

Comment Letter I26

Hank and Nancy Reib
 PO Box 662
 Pine Valley, CA 91962
 619-473-8803



February 6, 2014

Mr. Robert Hingtgen, Planner
 Planning and Development Services
 5510 Overland Ave, Suite #110
 San Diego, CA 92123

Dear Sir:

We strongly oppose all four of the solar projects as described in the Soitec Solar PEIR.

We oppose these projects because of their significant impacts to the natural environment, sensitive biological and cultural resources, and adjacent residents' quality of life, property values, and wells. These industrial-size solar farms that will greatly harm the community character of Boulevard, will displace established wildlife corridors and negatively affect local aquifers during a declared state-wide drought. We are also concerned about the placement of large-scale solar farms in a wildfire-prone area that has limited firefighting capabilities and is understaffed.

The proposed placement of more than 7200 huge Concentrated Photovoltaic (CPV) trackers in the rural natural landscape of Boulevard is simply wrong. These large CPV trackers would never be approved for placement in Rancho Santa Fe, Escondido, Poway or other North County communities even though the power that they will generate will be used in nearby urban areas.

These huge solar projects **do not fit our rural landscapes!** That is why we support the NO PROJECT alternative listed in the Soitec Solar PEIR.

Sincerely,

H. Reib Nancy Reib
 Hank and Nancy Reib

I26-1
 I26-2

Response to Comment Letter I26

Hank and Nancy Reib
 February 7, 2014

I26-1

The County of San Diego (County) acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project. The information in this comment will be provided in the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (FPEIR) for review and consideration by the decision makers. Adverse effects related to the environmental issues cited in this comment were considered and addressed in the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (DPEIR). Based on the environmental evaluation, it has been determined that the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on biological resources, including wildlife corridors, cultural resources, groundwater supply, and hazards such as risk of wildfire and firefighting capabilities (see DPEIR Chapters 2.3, 2.4, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.1.7; common response WR1 and WR2). The County acknowledges that the Project will have certain significant and unavoidable impacts related to aesthetics (see DPEIR Chapter 2.1). Property values are not an environmental issue and as such, are not evaluated in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

The Proposed Project is consistent with County zoning and is therefore an appropriate land use for the proposed sites (DPEIR Section 2.5.3.2). With the

	<p>exception of the LanEast and LanWest projects' inconsistency with two policies of the General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element, as noted in the DPEIR, the Proposed Project is also consistent with applicable land use plans, policies, and ordinances.</p> <p>As the Proposed Project does not yet have a utility offtaker, it is not possible to determine where the electricity generated by the Proposed Project will be used.</p> <p>I26-2 The County acknowledges the commenter's support for the No Project Alternative. The information in this comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.</p>
--	---