself and climbed along the trail and tried to  
17 judge what the proposal was at that time and how it would  
18 impact Syar and also the visual impacts.

19           I'm very sensitive to the visual impacts, the  
20 sound impacts, to the neighbors. I'm -- personally, I'm a  
21 little concerned about nighttime operations. I'm certainly  
22 concerned about nighttime blasting. I don't think it's --  
23 I know if I lived there I'd be concerned about it, and I  
24 certainly understand the perspective of the neighbors who  
25 do. Anyhow, I think that a continuance as has been

85

January 7, 2015

1 suggested will give our staff the opportunity to address  
2 many of these issues that have been brought up and to  
3 respond to them, and at the same time, it will allow them  
4 to frame the different alternatives that are available to  
5 us on this project and allow us to make it better -- allow  
6 us to be better able to make an appropriate decision. So I  
7 would be supportive of that continuance.

8           COMMISSIONER COTTRELL: I also just wanted to  
9 make a couple of comments, and I am also supportive of a  
10 continuance. My first experience of the context of this  
11 project has been as a visitor to Skyline Park. I've hiked  
12 there and run there and lost at least one golf disc there,  
13 so I know something, a little bit, about the wilderness  
14 there. And I appreciate the citizens who have used that  
15 park so much coming to speak out and also the residents in  
16 the area letting us, the Commission, know their experiences  
17 as well.

18           And also I would acknowledge the presence of Syar  
19 on that property and the mining operations that have  
20 happened there, a tradition that started 100 years ago.  
21 And this County has embodied in its general plan goals  
22 related to continuing availability of aggregate for roads  
23 and other projects in the County as something that is  
24 important. So we are in a situation where we have two very  
25 unique public assets that share a boundary, and that's a

86

January 7, 2015

1 tough one. So acknowledging that, I think it's important  
2 to approach this thoughtfully and gather as much  
3 information as we can.

4           And so turning specifically to the EIR and  
5 questions about -- I think some of the discussion came up  
6 about alternatives. And I wanted to ask staff in this  
7 interim time if we could have a little bit more information  
8 about -- I think a lot of the comments we heard today had  
9 to do with that reduced footprint conservation alternative,  
10 and I think it would be helpful for the Commission to  
11 understand more of the tradeoffs that that -- that option  
12 would offer. Because I understand that the Pasini parcel  
13 is key to viewsheds and experience from Skyline. I also  
14 understand that that's a source of real import to the Syar  
15 efforts as well. So figuring out if, you know, there is  
16 some other modification of that alternative, I would be  
17 interested in hearing about that more as well.

18           CHAIR PHILLIPS: Okay. Well, I'm going to -- I  
19 see that there's a universal support of a continuation, and  
20 so I want to ask staff and Director Morrison, is this -- is  
21 that enough direction what you've gotten from our comments  
22 to feel like you could come back and be able to be prepared  
23 to meet what we need?

24           UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. What we plan on  
25 doing would be coming back with some clarifications of the

87

January 7, 2015

1 mitigation measures in order to make them a little bit more  
2 tighter and also to bring back some kind of matrix or  
3 comparison of the alternatives to provide the Commission  
4 better framework within which to make their decision.

5 CHAIR PHILLIPS: Okay. Well, I wanted to make  
6 sure that you are -- that you had the direction that you  
7 needed to be able to do your job. So that being said, I  
8 would entertain a motion.

9 COMMISSIONER POPE: So moved that we continue  
10 this item until --

11 CHAIR PHILLIPS: February --

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: February 18th.

13 COMMISSIONER BASAYNE: Second.

14 CHAIR PHILLIPS: All in favor?

15 ALL COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

16 CHAIR PHILLIPS: All opposed? Passes  
17 unanimously.

18 MS. FELCH: Just a request. I know many people  
19 could not be here today because the meeting took place in  
20 the daytime. I would like to see if we could have a  
21 meeting in the evening so that other members of the  
22 community can attend. Just for your consideration.

23 CHAIR PHILLIPS: And just for the record, can you  
24 state your name and address?

25 MS. FELCH: I'm sorry. I'm Kathy Felch, and I

88

January 7, 2015

1 live at 2196 Penny Lane, which is on the corner of Penny  
2 Lane and Imola in Napa. Thank you.

3 CHAIR PHILLIPS: Great. And I will leave that  
4 recommendation with staff with -- regarding scheduling.  
5 Thank you.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Chair Phillips, if it is  
7 the desire of the Commission to conduct an evening meeting,  
8 I think we would simply have to call that as a special  
9 meeting and then advertise and post appropriately.

10 CHAIR PHILLIPS: I will take comments from other  
11 Commissioners if you would like to discuss that now in  
12 terms of your preference for a special meeting or -- on the  
13 February 18th meeting.

14 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: My question would be -- you  
15 know, I like the idea of having people who were unable to  
16 attend today attend that meeting if they could do so in the  
17 evening, but I'm not sure what different perspectives they  
18 would provide. I mean, we've heard a lot of speakers  
19 today, and I can't imagine what could be provided that we  
20 haven't already heard in one form or another. The other  
21 issue is -- a special meeting, you know, it does create  
22 some difficulties for staff and for, you know, the rest of  
23 us who have other obligations, so. . .

24 CHAIR PHILLIPS: I guess the alternative would  
25 be, Ms. Felch, to encourage people that were unable to make

89

January 7, 2015

1 the meeting today to submit in writing to the County their  
2 concerns and their questions, and then it will be  
3 incorporated in terms of the responses and the public  
4 record.

5 MS. FELCH: Okay. I understand conservation of  
6 staff resources and your time. You've been enormously  
7 patient today listening to everyone. But I have heard that  
8 a lot of people feel shut out of the process because of the  
9 time of the meeting, which I understand is more convenient  
10 for staff and the Commissioners, but not for other working  
11 folk.

12 CHAIR PHILLIPS: It is tough. I understand.  
13 I've been on both sides of the podium, and I understand  
14 what a commitment it is to take a day off of work or your  
15 kids -- to come here and participate. So I do -- I'm  
16 totally empathetic to that.

17 MS FELCH: Okay. Well, we will take advantage of  
18 modern electronic communication and get more information to  
19 the Commissioners and staff.

20 CHAIR PHILLIPS: And staff especially --

21 MS. FELCH: Before the 18th.

22 CHAIR PHILLIPS: -- so they're able to respond to  
23 this specifically.

24 MS. FELCH: Okay. Thank you.

25 COMMISSIONER POPE: Yeah, I think that's a really

90

January 7, 2015

1 key point. If there's going to be any more information  
2 brought in, please make sure -- I think Don is probably the  
3 best -- please copy Donald Barrella on any e-mails.

4 CHAIR PHILLIPS: All right. Well -- and thank  
5 you everyone for coming today to participate with that.

6 (Public Hearing Item 9A was adjourned.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

January 7, 2015

1 I do hereby certify that the foregoing meeting was  
2 taken at the time and place therein stated; that the  
3 testimony of said parties was reported by me, a shorthand  
4 reporter and a disinterested person, and was under my  
5 supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

6  
7  
8 Jessica Dunlap  
9 CSR #13990  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25