

February 7, 2014



Robert Hingtgen  
County of San Diego  
Dept. Of Planning & Development Services  
5510 Overland Ave., Suite 110  
San Diego, CA 92123

I'll start by saying that I'm against the Soite's Solar Project in Boulevard.

In the EIR Analysis I have issues, Mostly in the mitigations as follows:

### AESTHETICS

How can six feet tall landscape screening be a solution to significant impacts to the vistas in this area.

### AIR QUALITY

I find no provision for dust control during operation and maintenance of the sites. I make reference to Soitec's site near Borrego Springs. The area is constantly fighting the dust problem from the sight although the area was promised that there would be dust control. With the Boulevard area having more winds than are experienced in Borrego Springs, I urge a review of this site and force Soitec to control the dusty conditions that the sites will produce.

### LAND USE

Reference Para. 2.5.3.2: Conflict with Plans, Policies and Regulations

When a project goes against the Plans, Policies and regulations of the area, why has the project allowed the progress to this level when the Mitigation solution is "UNAVOIDABLE". Did anyone read this paragraph?

### GROUND WATER

The 10 feet draw down threshold is too drastic. The sites are located mostly in lower lying areas. Most home sites with private wells are elevated above these sites. Lowering the ground water table will certainly affect the private wells in the surrounding home sites.

### TRAFFIC

Reference Para, 3.1.8.3.2: Roadway Segment Operations

Impact is specified as "none identified". The construction traffic over the county maintained roads will be a significant impact.

I reference the construction of SDG&E's sub station at the end of Jewel Valley road. Over the months, and their project is still not completed, the heavy volume of their construction traffic has destroyed the surface of Jewel Valley road.

Paying into the TIF will not assure that the funds will be allotted directly to the damage of county roads caused in the construction phase.

## ALTERNATIVES

This section of the EIR is the most disturbing to me and my family. Our property is located on the north boundary of the Los Robles site (ref. APN 612-040-20). In 1990 we bought this parcel, that was raw land, overlooking a beautiful working cattle ranch. Over the next ten years with a lot of sweat and hard labor, we single handily cleared and improved the land for building our retirement home. In 2002 we moved into our new home and have enjoyed the peace and quiet of the area and the beautiful view over Jewel Valley.

Even considering Los Robles as an alternate site is something I cannot understand. Having an absentee owner that has no involvement in the Boulevard area makes the property an easy target for foreign companies such as Soitec to move onto and take advantage of the community.

I support the "NO PROJECT: alternative as my first choice. Reducing the entire proposed project as covered in the EIR would reduce the impact to the area.

Earl Goodnight  
1902 Jewel Valley Lane  
Boulevard, CA 91905  
blvdgoodnight@aol.com