

I-342 Steven Scriven (1)

- I-342-1** The comment is an introduction to comments regarding contamination of the project site.

The County acknowledges the comment as an introduction to comments that follow. This comment is included in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

- I-342-2** The comment states the commenter has reviewed the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment, Soil Vapor Screening Survey Report and Report of Removal of Above Ground Storage Tank. The commenter states many people hike in the area of the proposed Project.

The County acknowledges the comment as an introduction to comments that follow. The County notes the comment provides factual background information and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required because the comment does not raise an environmental issue concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR.

- I-342-3** The comment quotes language from the reports related to spent shotgun shell casings.

The comment restates information contained in the Draft EIR and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

- I-342-4** The comment states the commenter believes this is an understatement based on metal detecting the project Site “over the years.” The comment stated the commenter has found that shell and brass casings “litter the entire property along all major roadways,” including “piles of lead bullets that filter into the ruts on the roads” which are “not limited to a few particular areas as the Phase 1 ESA states.”

The County acknowledges the comment and notes that the Phase 1 ESA was prepared and reviewed by the County, the findings of which are presented as Appendix L of the DEIR. Section 2.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, analyzed the proposed projects effects with respect to Hazardous Materials in Section 2.8.3.2 and identified a potentially significant impact (Impact HZ-4) related to lead contamination in an area of illegal shooting were 500 shotgun shell casings and other 22-caliber bullet

Comment Letter Responses

casings were found. Mitigation Measure M-HZ-4 is proposed to reduce this impact to less than significant.

With respect to the location of other bullet casings, the County acknowledges the comment and notes the commenter does not provide specific evidence as to where these locations are, the number of such shell casings, and whether these totals are similar to the amounts identified in the DEIR. Accordingly, the County cannot provide a more detailed response. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

- I-342-5** The comment states that there are piles of E-waste, “guttled car frames and shattered auto debris, oil containers, etc.” The comment notes the debris was found over the entire project Site, not just in the areas stated in the DEIR.

The County acknowledges the comment and notes the commenter does not provide specific evidence as to where these locations are and the amount of such debris. Accordingly, the County cannot provide a more detailed response. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

- I-342-6** The comment has been combined with Response to Comment I-342-5, above.

- I-342-7** The comment quotes information regarding arsenic, lead and metal concentrations from the DEIR.

The comment restates information contained in the Draft EIR and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

- I-342-8** The comment asks if the project applicant is required to re-evaluate the contamination of lead and E-waste in more areas.

The County acknowledges the comment and refers the reader to Response to Comment I-342-4 and I-342-5, above. No further evaluation is required and no additional response is required or necessary.

- I-342-9** The comment refers to another property in San Marcos where the owner was fined for people dumping on the property.

Comment Letter Responses

The comment does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

- I-342-10** The comment asks if the project applicant has been fined or required to clean up the project Site. The comment states the project applicant “have not been observed as being good property owners to this point.”

The County acknowledges the comment and notes it raises economic, social, or political issues that do not appear to relate to any physical effect on the environment. The County notes the comment expresses the opinions of the commentator, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required because the comment does not raise an environmental issue concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR.

- I-342-11** The comment quotes information from the Draft EIR related to the off-site Arco facility.

The comment restates information contained in the Draft EIR and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

- I-342-12** The comment asks how the project applicant will be required to address contamination in the Town Center area.

The County acknowledges the comment and refers the reader to page 2.8-24 of the DEIR which states:

The proposed school site is located approximately 1,200 feet of the off-site ARCO gas station, which was identified on the following databases: (1) the RCRA Small Quantity Generator, (2) the Facility Index System, (3) the 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. However, as discussed under Significance Guidelines C through H, the potential for contaminated soils within the project Site resulting from the ARCO station do not pose a risk to human health. Further, a Health Risk Assessment, which analyzes potential for toxic

Comment Letter Responses

air contaminants impacts to the proposed school resulting from operation of the ARCO station, concluded that risks to human health at the school would be below significance thresholds (refer to Section 2.3, Air Quality, and Appendix G)....

As described previously, the ARCO station and I-15 would constitute such facilities and have been assessed as part of the Health Risk Assessment prepared for the proposed project and is included as Appendix G. As discussed under Significance Guidelines C through H, the potential for contaminated soils within the project Site resulting from the ARCO station do not pose a risk to human health. The Health Risk Assessment concluded that risks to human health at the school resulting from potential toxic emissions from the ARCO station and I-15 would be below significance thresholds and would not pose a risk to human health (refer to Section 2.3, Air Quality, and Appendix G).Therefore, impacts related to hazardous materials handling would be **less than significant**.

Accordingly, no further mitigation is required.

- I-342-13** The County acknowledges the comment and notes it provides concluding remarks that do not raise new or additional environmental issues concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR. For that reason, the County provides no further response to this comment.
- I-342-14** The comment refers to the sources used for the above comments. No response is required.