



T 510.836.4200
F 510.836.4205

1939 Harrison Street, Ste. 150
Oakland, CA 94612

www.lozeaudrury.com
victoria@lozeaudrury.com

Via Email

September 21, 2026

Mike Barnett, Commissioner
Christopher Carroll, Commissioner
Diana Cavanaugh, Commissioner
Fatima Guerrero, Commissioner
Steve Kildoo, Commissioner
Kevin Norris, Commissioner
Lionel Saulsberry, Commissioner
Marie Marcinko, Alternate Commissioner
Lindsey Smith, Alternate Commissioner
Planning Commission
City of San Marcos
1 Civic Center Drive
San Marcos, CA 92069

Song LeBaron, Staff Liaison
Planning Division
Development Services Department
City of San Marcos
1 Civic Center Drive
San Marcos, CA 92069
slebaron@san-marcos.net
slebaron@sanmarcosca.gov

Gina Jackson, Secretary
Planning Commission
City of San Marcos
1 Civic Center Drive
San Marcos, CA 92069
gjackson@san-marcos.net

Chris Garcia, Senior Planner
Planning Division
Development Services
Department
City of San Marcos
1 Civic Center Drive
San Marcos, CA 92069
cgarcia@san-marcos.net

**Re: Comment on Oakcrest Specific Plan (SP25-0004), Planning
Commission Meeting of September 21, 2026, Agenda Item 2**

Dear Honorable Commissioners, Ms. LeBaron, Ms. Jackson, and Mr. Garcia:

This comment is submitted on behalf of Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility ("SAFER") regarding the Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") prepared for the Oakcrest Specific Plan (SP25-0004), which proposes the development of 257 single-family homes, trails, an approximately 6-acre public park, roads, drainage infrastructure, fire buffer areas and open space, located on 84 acres of a 136-acre project site on the west side of North Twin Oaks Valley Road between Legacy Drive and Del Roy Drive in the City of San Marcos ("Project"). The Project is scheduled to be considered by the Planning Commission at its regular meeting on September 21, 2026 as Agenda Item 2.

SAFER is concerned that the FEIR fails to adequately respond to comments submitted on the Draft EIR. When a significant environmental issue is raised in comments

that object to the draft EIR's analysis, the response must be detailed and must provide a reasoned, good faith analysis. (14 CCR § 15088(c).) The responses to comments on a draft EIR must state reasons for rejecting suggestions and objections concerning significant environmental issues. (*City of Maywood v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist.* (2012) 208

Cal.App.4th 362, 391.) The need for a reasoned, factual response is particularly acute when critical comments have been made by other agencies or by experts. (See *Berkeley Keep Jets Over the Bay Comm. v. Board of Port Comm'rs* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 1344, 1367, 1371.) Also, the EIR must impose all feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to reduce significant impacts. (*Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles* (2023) 98 Cal. App. 5th 1176, 1226.)

If significant new information is added to an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) after notice of public review has occurred, but before final certification of the EIR, the lead agency must issue a new notice and recirculate the EIR for comments and consultation. (Pub. Res. Code § 21092.1; 14 CCR § 15088.5.) "Significant new information" triggering the need for EIR recirculation includes information showing that (1) a new or more severe environmental impact would result from the project, (2) a feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of a project but the project proponent declines to adopt it, or (3) the draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded. (14 CCR § 15088.5(a)(1)-(4).) A decision not to recirculate an EIR must be supported by substantial evidence in the administrative record. (14 CCR § 15088.5(e).)

Significant comments were filed in the Draft EIR by United States Fish and Wildlife Services, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Caltrans, Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians, and Twin Oaks Valley Community Sponsor Group. The Final EIR fails to adequately respond to these comments and fails to impose feasible mitigation measures suggested by the expert consultants and expert agencies.

A recirculated EIR is required to address these deficiencies.

SAFER reserves the right to supplement these comments during the administrative process. *Galante Vineyards v. Monterey Peninsula Water Management Dist.*, 60 Cal. App. 4th 1109, 1121 (1997).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Victoria Yundt".

Victoria Yundt
Lozeau Drury LLP