

I-344 Steven Scriven (3)

Comment Letter I-344



County of San Diego

MARK WARDLAW
DIRECTOR
PHONE (858) 694-2062
FAX (858) 694-2655

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 310, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
www.sdcountry.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

Thank you for addressing these questions
please read attached letter for review. They are
on air quality in our local area.

I-344-1


Mail to:

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

Email: ashley.smith2@sdcounty.ca.gov

FAX: (858) 694-3373

Phone: (858) 495-5375

 8-9-2017
Signature, Date
Steve Scriven
Print Name
150 S. Rancho Santa Fe Rd Spc 26 San Marcos CA 92078
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 Section 2.3 on Air Quality and have found some inconsistencies, and troubling wording. Many people in the community who live within the area are older. Many have stated publicly that they have health ailments that are aggravated by air quality. In reading the EIR I have found the following information:

I-344-2

"Significant reductions in VOC, CO, and PM10 and PM2.5 emissions would be required to reduce emissions of these pollutants to levels that are less than significant, and feasible mitigation measures are not 2.3 Air Quality June 2017 7608 Newland Sierra Draft Environmental Impact Report 2.3-44 available to achieve these reductions. Following implementation of project design features listed above and M-AQ-6 through M-AQ-9, proposed project operational emissions would remain **significant and unavoidable**. "

"Additionally, as shown in Table 2.3-14, combined emissions from construction and operational activities would exceed the thresholds for NOx, CO, and PM10 with blasting and rock crushing activities. Combined construction and operational emissions, without blasting and rock crushing activities, would only exceed the threshold for PM10. Following implementation of M-AQ-2 through M-AQ-4, PDF-1 through PDF-32, and M-AQ-6 through M-AQ-9, proposed project construction and operational emissions would remain **significant and unavoidable** for NOx, CO, and PM10 with blasting and rock crushing activities. Combined construction and operational emissions would remain **significant and unavoidable** for PM10 without blasting and rock crushing activities."

I-344-3

"In summary, deposited crystalline silica is not considered to be a source of significant health risk and impacts would be less than significant. Although impacts would be **less than significant**, mitigation measure measures M-AQ-12 and M-AQ-12 would be implemented to control fugitive dust emissions generated during blasting activities."

"Even with implementation of PDF-1 through PDF-32 and M-AQ-6 through M-AQ-9, significant reductions in VOCs, CO, PM10 and PM2.5 emissions would be required to reduce emissions of these pollutants to less than significant and feasible mitigation measures are not available to achieve these reductions. When considered with other potential cumulative projects in the proposed project vicinity, cumulative operational emissions would be considered **significant and unavoidable**."

Firstly I would like to know whether Newland will be required to research, and plan more mitigations for the air quality effects since theirs fail to properly mitigate the affects to air quality?

I-344-4

Will they still be considered for approval even though the effects on locals are **Significant and Unavoidable**?

I-344-5

Even though they say the effects will be **Significant and Unavoidable** for PM2.5, and PM10 how is it that their projections for silica will be **Less than Significant** since many geological studies in the past, and their own recognize that they will be grading into a lot of granite that has a high silica/quartz content?

I-344-6

Comment Letters

I work in construction and silica is a huge health hazard. California lists PM2.5 and PM10 as the biggest contaminate that people in our state are exposed to every day. They can travel in the air for up to 30 miles and settle onto everything. Anytime anything walks or stirs up this layer it is being breathed in. It is particularly dangerous for wildlife who have much smaller lungs than we do, especially avian and amphibians. In the Biology section they state that there is plenty of wildlife including a Gnat Catcher that is currently Endangered, a threatened toad species, also the older folks in the community I discussed earlier. Newland acknowledges their is going to be **Significantly** impacted Air Quality from PM2.5 and PM10 that can not be mitigated by their proposed plans.

I-344-7

In light of this will Newland be required to provide more feasible mitigations to protect the extremely sensitive, and endangered wildlife in the area from negative air quality effects?

I-344-8

My last question pertains to the statement the EIR made about the air quality effects being **Significant and Unavoidable and also un-mitigatable** if there are other projects being built in the area. In the Local San Marcos area alone there are already 7000 projected units approved and being built. Will Newland be required to find new mitigation resources to fix this, and if they cant will they be required to reassess their project to reduce the affects to air quality?

I-344-9

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-344-10

Sources EIR Section 2.3 pgs 43-44, 49-50, 62 and 64

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK