

I-342 Steven Scriven (1)

Comment Letter I-342



County of San Diego

MARK WARDLAW  
DIRECTOR  
PHONE (858) 694-2962  
FAX (858) 694-2555

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES  
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 310, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123  
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds

NEWLAND SIERRA  
PDS2015-GPA-15-001; PDS2015-SP-15-001; PDS2015-REZ-15-001; PDS2015-TM-5597  
JULY 18, 2017, SAN MARCOS COMMUNITY HALL  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) PUBLIC REVIEW MEETING COMMENT SHEET

Hello my name is Steve please Review  
attached questions about project site  
contamination regarding the Newland Sierra project  
development

I-342-1

Mail to:

Ashley Smith, Project Manager  
5510 Overland Ave., Suite 310  
San Diego, CA 92123

Email: [ashley.smith2@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:ashley.smith2@sdcounty.ca.gov)

FAX: (858) 694-3373

Phone: (858) 495-5375

 8-9-2017  
Signature, Date

STEVEN SCRIVEN  
Print Name

150 S. Rancho Santa Fe Rd Spc 26  
Address

San Marcos CA 92078  
City, State, Zip Code

## Comment Letters

---

Hello my name is Steve Scriven and I would like to ask a few questions about the proposed Newland Sierra Community in San Marcos. I have taken some time to read the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Soil Vapor Screening Survey Report, and Report of Removal of Above Ground Storage Tank. Many people have hiked in the area of this development for a long time. Newland states in 1 of this section they found the following:

I-342-2

"Spent shotgun shell casings (approximately 500) and 22-bullet casings were noted northeast of the abandoned private airstrip in the northwest area of the subject site. An abandoned hillside quarry was noted in the northwest area of the subject site. On August 31, 2006, Leighton collected four (4) surface soil samples from the area of the spent shotgun shells and tested them for Total Lead, soluble lead by State of California wet extraction method (Soluble Threshold Limit Concentration-STLC) and RCRA wet extraction method (Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure-TCLP).

The four soil samples in the immediate area of the shot gun shells has been impacted with lead at concentrations between 240mg/kg and 2,740 mg/kg of which samples have total lead above the California standard for hazardous waste of 1,000 mg/kg for Total Lead and 5.0 mg/L for soluble lead and RCRA standard for hazardous waste.

I-342-3

10618.004 31 Groundwater production wells are known to have existed on parcel # 178-101- 27 in September 1999 and 174-280-11 in May 1996. The County of San Diego Building Department showed one open and two expired electrical permits in their files for the above parcels. Trash and debris was observed throughout the subject site, particularly near the entrances to the subject site"

I feel this is a understatement of the affected area, and findings. In metal detecting the area over the years shell, and brass casings litter the entire property along all major roadways. We have found piles of lead bullets that filter into the ruts on the roads among which are .22, 5.56, 308, shotgun shells, and 9mm. They are not limited to a few particular areas as Leighton states. Also littering much of the property is numerous piles of blown up E-waste also not isolated to a lone TV as stated in the EIR, Multiple gutted car frames and shattered auto debris, oil containers, etc. These debris are found all over the entire projected site not just in the areas stated in the EIR. The EIR also states:

I-342-4

I-342-5

I-342-6

"With the exception of arsenic and lead, metals were not detected at concentrations exceeding the EPA Region 9 Regional Screening Levels. Arsenic levels were below California background concentrations. Total lead exceeded 80 mg/kg in three samples. The lead regional screening level exceedances in the illegal shooting areas appear to be scattered and limited to shallow soil. The results of the laboratory analyses suggest that the lead exceedances detected could be directly related to sampling bias from minute pieces of lead projectile in specific samples. However, dependent on final grading and construction plans, the extent of the lead contamination may result in adverse effects. Therefore, impacts would be **potentially significant** (Impact HZ-4)."

I-342-7

## Comment Letters

---

One question is if Newland will need to reevaluate the contamination of lead and E-waste on site in more areas?

I-342-8

In the past I knew the owner of a large parcel behind the Shopping center on grand in San Marcos near the 78. He was fined multiple times 10's of thousands of dollars and had to clean up after people dumping on his property. It got so bad he eventually and fenced it off to limit access.

I-342-9

I would also like to know why Newland has never seemed to have been fined by the city, and required to clean the project site long before this EIR considering they have owned it for over 8 years and considering the levels of contamination and dumping?

I-342-10

They claim to be about being environmentally friendly, and stewards of a new "reserve." However they have not been observed as being good property owners to this point.

Another issue in the same category is the EIR section that states the following:

"off-site, Arco Facility No 05625 (26915 Mesa Rock Road) was identified on the following databases: (1) the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Small Quantity Generator, (2) the Facility Index System, (3) the Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST), (4) the Hazardous Waste Manifest (HAZNET), (5) the Toxics and Criteria Pollutant Emissions Data (EMI), (6) the UST, and (7) the Recovered Government Archive LUST. According to the information provided, the facility has generated hazardous waste from approximately 1994 through 2013, and has registered USTs. According to the EDR report, a gasoline release has impacted the aquifer and is currently under investigation (EIR, Appendix L). Groundwater was monitored in March 2014 and the wells were abandoned in August 2014. The Arco facility was issued a closure letter by the Regional Water Quality Control Board on October 28, 2014."

I-342-11

With that said, how will Newland be required to deal with the contamination in the Town Center section of their proposal where the following was found?

I-342-12

Thank you for your time, and I hope that the city is doing its due diligence in researching what's going on with this massive project.

I-342-13

Sources Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment, Soil Vapor Screening Survey Report, and Report of Removal of Above Ground Storage Tank. (1), Section 2.8 pg 6, pg 25

I-342-14

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK