

Response to Comment Letter X1

Gregg Curtis
March 6, 2014

Comment Letter X1

Hingtgen, Robert J

From: gregg curtis <greggcurtis@live.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 06, 2014 7:42 PM
To: Hingtgen, Robert J
Subject: Soitec Public Review Comments (Boulevard)

Robert Hingtgen
 County of San Diego
 Department of Planning & Development Services

The idea of a solar farm even being proposed 1/8th of a mile from my home is beyond what I can tolerate. I have owned the land my home is on 10 years ago and I built my house 3 years ago. It cost me \$28,000 to drill a well over 900 feet deep until I finally hit water, and currently only have 1 ½ gallon per minute flow rate. The idea of a solar farm drilling multiple wells and pulling what they estimate to be in excess of 18 acre-feet of water which equals 5,880,600 gallons from the ground for their construction as well as 6 acre-feet of water equaling 1,960,200 gallons ever year from that point on will without doubt affect the water table, being so close to my home. Who will pay for my water when I have to have it trucked in weekly from an outside source?

In addition, with the constant winds here in Boulevard (often times in excess of 60 mph), having 420 acres of land that has been stripped of ALL vegetation would create a giant dust bowl during these windy conditions. This dust will infiltrate the windows in our homes, pit and damage the windshields of our vehicles as well as affect our animals, pets, and livestock.

The roads leading to and from our house from interstate 8 are narrow 2 lane roads that were only designed for average size vehicle traffic. Having large equipment travel these roads on a daily basis during construction, as well as maintenance vehicles after construction, will be a severe danger to the residents not to mention open the door to lawsuits related to head on collisions that are likely to occur as a result of the heavy equipment traffic. Additional, all residents in our area are required to pay a yearly "fire prevention fee" to the state. These fees apply to us regardless if we have ½ acre or 100 acres. However, the Soitec Solar Farm is exempt from these yearly fees despite owning a proposed 420 acre piece of property (that could in fact be the source of a fire itself).

The summers in Boulevard (being considered "high desert") often reach close to 100 degrees. By Soitec's own admission, the solar panels radiate as much as 200 degrees per panel, and with a proposed 2,657 panels in place, that certainly won't help the surrounding homes and wildlife.

This sort of project belongs in a desert or mountainside NOT in a neighborhood and community. Better yet, they should be on the roof tops of commercial buildings in the city but NOT within view of my backyard!

I DO NOT WANT THE SOITEC SOLAR FARM IN BOULEVARD!

Gregg Curtis
 38211 Moon Valley Rd
 Boulevard Ca
 91905
 619-757-8542

1

X1-1

This comment raises concerns related to groundwater use during construction and operation of the Proposed Project. Potential impacts related to groundwater use are considered and addressed in the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (DPEIR); see Section 3.1.5.3.4, Groundwater Resources, and Section 3.1.9.3.1, Water. Also refer to common response WR1.

X1-2

Fugitive dust impacts are analyzed in Section 2.2.3.2 of the DPEIR. Particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) emissions were estimated for the Proposed Project and project design features have been identified to reduce impacts related to fugitive dust emissions.

Moreover, as stated in Section 2.2.2 of the DPEIR, the San Diego Air Pollution Control District's (SDAPCD's) Regulation IV: Prohibitions; Rule 55: Fugitive Dust, regulates fugitive dust emissions from any commercial construction activity capable of generating fugitive dust emissions beyond the project site (SDAPCD 2009). Compliance with this rule would further minimize fugitive dust impacts. Furthermore, County Code Section 87.428 requires that "All clearing and grading shall be carried out with dust control measures adequate to prevent creation of a nuisance to

	persons or public or private property.” Project design feature PDF-AQ-1 will be incorporated to minimize fugitive dust during construction activities and comply with County Code Section 87.428. Fugitive dust violations can be reported to the SDAPCD, which would investigate the complaint, and to County staff. Regarding fugitive dust following completion of construction activities, dust control measures including the application of a nontoxic soil stabilizer or other acceptable methods that would be applied annually have been incorporated as conditions of approval for the Proposed Project to reduce fugitive dust impacts. In addition, Mitigation Measure M-BI-PP-5, as described in Section 2.3.6.1 of the DPEIR, requires the development of a project-specific fugitive dust control plan. X1-3 Please refer to the response to comment I34-4 regarding the potential for traffic hazards. In addition, please refer to common response TRAF1, which addresses maintenance of project area roads. X1-4 “Fire prevention fees” were not discussed in the DPEIR since this topic is not related to environmental impacts (see 14 CCR § 15131). The Proposed Project’s potential impact to fire hazards in the area were analyzed in Section 3.1.4, Hazards and Hazardous Materials.
--	---

	X1-5 The County disagrees that the Proposed Project would result in higher ambient temperatures in the area surrounding the Proposed Project sites; see response to comment I91-5. The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project. The information in this comment will be in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers. References 14 CCR 15000–15387 and Appendices A–L. Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, as amended. SDAPCD (San Diego Air Pollution Control District). 2009. Rules and Regulations, Regulation IV, Prohibitions, Rule 55: Fugitive Dust. Adopted June 24, 2009; effective December 24, 2009.
--	--

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK