

County of Santa Clara

Department of Planning and Development
Planning Office

County Government Center, East Wing, 7th Floor
70 West Hedding Street
San Jose, California 95110-1705
(408) 299-5770 FAX (408) 288-9198
www.sccplanning.org



October 21, 2020

****Sent via email ****

Mr. Jason Voss
Stevens Creek Quarry, Inc.
12100 Stevens Canyon Road
Cupertino, CA 95014
Email: JVoss@sqinc.com

FILE NUMBER: PLN20-119
SUBJECT: Use Permit with Architecture and Site Approval (“ASA”) and
Reclamation Plan Amendment
SITE LOCATION: 12100 Stevens Canyon Road
DATE RECEIVED: 9/21/2020

Dear Mr. Voss:

The application for a Use Permit with ASA and Reclamation Plan Amendment (“Application”) submitted by Stevens Creek Quarry Inc. (“SCQ”) on September 21, 2020 has been deemed **incomplete by the County of Santa Clara Department of Planning and Development**. A brief description of the Application is included in Section I of this letter, incomplete comments to address in the Application resubmittal are listed in Section II, and key issues of concern are identified in Section III.

Pursuant to the Amended Compliance Agreement and Stipulated Order to Comply (Attachment 1) under Public Resources Code Section 2774.1 between the County of Santa Clara (“County”) and SCQ, effective September 3, 2020, SCQ must obtain a complete application determination for the Application by January 11, 2021. To meet this requirement, SCQ shall submit all required information requested in Section II no later than **December 11, 2020**.

An incomplete resubmittal will not be accepted. Currently, the Department of Planning and Development (“Department”) is only accepting electronic submittals in adherence to the County’s Shelter in Place Order in relation to the COVID-19 pandemic. Please refer to procedures for Planning resubmittals available on the County website at <https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/Iwantto/Permits/Pages/PlanningResubmittals.aspx>.

Prior to submitting the requested information, **SCQ is required to schedule a virtual appointment** to discuss the required resubmittal. Please contact Robert Salisbury (Robert.Salisbury@pln.sccgov.org / 408-299-5785) to schedule this appointment. We

recommend that the appointment be held as early as possible to allow adequate time to prepare and resubmit a complete application.

If approved by the County, the proposed Reclamation Plan Amendment (RPA) will replace the approved Reclamation Plan for the Stevens Creek Quarry (“Quarry”) that was approved by the Planning Commission in 1986 and amended in 2009.

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Application proposes a new Use Permit for Surface Mining to cover the entire property (referred to as Parcel A and Parcel B), and authorize the processing and sale of greenstone imported from Lehigh Permanete Quarry.

The Application contains the following components:

1. Use Permit for Surface Mining to apply to Parcel A and Parcel B (Assessor’s Parcel Number[s] 351-10-017, 351-10-019, 351-10-033, 351-10-039, 351-10-040, 351-10-044, 351-11-001, and 351-18-048) for a term of 30 years for the following activities:
 - a. Surface Mining: Expansion of the mining operation along the western face of Parcel B highwall to capture new mineral reserves, new benches in the main pit, and extraction of 2.6 million tons of Franciscan-aged greenstone rock for aggregate production annually crusher feed of 2 million tons per year. Excavation, crushing, processing, and hauling of materials - Monday through Friday; between 6:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. except on New Year’s Day, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Thanksgiving Day, and Christmas Day. Stacking, loading, and hauling of materials Monday through Friday; between 6:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Saturday and no more than 15 Saturday's per year; from 7:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.; no more than one Saturday per month from May 15 to October 15, inclusive. Evening work for special circumstances would occur only 30 work evenings per year, no longer than 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. The total workforce would include up to 75 employees.
 - b. Import of Aggregate: Import up to 1 million tons of greenstone per year from Lehigh Permanete Quarry (“Lehigh”) for processing. Native greenstone mined at Lehigh Permanete Quarry would be purchased by SCQ and transported to Parcel B along a newly constructed Haul Road between SCQ and Lehigh Hanson for processing.
 - c. Construction of a New Haul Road for Aggregate Importation: Construction of a new Haul Road to connect SCQ to Lehigh to allow the importation of greenstone for processing.
2. Amend the 2009 Reclamation Plan to include:
 - a. Update Reclamation Plan Boundary: Expand the Reclamation Plan boundary to include portions of adjacent parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers

351-10-017, 351-10-033, 351-10-039, 351-11-011) located directly to the east and west of Parcel B, currently owned by Lehigh Hansen, Inc..

- b. Expansion of Mining Operation and Correct Slope Instability Issues: SCQ plans to expand mining operations along the western face of the existing Parcel B highwall by constructing new benches to a bottom elevation of 860 feet medium sea level (msl) in the northern portion of the pit, and 700 feet msl in the center and southern portion of the pit. The quarry floor is planned to have a maximum depth of 700 feet msl, with gently sloping floors that drain southerly and westerly. The bottom of the pit would then be backfilled to 900-feet msl.
- c. Reclamation of Haul Road: conversion of the illegally improved Haul Road (Item 1c above) to a Utility (Pacific, Gas and Electric) Access Road.
- d. Import of Fill: Import a maximum of 2 million cubic yards of backfill material over a 30-year period for reclamation
- e. Drainage Modifications and New Settling Basin: SCQ proposes to implement best management practices (BMPs) to direct offsite and non-industrial run-on away from industrial areas and erodible surfaces in compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for stormwater discharges. The run-off from the quarry would be redirected from the existing in-creek Upper Settling Basin to a new settling basin designed and engineered by Bay Area Geotechnical Group (BAGG Engineering) to be consistent with design storm standards in the Industrial General Permit for the expanded mining areas as well as Compliance Agreement and Stipulated Order to Comply and Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements.

II. INCOMPLETE COMMENTS

PLANNING

Contact Robert Salisbury (408) 299-5785 / robert.salisbury@pln.sccgov.org and Patrick Angell (916) 764-0108) / Pat.Angell@ascentenvironmental.com for information regarding the following items.

Use Permit Submittal

1. The Use Permit and RPA proposes to expand the mining and RPA boundary to include portions of parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers 351-10-017, 351-10-033, 351-10-039, 351-11-011) that are currently owned by Lehigh Hansen Inc.. The Application materials reference an agreement between Lehigh and SCQ allowing this expansion, but the require written authorization was not submitted. Written authorization from Lehigh authorizing SCQ to apply for surface mining and reclamation on these parcels, along with a letter of intent to enter into a lease agreement between Lehigh and SCQ or similar agreement that allows for surface mining and reclamation in this area must be submitted. In addition, the area designated as "Area to Remain Under Permanente Quarry Reclamation Plan Until

Needed by Stevens Creek Quarry" will need to have some clarification of its status under both RPAs. All such other-owner agreements must convey the right to conduct reclamation by the County in the event that the quarry defaults on its responsibilities under SMARA.

2. The Project Description and RPA documents include conflicting references to the total acreage of the project. For example, Section 4.1 of the Project Description cites 167 acres, but Section 4.3 cites 147 acres. Please correct this discrepancy.
3. Multiple items on the Use Permit submittal checklist were not included with the submitted application and these items must be included with the resubmittal. These include:
 - a. Current grant deed(s) for all four legal parcels on which mining activities are proposed. Appendix D includes Grant Deeds for three parcels but does not clearly identify the assessor parcel numbers for parcels owned by SCQ.
 - b. Proof of lot legality for each parcel on which mining activities are proposed, including those owned by Lehigh Quarry. Please see Attachment 5.
 - c. Site Plan drawn to scale which shows the location of all existing and proposed buildings, mining equipment, and other improvements. The site plan must also show setbacks to property lines and must clearly state whether the buildings and improvements are existing or proposed.
 - d. Floor plans and elevations for existing and proposed buildings. As an alternative for existing buildings, adequately labeled photographs in lieu of elevations would also suffice.

Because these required items were not included with the Application, additional incomplete comments may be forthcoming after these items have been submitted and reviewed by the Department. Given the timelines in the compliance agreement we recommend early consultation on the items listed above to ensure a complete resubmittal.

4. The County's Early Public Outreach policy requires that SCQ install project notification signs onsite within 30-days of Application submittal. The sign must remain on the project site during the time the application is actively being processed and must be removed after an action to approve or deny the application has become effective. Please print the sign included as Attachment 6, install onsite, and provide a photo of the sign to the Department within 30-days of receipt of this letter, on or before **November 19, 2020**, to confirm this requirement is satisfied.
5. The Project Description and Environmental Information Form (EIF) is incomplete. Please address the following:
 - a. Number of visitors in addition to employees expected on site.
 - b. Truck Trips: clarify the number of truck trips that would result from proposed mining operations, importation of greenstone from Lehigh, and any other associated operation.

