

Comment Letter I69 February 10, 2014 Mr. Robert Hingtge Planning & Development Services 5510 Overland Avenue, Ste. 110 San Diego, CA 92123 RE: Soitec Solar Peier four Boulevard Projects Dear Mr. Hingtgen: I wish to be on record as OPPOSING the four projects and support the NO PROJECT alternative. 1. Water is a main concern and very precious to all residents of the Boulevard area. We rely on well water for our household and home garden consumption. I believe that the construction and maintenance of the solar projects threatens the supply of water for the residents of this community. 2. Property values. When the real estate market took a dive, property values decreased significantly. These highly visual solar projects are eye sores, causing another decrease in the value of our properties. 3. Traffic on Ribbonwood Rd., a narrow 2-lane country road, was never designed for the large trucks and construction equipment and large panel delivery trucks, which will create an extremely dangerous situation for homeowners going and coming from home. 4. Danger to birdlife: In other solar plants, birds have been found dead and injured by the reflected beams of sunlight given off by the solar panels. Also, birds are confused by the glittering sheen of solar panels and the birds dive towards the panels believing them to be water. We live west of the Ribbonwood and will plainly see the solar farm. I sincerely request that these projects be denied permit for the reasons stated. Sincerely, Mrs. Olivia G. Waegner 39506 Clements St. Boulevard, CA 91905 I69-1 I69-2 I69-3 I69-4 I69-5	Response to Comment Letter I69 Olivia Waegner February 13, 2014 I69-1 The County of San Diego (County) acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project. The County acknowledges the commenter's support for the No Project Alternative. The decision makers will consider all information in the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (FPEIR) and related documents before making a decision on the Project. The information in this comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers. I69-2 Potential impacts to groundwater were considered and discussed in Sections 3.1.5.3.4, Groundwater Resources, and 3.1.9.3.1, Water, of the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (DPEIR). Also, see common response WR1. Based on the environmental analysis, it was determined that the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on groundwater supply. As stated in Section 3.1.9.3.1, the County will place conditions on the Major Use Permit that will restrict the amount of water that is permitted to be withdrawn from the on-site wells in order to prevent interference with off-site wells. As such, the County does not anticipate that wells of neighboring residents will be significantly impacted as a result of the Proposed Project.
---	--

	I69-3 This comment raises concerns regarding property values. This topic was not evaluated in the DPEIR since it is not related to environmental impacts (see 14 CCR 15131). However, the information in this comment will be included in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers. The County acknowledges that the Proposed Project would have a significant and unmitigable impact on visual character and quality (DPEIR Section 2.1.7). See response to comment I17-5 for details related to landscaping that will be implemented to reduce visual impacts. I69-4 The Proposed Project would not result in dangerous use conflicts between construction vehicles and local traffic. In addition, Ribbonwood Road can accommodate the operation of construction vehicles. Potential traffic hazards during construction are considered and addressed in Section 3.1.8.3.4, Traffic Hazards Due to Design Feature. The County found that the Proposed Project would have less than significant impacts related to traffic. Project design features, such as a traffic control plan and notification of residents would ensure that the Proposed Project would not create local driving hazards (see PDF-TR-1). I69-5 Based on the environmental analysis, it has been determined that the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact to biological resources with the implementation of mitigation, including
--	---

potential impacts related to glare effects on avian species. This issue is discussed in Section 2.3, Biological Resources, of the DPEIR. Please also refer to the response to comment F1-6.

References

14 CCR 15000–15387 and Appendices A–L. Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, as amended.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK