

appendix **F**  
Expert Review Panel

## EXPERT REVIEW PANEL

Expert review panels were established to gather data and information and obtain technical assistance as needed to shape the research study. The Expert Review Panel comprised representatives of environmental resource agencies, local suppliers of aggregate, importers and transporters of aggregate, and users of aggregate. These representatives identified areas of concern in understanding aggregate supply issues and served as a resource to maximize the opportunities to successfully complete this study.

The agendas and summaries of the meetings are included in this appendix.

## REPRESENTATIVES

Abu-Bakr H. Al-Jafri, Caltrans District 11  
Matt Adams, Building Industry Association  
Maryam Babaki, City of National City  
Brian Baca, County of San Diego  
Brad Barnum, Association of General Contractors  
Michael Beck, Endangered Habitats League  
Vic Bienes, San Diego County Water Authority  
Paul Brown, San Diego Unified Port District  
Juan C. Castillo, CEMEX  
John Clinkenbeard, California Department of Conservation  
Jon Cloud, Hester's Granite  
Warren Coalson, EnviroMINE Inc.  
Randa Coniglio, San Diego Unified Port District  
John Corcoran, Aggregate Products Inc.  
Debbie Day, Engineering and General Contractors Association  
Dain Deforest, Vulcan Materials  
Matt Domen, San Diego & Imperial Valley Rail Road  
Tim Dyer, San Diego County Water Authority  
Scott Errica, Association of General Contractors  
Marcela Escobar-Eck, Atlantis Group, LLC  
Ian Firth, Hanson Aggregates  
Verne Freeman, Freeman Associates  
Elizabeth Goldmann, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Jim Griggs, Union Pacific Railroad  
Andy Hamilton, Air Pollution Control District  
Taylor Harrington, Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway  
John Hoegemeier, Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway

## **REPRESENTATIVES (CONT'D)**

Crystal Howard, EnviroMINE Inc.

Jeff Kermod, Caltrans District 11

Matt Malchow, California Air Resources Board

Michelle Mattson, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

David Mayer, California Department of Fish and Game

Gary McCall, Hanson Aggregates

Ed McKechnie, WATCO Companies

Gregg Monger, Western Aggregates

Jorge Monraz, ADMICARGA (Tijuana-Tecate Short Line Railroad) Gobierno de Baja California

Devon Muto, County of San Diego

Gary Nolan, Granite Construction

Tom Oberbauer, County of San Diego

Ron Popham, San Diego Unified Port District

Bill Prey, SANDAG

Jose Ramos, San Diego & Imperial Valley Rail Road

Don Seil, California Northern Railroad

Mike Shaw, Engineering and General Contractors Association

Craig Smith, CEMEX

Bill Terry, Eagle Rock Aggregates Inc.

Marcus Tyrance, Union Pacific Railroad

Juli Wilson, Vulcan Materials

Susan Wynn, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Arnie Veldkamp, Superior Ready Mix

Angelika Villagrana, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce

## **CALTRANS AND SANDAG STAFF**

Bill Figge, Deputy District Director, Planning Division

Chris Schmidt, Chief, Public Transportation Branch

Carolyn Alkire, Senior Regional Economist

Jack Boda, Former Director, Mobility Management and Implementation

Jim Linthicum, Director, Mobility Management and Implementation

Richard Chavez, Principal Engineer

Grace Chung, Associate GIS Analyst

Andy Gordon, GIS Analyst

Keith Greer, Senior Regional Planner

Kurt Kroninger, Director, Technical Services

Cheryl Mason, Senior Research Analyst

## **CONSULTANT**

Neal Driscoll, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, UCSD

[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]



## SUMMARY

### San Diego Regional Aggregate Supply Study

#### Expert Review Panel

January 14, 2010 – 10:00 – 11:30 AM

SANDAG, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101

Board Room; Ph: (619) 699-1900

#### Meeting Objectives:

1. Obtain common understanding among participants of project objectives, scope of work and study schedule
2. Clarify study expectations and Expert Review Panel participation
3. Provide overview of GIS analysis

#### Sign-in Sheet:

The following individuals attended the meeting and signed the "Sign-in Sheet"

Jim Greggs, Union Pacific Railroad  
Marcus Tyrance, Union Pacific Railroad  
Dain Deforest, Vulcan Materials Co.  
Scott Erreca, Erreca's Inc./Association of General Contractors, San Diego  
David Mayer, California Department of Fish and Game  
Randa Coniglio, Port of San Diego  
Gregg Monger, Pavestone-Western Aggregate  
Paul Brown, Port of San Diego  
Jorge O. Monraz, ADMICARGA, Tijuana-Tecate Railroad  
Gaspar Metzler, ADMICARGA, Tijuana-Tecate Railroad  
Jose Ramos, San Diego & Imperial Railroad  
Angelika Villagrana, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce  
Kurt Kroninger, SANDAG  
Jack Boda, SANDAG  
Keith Greer, SANDAG  
William Prey, SANDAG  
Matt Adams, Building Industry Association – San Diego  
Taylor Harrington, BNSF Railway  
John Hoegemeier, BNSF Railway  
Ed McKechnie, WATCO Companies  
Arnold Veldkamp, Superior Ready Mix Concrete  
Gary McCall, Hanson Aggregates  
Michael Beck, Endangered Habitats League  
Crystal Howard, EnviroMINE / CalCIMA  
Warren Coalson, EnviroMINE / CalCIMA  
Debbie Day, EGCA  
Mike Shaw, Perry & Shaw/EGCA  
Susan Wynn, US Fish and Wildlife Service  
Gary Nolan, Granite Construction  
Jon Cloud, Hester's Granite

Juan Castillo, CEMEX  
Tim Dyer, San Diego County Water Authority  
Kristi Plume, Coronado Public Services  
Thomas Oberbauer, County of San Diego  
Devon Muto, County of San Diego  
Chris Schmidt, Caltrans  
Neal Driscoll, Scripps Institution of Oceanography  
Richard Chavez, SANDAG  
Carolyn Alkire, SANDAG  
Grace Chung, SANDAG  
Andy Gordon, SANDAG  
Cheryl Mason, SANDAG

### **Project Overview and Process for Input**

Staff provided an overview of the study, discussed the role of the Expert Review Panel, and presented a preliminary GIS spatial optimization analysis.

The process for obtaining input and feedback into the study will be through focus group discussions and a topic-based meeting. The Expert Review Panel attendees were asked to sign up for one focus group. The focus groups are comprised of like agencies and are as follows:

- **Environmental/Resource Agencies** (2/2/10 from 9 a.m. to noon at SANDAG, CR8A)
- **Local Suppliers** (2/2/10 from 1 to 4 p.m. at SANDAG, CR8A)
- **Importers/Transporters** (2/4/10 from 9 a.m. to noon, Wells Fargo Third Floor Conference Rm. #350)
- **Users of Aggregate** (2/4/10 from 1 to 4 p.m., Wells Fargo Third Floor Conference Rm. #350)

Each Focus Group will select two representatives and one alternate to participate in a topic-based meeting. We anticipate that the topic-based meeting will be held during the first week of March 2010.

### **Contact Information:**

Cheryl Mason, Project Manager  
[cma@sandag.org](mailto:cma@sandag.org)  
619.699.1951



## **San Diego Regional Aggregate Supply Study Expert Review Panel Focus Group Discussion Environmental and Resource Agencies**

Feb 2, 2010 – 9 a.m. to noon  
SANDAG, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101  
Conference Room 8A; Ph: (619) 699-1900

### **Agenda:**

#### **Welcome and Introductions**

#### **Study Input and Feedback**

- GIS Quantitative Spatial Analysis Recap
- Economic and Environmental Aspects

#### **Roundtable Discussion of Issues/Concerns**

#### **Framing Key Issues**

#### **Representatives for Topic-Specific Meeting**

#### Teleconferencing Information:

Dial-in Number: 1 (877) 356-9437  
Pass Code: 9834922#





## **San Diego Regional Aggregate Supply Study Expert Review Panel Focus Group Discussion Local Suppliers of Aggregate**

Feb 2, 2010 – 1 to 4 p.m.  
SANDAG, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101  
Conference Room 8A; Ph: (619) 699-1900

### **Agenda:**

#### **Welcome and Introductions**

#### **Study Input and Feedback**

- GIS Quantitative Spatial Analysis Recap
- Economic and Environmental Aspects

#### **Roundtable Discussion of Issues/Concerns**

#### **Framing Key Issues**

#### **Representatives for Topic-Specific Meeting**



## **San Diego Regional Aggregate Supply Study Expert Review Panel Focus Group Discussion Importers and Transporters of Aggregate**

Feb 4, 2010 – 9 a.m. to noon  
Wells Fargo Building, Third Floor  
401 B Street, San Diego, CA 92101  
**Third Floor Conference Room 350**  
Ph: (619) 699-1900

### **Agenda:**

#### **Welcome and Introductions**

#### **Study Input and Feedback**

- GIS Quantitative Spatial Analysis Recap
- Economic and Environmental Aspects

#### **Roundtable Discussion of Issues/Concerns**

#### **Framing Key Issues**

#### **Representatives for Topic-Specific Meeting**

*Please note that this meeting will be held in the Wells Fargo Building (same building where SANDAG is located) but it will be on the Third Floor in Conference Room 350, across from the coffee café.*



## **San Diego Regional Aggregate Supply Study Expert Review Panel Focus Group Discussion Users of Aggregate**

Feb 4, 2010 – 1 to 4 p.m.  
Wells Fargo Building, Third Floor  
401 B Street, San Diego, CA 92101  
**Third Floor Conference Room 350**  
Ph: (619) 699-1900

### **Agenda:**

#### **Welcome and Introductions**

#### **Study Input and Feedback**

- GIS Quantitative Spatial Analysis Recap
- Economic and Environmental Aspects

#### **Roundtable Discussion of Issues/Concerns**

#### **Framing Key Issues**

#### **Representatives for Topic-Specific Meeting**

*Please note that this meeting will be held in the Wells Fargo Building (same building where SANDAG is located) but it will be on the Third Floor in Conference Room 350, across from the coffee café.*



## San Diego Regional Aggregate Study Expert Review Panel Focus Groups Draft Summary of Expressed Issues

Issues expressed by the four focus groups are organized into the following broad categories:

Supply (*Supply and demand of aggregate; quality of aggregate*)

Impact (*Environmental and economic costs*)

Regulatory (*Permitting process; environmental permitting process*)

Public Policy (*Public policy types of issues*)

### Supply

- How to manage the gap between supply and demand for aggregate is an important focus of the study
- Narrow definition of “local” being used; the region doesn’t stop at the county boundary
- Aggregate shortfall is a concern for Caltrans projects and others
- Shortage of sand creates opportunities for importers, especially if bring in good quality sand that doesn’t require processing
- The gap in the supply and demand of aggregate reinforces that San Diego needs importers of sand
- Importance of importers and locals working together toward a solution for reducing gap--need a balance between importing and local production—not one method vs. another; neither can do it alone
- Port of San Diego wants to be part of solution and is considering plans to increase capacity to expand facility to increase aggregates
- Study should include the impact of recycled materials on site
- Type and quality of aggregate is important in identifying potential sites
- Importing by itself is not the only solution
- Reduce the dependence on aggregate by considering alternative materials
- Getting quality material
- Importance of using recycled material--Implication: legislation mandating recycling
- Potential depletion of imported resources from neighboring regions that have been supplying San Diego
- Rail yard vs. distribution center--distribution centers would facilitate delivery of aggregate materials to RTP and other projects
- Distribution yard is very efficient; state of the art high speed unloading

## Impact

- Caltrans is paying double for aggregate. Using local supply equal to lower emissions
- Mining industry's perspective is long-term operation (at least 10 years)
- Air emissions is an important concern but need to realize that the market will determine the price, and many contracts are for reasonable low bidder—price more of a concern.
- “Green” is a consideration but it is not the deciding factor at the end of the day.
- Some concerns that EPA/CARB estimates do not reflect accurate estimates for ships
- Study needs to be careful how it uses the estimates so that it does not negatively influence CEQA efforts currently underway.
- New techniques such as auxiliary marine power (or cold ironing)
- Rail is green way of transporting aggregate (and other commodities), but need a place to land/store the aggregate.
- Affordable price of aggregate for projects
- Import price is already driving the local price up
- Impact to the tax payer a higher price due to importing
- Include a broader economic analysis on trucking (economic cost and environmental cost)
- Report should discuss trade off associated with the local production vs. import--air quality, dust, emission, noise, road maintenance, congestion
- Importing from other regions means exporting environmental impact to other areas rather than setting up a process that works here; pushing problems to other region or country not the answer
- Potential depletion of imported resources—problem is not just depletion of local resources
- Advantage of having small local mines vs mega mines (more competition, jobs, money stays local, fewer trucks per site, fewer years of operation)
- Environmental justice community
- Adjacent local community impact (traffic congestion, other negative externalities)
- Increased truck traffic; transition zones
- Data used in report need to be credible otherwise folks get lost in credibility argument and don't see larger picture.

## Regulatory

- Using mitigation site for mining has to be case-by-case decision
- Permitting process not consistent; frustration/confusion about permitting process
- Flowchart of the existing permitting process/regulatory standard is needed
- Need agreed upon standards for the permitting process to apply to every project
- Project purpose is important in permitting process
- What is driving the project design is an important part of the permit process—is it really restoration or is the primary purpose aggregate mining?
- Long permitting process, 20 years minimum
- Long permitting process creates a mega mine because deep pockets are required

## **Regulatory (cont'd)**

- Permitting process a challenge. No systematic approach. This would apply to rail distribution centers and bringing in materials from the port too
- Permitting process is not transparent, not predictable systematic
- Permit process should include a mandated rigid timeline at a "reasonably" predictable cost
- Reviewing SMARA regulation to reflect today's priorities
- Protection of mineral resource not being enforced
- Explore establishing wetland mitigation banks (in each watershed)

## **Public Policy**

- Explore establishing wetland mitigation banks (in each watershed)
- Lack of support by government agencies
- Takes political figures and agencies to help
- The overlay (potential aggregate sites) may allow jurisdictions to decide on having more but smaller mines or one big mega site
- Caltrans or other agencies could lease land to miners for aggregate
- County might want to have different policy for setting up a smaller site for a shorter duration
- Balanced conservation (Example: set aside 5000 acres for aggregate conservation, then we will have supply for 200-300 years)
- Need State leadership; encourage balanced resource development at statewide level
- Recommendations for policy improvements should be included as part of the study
- Policy implications should be included in the study
- Look for opportunities to improve the way we use small areas which need to be done early on in the planning stages
- Having rail distribution centers would facilitate delivery of aggregate materials to RTP and other projects
- Viability of regional programmatic EIR (like the CWA did)
- Viability of crafting a region wide approach to the environmental and permitting requirements that could cross all jurisdictional lines (resource agency or the lead agencies) and provide a systematic and predictable set of guidelines that would address possible conditions encountered
- Reducing emissions important but the permitting agencies are not so concerned with the emissions argument
- Would environmental/resource agencies work with aggregate industry? Or will they only do so if they are legislated to do so?
- Desire to have environmental/resource agencies to see the benefit from a "holistic" environmental impact as opposed to that that is specifically under their purview
- Possibility for agreement with miners develop more environmentally appealing reclamation plan for faster permitting process
- Land use allocation and environmental process
- Smaller aggregate distribution site vs. mega site

### **Public Policy (cont'd)**

- Develop a process that makes local mining accessible to more local small and medium operators rather than just those large operations with the deep pockets necessary to sustain the current process
- Process could decentralize a portion of the region wide quarry operations (less local impact over a shorter quarry life for a smaller site)
- Agencies don't understand mining business/industry and how their products can help the region
- Important to change people's attitude about aggregate and political acceptability of aggregate mines, make public aware of trade offs/impact when importing aggregate and no local supply; increased cost
- Public education is needed (Aggregate provides services, and benefits homes and community)
- Public education program; field trips for young kids, California Mineral Education Foundation has week long education program
- Share successful stories of mining reclamation
- Government and regulatory agencies and others don't understand the industry



## **San Diego Regional Aggregate Supply Study Expert Review Panel Topic-specific Discussion**

March 4, 2010 – 9 a.m. to noon  
SANDAG, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101  
Conference Room 8A; Ph: (619) 699-1900

### **Agenda:**

#### **Welcome and Introductions**

#### **Framing Key Issues--Review of Issues Expressed by Focus Groups**

#### **Roundtable Discussion**

Participants will contribute ideas that were discussed at the individual focus groups or add new ideas based on the current discussion. Key question areas are:

- Is a balanced approach with local and import sources the solution?
- How does the region balance growth and environmental concerns?
- What are new strategies to manage the gap between aggregate supply and demand?

Note: A summary of the issues expressed during the focus groups will be emailed to the participants to help provide background information and to generate ideas.

#### **Next Steps**





## San Diego Regional Aggregate Supply Study

### Summary Expert Review Panel Topic-Specific Discussion (Representatives from each Focus Group)

March 4, 2010 – 9 a.m. to Noon.  
SANDAG, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101  
Conference Room 8A; Ph: (619) 699-1900

#### Attendance at Topic-Specific Meeting:

##### Local Suppliers:

- Warren Coalson, EnviroMINE and CALCIMA
- Gary Nolan, Granite

##### Importers/Transporters of Aggregate:

- Ian Firth, Hanson
- Bill Terry, Eagle Rock Aggregates
- John Hoegemeier, BNSF Railway
- Paul Brown, Port of San Diego

##### Environmental/Resource Agencies

- Michelle Mattson, Army Corps of Engineers
- Jeff Kermode, Caltrans

##### Users of Aggregate:

- Tim Dyer, San Diego County Water Authority
- Mike Shaw, EGCA/Perry & Shaw
- Abu-Bakr H. Al-Jafri, Caltrans

Chris Schmidt, Caltrans  
Neal Driscoll, Scripps  
Keith Greer, SANDAG  
Carolyn Alkire, SANDAG  
Grace Chung, SANDAG  
Richard Chavez, SANDAG  
Cheryl Mason, SANDAG

#### Review of Approach:

At the January 14, 2010 Expert Review Panel meeting, SANDAG staff described that the process for obtaining feedback and input from the Expert Review Panel participants would be through focus group discussions and a topic-based meeting. The Expert Review Panel attendees were asked to sign up for one focus group. The focus groups were comprised of like interests and were as follows:

- Environmental/Resource Agencies (2/2/10)
- Local Suppliers (2/2/10)
- Importers/Transporters (2/4/10)

- Users of Aggregate (2/4/10)

A summary of the issues/concerns expressed during the four focus group sessions were organized by key topic area and summarized. This summary was provided as background information and used to generate discussion items for the topic-based meeting.

Each Focus Group selected two representatives and one alternate to participate in a topic-based meeting. The topic-based meeting was held on March 4, 2010. Refer to the list above for a list of the attendees.

### **Topic-based Meeting**

Participants discussed the issues and concerns that were raised at the individual focus groups and contributed new ideas based on the current discussion. Framing the discussion were the following key question areas:

- Is a balanced approach with local and import sources the solution?
- How does the region balance growth and environmental concerns?
- What are new strategies to manage the gap between aggregate supply and demand?

A summary of the key discussion items is provided in the Attachment.

### **Next Steps**

SANDAG staff will concentrate on completing the tasks outlined in the scope of work and preparing the draft documentation and report. SANDAG may contact the Expert Review Panel to obtain feedback and assistance.

SANDAG plans on having a draft report to SANDAG Directors and Caltrans executive-level staff in June and bring the Expert Review Panel back together to present highlights of the draft report in July.



## **San Diego Regional Aggregate Study Expert Review Panel -- Topic-Specific Meeting – March 4, 2010 Draft Summary of Expressed Issues/Concerns/Ideas**

Participants attending the topic-specific meeting clarified the issues and concerns that were discussed at the individual focus groups and contributed new ideas based on the day's discussion. Framing the discussion were the key question areas listed below. The ideas communicated by the Expert Review Panel are grouped by key question area.

- Is a balanced approach with local and import sources the solution?
- How does the region balance growth and environmental concerns?
- What are new strategies to manage the gap between aggregate supply and demand?

### **Is a balanced approach with local and import sources the solution?**

- How to manage the gap between supply and demand for aggregate is an important focus of the study. There was general agreement, but not 100 percent, that there is a need for both local production and importation of aggregate in order to meet the demand in the San Diego region. Sufficient resources exist in the region, obtaining permits is a challenge.
- Acreage necessary for aggregate production is relatively small in comparison to other types of land uses. According to the participants, aggregate production currently occupies less than 2,000 acres in the region.
- All material types exist in the region, but some materials—sand in particular—is located in environmentally sensitive areas so there are restrictions on extracting it. Mutual benefits sand extraction could have on the environment in the long run when using specific extraction methods should be explored.
- Important to remember that it isn't just the resource being available, economic viability also is a factor. Access to markets, storage and processing of aggregates are considerations.
- Aggregate was not imported into the region in the 1980s. In the early 1990s, the region started importing aggregate. Sand is the material type that represents the majority of aggregate imports to the region.
- Imports will likely remain an important element of providing aggregates to the region.
- The Port of San Diego would need substantial infrastructure improvements to adequately supply large volumes of aggregates.
- Mitigation is different than process for local mine—focus is on local community impact.
- Port property has been encroached on by development so balancing the waterfront activities with the community is a challenge. Port Commission has to approve facility expansion projects and the impact on the local community is an important factor in their decision making. The number of truck trips driving through the neighborhood is an important impact the Port Commission considers.
- It was noted that adequate rail mainline access is available in the region, but that a rail distribution facility is needed to make this an efficient mode for aggregate importation.
- Rail distribution facilities are not currently available for receiving and handling aggregates, but several suggested that it was worth investigating as it could bring in aggregates and other commodities. It was indicated that the train has a fixed cost—the engineer and the locomotive—so one could add more cars and to increase efficiency.

- It was indicated that the ideal site for a rail distribution center is 100 acres, but an efficient center could be designed on a 20 to 40 acre site along a main line.
- Rail is economic and “green.” A rail distribution center is needed to make the transportation of aggregates work to its fullest potential. This requires infrastructure improvements and a distribution facility.
- Outreach to public and decision makers could help increase the understanding of the impact of improving freight related infrastructure and develop policies and services in addressing related economic and environmental concerns.
- The Interconnection of various modes of transportation is growing in importance. This includes port to rail to truck. The distribution center should be located within the 20- to 25-mile driveshed.
- As the region looks toward solutions for improving goods movement, it should consider the distribution center and a well functioning freight system. One consideration mentioned is to bring in aggregate from outside the region to a distribution point or points where it could be accessed by many transporters.
- It was noted that a new trend is for the shippers to build the facilities. Shippers may consider building the distribution facility in the region if an appropriate site could be located.

#### **How does the region balance growth and environmental concerns?**

- Managed production of fine aggregate sites could help satisfy local production needs, as well as provide an environmental benefit. For instance removal of sand from the San Diego and San Luis Rey Rivers.
- Some felt that extracting sand from the reservoirs might be an opportunity if the sand is the right type and the habitat could be protected. General agreement that El Capitan Reservoir could have several million tons of sand backed up in the San Diego River. Important habitat has been established there now and the challenge is how to remove the sand. This has been discussed in the past but not resolved.
- Environmental regulations have been identified as a process that has contributed to the mega mine in this region—because the permit is difficult, time consuming, and costly. It was noted that permitting difficulties/costs are a deterrent to establishing smaller sites, but standardized regulatory process could help to make smaller sites economically feasible.
- Regulatory agencies may not have a lot of experience with permitting mining projects, but participants generally felt there could be opportunities for informational exchanges.
- Regulatory agencies such as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, and Regional Water Quality Control Board should be fully engaged in the process throughout. This is not the same as holding a pre-application meeting; it is about working though the pre-design process together.
- It was emphasized that the federal resource agencies may not have sufficient staffing to review local agency and CEQA documents. The federal agencies are obligated to review the project at the NEPA stage. So often a project gets all the way to the NEPA stage and then concerns are identified.
- State and local public agencies are able to provide funding to regulatory agencies to ensure environmental review throughout the process. There is no avenue for resource agencies to receive funding from private parties to facilitate early and ongoing review.
- The description and purpose of the project is important to regulatory agencies.
- Using mitigation site for mining has to be case-by-case decision.
- Regulatory agency staff emphasized that permit applications need to be high quality with adequate baseline provided for consideration during the permitting process.

- Permitting process varies from agency to agency. A better explanation of the process and how private sector and resource agencies could coordinate may lead to more certainty in the outcome.
- Increased understanding by industry of what the resource agencies need in the permitting process may lead to more certainty in the outcome. For example, sometimes when a permit for a mine is submitted, a resource agency might comment that applicant didn't look at enough sites. A reasonable range of locations should be considered for the location that minimizes adverse environmental disturbances.

### **What are new strategies to manage the gap between aggregate supply and demand?**

- Public outreach/education campaign to help make public aware of trade offs/impact when importing aggregate and no local supply; increased cost, which could affect people's attitude about aggregate and the political acceptability of aggregate mines.
- Examples of successful mine reclamation could be a useful tool for public education. The requirement to reclaim mines began in 1975 and the actual reclamation requirements were not specified until 1994. Examples of successful reclamation do exist however and include Mission Valley.
- Industry could help local leaders and decision makers by helping develop a political rationale or justification to support opening new mines or expanding existing ones.
- Industry could engage users of aggregate to help support the need and importance of aggregate in region (not targeted toward a specific project, but general need).
- Recycling is often an important source of base materials for freeway construction projects.
- Rail related infrastructure improvements to expand rail access and distribution center(s) could be considered.
- SMARA requires the lead agencies to address protection of mineral resources in jurisdiction's general plans, but these can be written broadly. Participants felt that the recommendations in the general plans were not being acted upon.
- There was discussion that a systematic and comprehensive approach could help streamline the permit process and help ensure that it is done in a responsible way that protects environmental lands and communities—MSCP idea applied to mineral resources.
- Example: Specific Area Management Plan (SAMP). A SAMP is a comprehensive plan designed to achieve a balance between economic development and aquatic resource protection. No details were provided but it was indicated that a good SAMP could reduce problems associated with the traditional case-by-case review. The federal agencies can be involved at the initial stages if there is a SAMP.
- A comprehensive approach or Area Management Plan (AMP) could get the resource agencies involved early on. It could benefit the region to view the supply of aggregate as a regional system...not project by project. This is what the County Water authority did—got a programmatic EIR because they think of water management as a system.
- It could be useful to explore feasibility of permitting smaller aggregate sites within local market areas that might make it easier for public to accept or be able to take advantage of a streamlined permit process. However, economic conditions should dictate whether to develop a mine.
  - Small mines, fewer trucks, sorter life span (two to 10 years)—short enough that it sounds finite and might be easier for community to accept. Restoration may be less complicated of an issue because it is a smaller site.
- Larger mines are still needed as it could be more efficient to work with one large mine on a project rather than multiple small mines. (Agreement on following definitions of the size of a mine: Generally speaking a small mine is less than 500,000 tons/year, a medium size mine is 500,000 to 1 ½ million ton/year, and a large mine is 1 ½ million tons/year and greater.)



**SUMMARY**  
**San Diego Regional Aggregate Supply Study**  
**Expert Review Panel**  
August 26, 2010 – 9 to 10:30 AM  
SANDAG, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101  
Board Room; Ph: (619) 699-1900

**Meeting Objectives:**

1. Review chapter highlights and discuss preliminary findings
2. Obtain feedback and technical assistance on draft report

**Sign-in Sheet:**

The following individuals attended the meeting and signed the “Sign-in Sheet”

Christine Richards, Port of San Diego  
Miguel Reyes, Port of San Diego  
Kurt Kroninger, SANDAG  
William Prey, SANDAG  
John Hoegemeier, BNSF Railway  
Michael Beck, Endangered Habitats League  
Crystal Howard, EnviroMINE / CalCIMA  
Warren Coalson, EnviroMINE / CalCIMA  
Debbie Day, EGCA  
Mike Shaw, Perry & Shaw/EGCA  
Gary Nolan, Granite Construction  
Juli Wilson, Vulcan Materials Co.  
Ian Firth, Hanson Aggregates  
Jon Cloud, Hester’s Granite  
Tim Dyer, San Diego County Water Authority  
Din Daneshfar, National City Public Works  
Devon Muto, County of San Diego  
Abu-Bakr H. Al-Jafri, Caltrans  
Marcela Escobar-Eck, Atlantis Group (Otay Valley Rock)  
Andy Hamilton, APCD  
Bill Terry, Eagle Rock Aggregates, Inc.  
Chris Schmidt, Caltrans  
Neal Driscoll, Scripps Institution of Oceanography  
Richard Chavez, SANDAG  
Carolyn Alkire, SANDAG  
Grace Chung, SANDAG  
Andy Gordon, SANDAG  
Cheryl Mason, SANDAG

The following individuals participated via teleconference call:

Verne Freeman, Freeman Associates (Otay Valley Rock)  
John Clinkenbeard, California Geologic Survey  
Matt Malchow, California Air Resources Board  
Elizabeth Goldman, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

### **Highlights and Process for Feedback**

Staff reviewed the background and purpose of the study. Staff distributed copies of the draft report and presented preliminary findings for discussion. The Expert Review Panel was asked to review the document and provide feedback and comments. To the extent possible, staff will try to address all comments in the document.

### **Next Steps**

Comments can be submitted via email, handwritten on the document, or in memo format. Comments are due to SANDAG staff by September 15, 2010.

Once the comments are incorporated, staff will prepare a final draft. It will include an Executive Summary. The target date for completing the final draft is October 15, 2010.

### **Contact Information:**

Cheryl Mason, Project Manager  
[cma@sandag.org](mailto:cma@sandag.org)  
619.699.1951