- c. Tree Disposition Plan: provide a tree removal plan specifying the height, species, and location under the proposed mining expansion.
- d. Provide daily and annual maximum tonnage of aggregate proposed to be processed in the aggregate plant and what percentage of the annual output being process is expected to come from Lehigh.
- e. Rick Voss Trucking Company – this use was permitted by the Planning Commission as an ancillary use under the 1996 Use Permit Amendment that is now expired. If you like to continue this use, revise the project description and plans to specify this ancillary use as a component of the requested Use Permit. In addition, please provide the following information:
 - i. Name of existing and proposed trucking operation(s).
 - ii. Inventory of trucks and other equipment related to this operation.
 - iii. Number of truck trips per day generated by this use.
 - iv. Number of employees.
 - v. Purpose of trucking operation(s).

Reclamation Plan Amendment Submittal

- 6. Provide a map that shows the difference between the existing and the proposed reclamation plan boundary.
- 7. The RPA needs to be revised to identify the exact acreage of each parcel that SCQ plans to incorporate into the RPA boundary.
- 8. Pursuant to County Code Section 4.10.370 Part II A.3, Noise and Vibration, please revise RPA to include noise attenuation measures and revise figures to identify the nearest property line and the distance between loading points and the closest property line.
- 9. Pursuant to County Code Section 4.10.370 Part II A.4, Traffic Safety, please revise RPA to clearly identify how and where trucks will park and queue onsite during loading and unloading of materials. Identify the number of parking spaces, including those available to employees, in the RPA.

Note: A minimum of 1 parking space per employee and adequate accessible spaces and spaces for company vehicles must be provided pursuant to Chapter 4.30 of the County Zoning Ordinance. The parking and access design must also comply with the requirements within this chapter.

- 10. Pursuant to County Code Section 4.10.370 Part II A.6.a, *Setbacks from Property Lines*, please revise RPA figures to clearly identify surrounding property lines and public right-of-way and their distance from cut slopes.
- 11. Pursuant to County Code Section 4.10.17. Part II A.6.b, *Ridgeline Setbacks*, please revise RPA figures to clearly identify that the top uppermost cut area which abuts a ridgeline is not less than 50 feet from the top of the ridge prior to excavation.

12. Revise RPA Section 2.7.4 to describe slope failures on Parcel B. This will lead into the justification of the proposed slope modifications later in the RPA.
13. RPA Section 2.7.5 and Appendix E must include the LSA survey conducted in 2018.
14. Expand RPA Appendix A (Index to Required Content) to demonstrate compliance with County Code SMARA requirements.
15. In RPA Appendix A (Index to Required Content) page A-1, please note the following for Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 2772(c)(5)(A-F):
 - a. Section 2 of the RPA should also be referenced under “Source or Explanation” in the first two rows.
 - b. Sheet 2 of the RPA should also be referenced under “Source or Explanation” in the fourth row.
 - c. Figure 5 of the RPA should also be referenced under “Source or Explanation” in the sixth row.
16. In RPA Appendix A (Index to Required Content) page A-2, the outstanding lease agreement with Lehigh needs to be identified under the “Source or Explanation” for PRC Section 2772(c)(6).
17. Responses to SMARA requirements regarding geologic/slope stability under California Code of Regulations (CCR) Sections 3502(b)(3), 3704(d), 3704(e), and 3704(f) cannot be reviewed until updated geotechnical/slope analysis (future RPA Appendix F) is provided.
18. Provide an analysis of impacts to surrounding land uses in the RPA, as required under CCR Section 3502(b)(1).
19. Clearly address within the RPA, how the proposed reclamation will comply with CCR Section 3703(b) regarding wildlife habitat. The RPA identifies that the site would be reclaimed as open space.

GEOLOGY

Contact Jim Baker at (408) 299-5785 / jim.baker@pln.sccgov.org for information regarding the following items.

20. Benchmark's Reclamation Plan Amendment (RPA) document (dated September 2020) indicates the proposed eastward extension of the quarry pit into the adjacent Lehigh-owned parcel in the form of a 2:1 cut slope ("layback") with 25-foot wide benches every 50 vertical feet intended to mitigate the slope failure that has occurred on the steeper highwall of the west side of the current pit. However, the plan shows proposed finished cut slopes on the north and east sides of the main pit that are not labeled but appear to be steeper than 2H:1V. Add labels to the plan that indicate the proposed gradient(s) of these slopes.
21. Analysis of the stability of all proposed cut slopes is required. The plan document refers to a memo prepared by Norfleet Consultants supporting the slope design is

included as Appendix F, "Slope Stability Memo", however, that Appendix has not been included with the initial submittal. This information must be included in the resubmittal in order to determine the completeness of the application relative to slope stability.

22. Figure 5 and Sheet 1 in Benchmark's Reclamation Plan Amendment document (dated September 2020) show current mining-related ground disturbances extending beyond the site boundaries on the north and east sides of the main pit. (See attached diagrams.) The proposed reclamation boundaries must be modified so as to include those disturbed areas. Also, the existing property lines must be shown on Figures 3 through 12 and Sheets 1 through 5. The required written authorization from Lehigh for SCQ noted under comment II-2 above must include these areas.

Please be aware that a portion of these identified ground disturbances is located within the jurisdiction of the City of Cupertino and is not covered by the existing agreement between Cupertino and the County of Santa Clara regarding SMARA enforcement.

23. The submitted RPA proposes to construct BMPs such as berms, drainage ditches, drop inlets, sediment traps, silt fences, check dams, and straw wattles along the quarry roads and throughout the 147-acre site. The Project Description figures do not show the location of the proposed BMPs. Please revise all figures to clearly identify the location of the proposed BMPs.
24. The Mining and Reclamation Plan shows the gradient of cut slopes north and east of the proposed new settling pond (designated as Stormwater Pond on Sheet 2 and Sheet 4 of the Mining and Reclamation Plan) at 1H:1V. However, the BAGG report (dated April 17, 2019 and titled "Engineering Geologic and Geotechnical Investigation - New Settling Pond") concluded that the slope gradient needs to be 2H:1V. Revise the Mining and Reclamation Plan to conform to this recommendation, or provide additional geologic analysis that proves that the indicated 1H:1V cut slope will be stable under both static and pseudo-static conditions.

LAND DEVELOPMENT AND ENGINEERING

Contact Ed Duazo at (408) 299-5733 / ed.duazo@pln.sccgov.org for more information regarding the following items.

25. The second paragraph in the subsection "Groundwater" under Section 4.5.1 (Water Quality Protections) is unclear. The paragraph describes the use of detention basins and existing settling basins prior to discharging into the natural watercourse, but also indicates full containment with no offsite discharge. Please clarify.
26. Figure 12 depicts the Drainage Plan upon completion of reclamation, however, the directional drainage arrows and v-ditch flow in directions not consistent with the contours shown. For example, the v-ditch in the middle of Parcel B, conveying run-off from west to east down the 2:1 cut slope appears to be on a ridgeline. The drainage arrows conveying slope run-off to the v-ditches are shown flowing along contour and not downhill. The drainage arrows at the far east of the reclamation

area indicate flows being directed toward the monitoring location. However, based on the contours, this run-off would flow to Stevens Canyon Road and by-pass the monitoring location. Clarify how these proposed drainage patterns will work given the contours shown on the reclamation plan.

27. Clarify the purpose of the concrete drainage box and if it is intended to remain after reclamation of the project site. Please specify whether this drainage structure require on-going maintenance.
28. The previous Use Permit Application included a technical stormwater memorandum. Provide an update to the memorandum that includes the expanded reclamation area.

ROADS AND AIRPORTS

Contact Leo Camacho at (408) 573-2464 / leo.camacho@rda.sccgov.gov for more information regarding the following items.

29. Provide a Traffic Circulation Report identifying the public road routes.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

Contact Darrin Lee at (408) 918-3435 / darrin.lee@cep.sccgov.gov for more information regarding the following items:

30. Submitted plans show numerous chemical/portable toilets.
 - a. For buildings with plumbing fixtures, where does the wastewater go? Show on the required Use Permit site plan the location of all existing and proposed septic systems serving the project site.
 - b. Per the County's Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems Ordinance, Sec B11-76, portable toilets have limited use. Please be aware that an administrative permit from DEH is required if portable toilets are proposed to be in use onsite for more than three consecutive days. Contact Darrin Lee at (408) 918-3435 / Darrin.lee@cep.sccgov.org for more information about the required permit and application process.
31. For the portable toilets, identify septage pumper, frequency of pumping, and septage disposal location.
32. Clarify source of potable water.
33. On the required site plan, show the location of all flammable and hazardous materials and any containment devices or similar equipment.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGIONAL WATER BOARD

Contact Lisa Horowitz McCann, Assistant Executive Officer, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Board at (510) 622-2441 or Lisa.mccann@waterboards.ca.gov for information regarding the following items.

34. Section 4.3.3, Revegetation Success Criteria, lacks sufficient detail with respect to methodologies to be used in assessing revegetation. This section proposes to use “species richness” as a performance criterion. However, this section does not

specify the protocol that will be used to assess species richness. Section 4.3.3 must be revised to describe how the metric of species richness will be assessed. Species richness at the closed facility is proposed to be compared to species richness at a reference location. This section must be revised to describe the requirements for an appropriate reference location and to propose specific reference locations that may be used to track the successful revegetation of the facility.

35. Section 4.3.6, Monitoring and Maintenance, does not include sufficient detail with respect to monitoring protocols. The first sentence of this section states that monitoring may be conducted by “a qualified biologist, restoration ecologist, or landscape architect.” Unless a landscape architect has specialized training in native habitat restoration, a landscape architect is not likely to be an appropriate monitor for restoration of the facility.

This section proposes to use random sampling plots to assess plant cover at the restored facility. This section must be revised to specify the sampling protocol that is to be used to assess plant cover at the restored site. This protocol must include the method to be used to confirm that a sufficient number of plots have been sampled to sufficiently characterize the condition of vegetation at the restored facility.

The second paragraph of this section states that maintenance will be conducted “as necessary”. This section must be revised to include an actual maintenance schedule and a list of parameters that will be used to determine when maintenance is necessary.

36. Section 4.5.1, Water Quality Protections, Surface Water and Erosion Control, does not include the restoration of stream channels at the facility and the removal of in-channel sediment basins. This section must be revised to include the removal of in-stream sediment ponds from Rattlesnake Creek and the restoration of stable creek channels along and through the facility or must be revised to indicate that the in-stream sediment ponds left in place will return the creek to a stable, hydrological/geomorphological functioning creek without water quality impacts from sediment or other process chemicals that have been or might be captured and concentrated in the ponds. Such an indication that the in-stream sediment ponds can be left in place, must be based on a technologically-sound hydrologic and geomorphologic analysis (conducted by a qualified professional fluvial geomorphologist) that justifies how the in-stream ponds will function to maintain the stability of the creek, the habitat and clean water quality after closure. Without regular maintenance, in-stream sediment ponds typically silt in and the berms that create the ponds erode from flows that overtop the berms. Eventually the berms fail, and the stream channels will establish new equilibrium dimensions within the context of their watershed. Berm failure may occur gradually or in sudden catastrophic failures that send large amounts of water and sediment downhill; such flows can damage property and pose a risk to human safety. Furthermore, to adequately address all beneficial use impacts of Rattlesnake Creek and protect downstream waterbodies to which Rattlesnake Creek is a tributary, the Quarry must evaluate sediment quality and habitat conditions in the reaches through and

downstream of the facility to insure that creek reaches between and downstream of in-stream ponds and propose adequate restoration of and protection of water quality and beneficial uses from past discharges, erosion and facility practices that may have caused waste discharges to the creek overtime.

Relatedly, to protect the creek, the plan must include maintenance of any and all containment structures used to prevent post-closure discharges of stormwater impacted by former mining operations to waters of the State, and the potential need for post-closure BMPs and/or treatment of such post-closure discharges to waters of the State.

This section must be revised to describe the removal of all in-channel ponds, the restoration of stable channels that are in dynamic equilibrium with the watershed, and the above mentioned maintenance of existing containment structures and an evaluation and inclusion, as needed, of additional BMPs and/or treatment of post-closure discharges. The restoration plan for the stream channels at the facility must be designed by an experienced fluvial geomorphologist.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) submitted comments on the Application on October 19, see Attachment 8. Contact Kristin Garrison, Environmental Scientist, CDFW at Kristin.Garrison@wildlife.ca.gov for information regarding CDFW comments.

CITY OF CUPERTINO

The City of Cupertino (City) submitted comments on the Application to the County on October 8, see Attachment 9. Contact Deborah Feng, City Manager, City of Cupertino at (408) 622-2441 / manager@cupertino.org for information regarding the City's comments.

III. CONCLUDING COMMENTS

In addition to the incomplete items listed above, the County has identified the following key issues where the proposed Use Permit and Reclamation Plan Amendment conflicts with applicable County policies and standards or adjacent land uses. These issues need to be carefully considered and addressed within the resubmitted application including the Environmental Information Form, Project Description, and RPA.

- The proposed Mining and Reclamation Plan included with this Application is significantly different from the Mining and Reclamation Plan submitted with the pre-application, and the required in-depth geologic investigation and associated detailed quantitative slope stability analysis, required under Section 4 and Exhibit A of the Compliance Agreement and Stipulated Order to Comply, was not provided. As a result, the prior geotechnical review comments provided by the County geologist in response to the pre-application are no longer applicable.
- As noted above, the Use Permit and RPA proposes to expand the mining and RPA boundary to include portions of parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers 351-10-017, 351-10-033, 351-10-039, 351-11-011) that are currently owned by Lehigh in compliance with Section 5 and Exhibits A and B of the Compliance Agreement and

Stipulated Order to Comply. The RPA needs be revised to identify the exact acreage of each parcel that SCQ plans to incorporate into the RPA boundary. Also, as stated previously in the pre-application letter for this project, written authorization from Lehigh for SCQ to apply for surface mining and reclamation on these parcels is required, along with an intent to enter into a lease agreement or similar agreement between Lehigh and SCQ that authorized SCQ to conduct surface mining and reclamation in this area.

- The Application specifies that SCQ is proposing to import 1 million cubic yards of unprocessed greenstone annually from Lehigh to process the material onsite at its aggregate plant, and then sell that processed material. This proposed use falls under the non-residential land use classification of *Manufacturing/Industry – Intensive* as defined in the County Zoning Ordinance. The Zoning Ordinance specifies that this type of use is only allowed on properties with an Industrial base zoning district. The SCQ property is zoned Hillside (HS-d1-sr); therefore, uses defined as *Manufacturing/Industry – Intensive* are not allowed.
- The NOV issued to SCQ on February 15, 2019 identified that the importation of materials from Lehigh Quarry was not an allowed use (Attachment 4). Please also note that there was a Notice of Violation issued to Lehigh on August 17, 2018 pursuant to Zoning Ordinance Code Section 4.10.370, Part III(C) and Public Resources Code section 2774.1 requiring Lehigh to cease the use of the Utility Haul Road between Lehigh and SCQ properties (Attachment 3).
- SCQ should be aware that the Department has requested that the County Board of Supervisors (“Board”) conduct an evidentiary hearing to determine if Lehigh’s proposal for the offsite sale of unprocessed aggregate and intensification in production are consistent with Lehigh’s vested right to conduct surface mining operations at the Lehigh Quarry. Please see the August 5, 2020 Memorandum to the Board (Attachment 2).

If you have any additional questions regarding this application or would like to meet to clarify Planning’s incomplete comments, please call me at (408) 299-5785 or call Patrick Angell at (916) 764-0108 to schedule an appointment to do so.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:

C140DFC1F718456...

Robert Salisbury
Senior Planner

Attachments

1. Stipulated Order to Comply
2. August 5, 2020 Memorandum to the County Board of Supervisors

3. August 17, 2018 Notice of Violation Permanente (Lehigh) Quarry
4. February 15, 2019 Notice of Violation and Public Nuisance Stevens Creek Quarry
5. Proof of Legal Creation of Lot
6. Early Outreach Notification Sign Template
7. 2020 SCQ RPA Sheet-1 with mark-up
8. California Department of Fish and Wildlife Comments on Stevens Creek Quarry Application
9. City of Cupertino Comments on Stevens Creek Quarry Application

cc: Jacqueline Onciano, Director of Planning and Development, County of Santa Clara
Rob Eastwood, Planning Manager, AICP, County of Santa Clara
Manira Sandhir, Principal Planner, AICP, County of Santa Clara
Rob Salisbury, Senior Planner
Jim Baker, County Geologist, County of Santa Clara
Elizabeth G. Pianca, Lead Deputy County Counsel, County of Santa Clara
Kristina Loquist, Office of Supervisor Simitian, County of Santa Clara
Paul Fry, Engineering and Geology Unit Manager, Division of Mine Reclamation
Roger Lee, Acting Public Works Director, City of Cupertino
Lisa Horowitz McCann, Assistant Executive Officer, SF Bay Regional Water Board
Kristin Garrison, Environmental Scientist, California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Deborah Feng, City Manager, City of Cupertino