

I-39 Karen Binns (3)

Comment Letter I-39

Karen Binns
2637 Deer Springs Place
San Marcos, CA 92069-9761
760-744-5916
royalviewranch@aol.com

August 14, 2017

San Diego County Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue
Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123

RE: Newland Sierra, Log NO. PDS2015-ER-15-08-001; SCH NO. 2015021036. Project Numbers: PDS2015-GPA-15-001, PDS2015-SP-15-001, PDS2015-REZ-15-001, PDS2015-TM-5597, PDSXXXX-HLP-XXX.

Dear Ashley,

I have some additions to the comments on the Draft EIR that I submitted the other night.

I-39-1

Thank you for allowing me to make comments to this Draft EIR.

Has Newland done any studies on how blasting would affect all the horses and farm animals, chickens etc., in Twin Oaks Valley as well as dogs, cats and birds? I have a very old horse and I am concerned with how she may respond with all the blasting, being an abutter to the project.

I-39-2

We also raise some chickens for eggs and I am concerned with the air quality during blasting as well as any residue left on the ground. I am concerned that this residue will be eaten by the chickens as they are pecking at the ground and that it will be deposited in the eggs they lay. Since chicken owners have to be extremely cautious with any medication, etc. that we give them, as it is deposited in the eggs they lay. Sometime with simple worming we have to discard eggs for 21 days. Has this effect on farm animals been studied?

I-39-3

Newland is claiming this is the first project in San Diego that will be carbon neutral. Is this what your new Climate Action Plan is referencing? Are they going to be buying credits so that they can say they are carbon neutral? The County is going to have a carbon offset fund as part of their Climate Action Plan where Developers can pay into a fund to help new projects meet requirements under the new proposed Climate Action Plan? Is Newland going to “buy their way” to a carbon neutral project? Is this a conflict of interest for the County to have this fund? What

I-39-4
I-39-5

Comment Letters

would prevent the County from approving projects which are inappropriate just so they can get an offset fee?

I-39-5
Cont.

In the Geotechnical Report , 2646 Deer Springs Road should be 2646 Deer Springs Place. There is no 2646 Deer Springs Road. Deer Springs Road only goes up to 1299 Deer Springs Road therefore that is most likely why no records were found in their records search.

I am aware that within the Merriam Mountains EIR there were issues with that property as it was set to be demolished with that plan also.

They only checked the 2646 number. They should have checked the Sarver Lane number, 2737 Sarver Lane as that was the original address for that home but sometime in the late 1980's that address was changed to 2646 Deer Springs Place, so the Geotechnical Report for that address is incorrect. Please correct this and do another records search and revise that section in the DEIR.

I-39-6

I am aware that there were issues with that home slated for demolition. If the Newland Sierra plan is approved there may be remediation issues that need to be done.

We just got this in a letter from Caltrans. How can The County/Newland/ the EIR claim that they are awaiting Caltrans regarding the widening of the I-15 Interchange at Deer Springs? Sounds like Caltrans does not even have a project at this location that they are studying!

Caltrans states:

Caltrans does not have a project at I-15 and Deer Springs Road as identified in the DEIR. Therefore any reference to such project bearing responsibility for future impacts is incorrect. As a result, the traffic analysis and mitigation is insufficient and misleading. Direct impacts from this Project are the responsibility of the County and the Developer to fully and adequately mitigate. Any work done in State Right of Way (ROW) will require Caltrans oversight and encroachment permits, including all required studies to be funded by the County or Developer. Any traffic mitigation within the States ROW needs to include feasible alternatives that suffices the Highway Design Manual without design exceptions.

I-39-7

This project should not move forward until that interchange is redesigned and improved.

I-39-8

We feel this project is a "leap frog" development.

I-39-9

How will the SDCWA aqueduct be affected during construction? Sierra Park has the aqueduct going right through it. What mitigation measure would have to be taken so as not to damage the aqueduct with all the heavy earth moving equipment? I did not see that addressed in the DEIR. The aqueduct goes through my property also so I am very concerned that they may do damage and then my property will be dug up also.

I-39-10

Comment Letters

The greenhouse waste facility in Sierra Farms Park needs to be moved to the center of this project where all the green waste will be generated, rather than infringing on the neighbors to this project. It makes no sense to put it on the outskirts of the project when the green waste will be generated throughout the project. All this will do is add to more driving and more Green House Gases being emitted into the air.

I-39-11

When will these bins be emptied? Daily? Weekly? Will the green waste be taken offsite or remain on the project grounds?

Will there be any grinding involved for mulching purposes? Has that noise level been studied in the DEIR?

In the Biological Technical Report there are 16 maps with no names. All they say are "Puddles". Why aren't they named and why isn't the location noted? Is this in regards to the 'fairy shrimp' issue?

I-39-12

The Resource Protection section noted that there are 3 new cultural sites that have been found since Merriam Mountains. Some are significant. What will be done to these sites for mitigation?

I-39-13

On page G-26 of the Biology Report it states that the "Stephen's Kangaroo Rat is a wildlife species with low potential or not expected to occur". That is incorrect. I have seen them frequently.

I-39-14

In the Biological Technical Appendix on page 2-24 regarding human activity; it states that "therefore the proposed development is expected to lead to the **decrease in human activity on the project site**". How can that be possible with the introduction of over 6,000 new people to this area?

I-39-15

Your Crystalline silica report is totally inadequate.

I-39-16

This DEIR needs to be totally revised and recirculated.

I-39-17

Sincerely,

Karen Binns

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK