

Comment Letter I63

Hingtgen, Robert J

**From:** Judith D. Dupree <adlib\_pv@sbcbglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 11, 2014 10:33 AM  
**To:** Hingtgen, Robert J  
**Cc:** Jacob, Dianne  
**Subject:** Soitec Solar PEIR

Dear Mr. Hingtgen,

I would like to offer my observations regarding the four solar projects projected by Soitec Solar PEIR in the East SD County area adjacent to or near Boulevard.

This massive project will obviously, to any truly neutral observer, be a significant disruption to the far east county, which has already struggled with both "unforeseen" (largely by those who favored it) and foreseen effects of SDG&E's Sunrise Powerlink project. More to the point, beyond initial and permanent "disruption," the effects will play out upon wildlife, human health (hazards not fully known, but postulated in regard to disruptive effects, documented professionally, of magnetic energy and transmission), and, incontrovertibly, both visual and environmental degradation along a broad corridor that includes a historical scenic highway. The effects upon water tables, vegetation, and community character are all issues that deeply concern local and East County citizens. Quite simply, Boulevard and environs are going to pay an unsustainable and vastly unfair "price" for a debatably-significant advantage to others far beyond their acreage. Governing is fraught with conflicts between the needs (perceived or undeniable) of one faction or another. Often there is no "good answer," and some-one(s) loses. Compromise doesn't "come easy" when the subject includes political overtones and corporate power plays. Compromise rarely enters the argument when it is the will of the people against the will of developers, regardless of the overarching merit, or perhaps lack of it, in the stated purpose. And sometimes there is nothing to compromise on. He who has the most toys, the loudest voice, wins again.

What gets lost increasingly in our incredibly complex nation is the idea and ideal of "public good." A project that is intentioned toward one facet of community life wrecks havoc upon those who stand in the way. They become "the enemy" to The Purpose, and the full weight of professional zeal and "righteousness" falls upon them. Boulevard is only a pebble in the stream. But those who live in or within driving range know the value of such semi-sacred places in a world too often bisected literally and/or metaphorically by those who can, who "own" The Plan, who have the moxie, who are a phalanx of persuasion where power is the magic key. To those who stand stubbornly in the way of Progress, it is death by suffocation, or a kind of starvation that few in the Board Room can understand.

I believe there is a better solution to existing problems than that of Soitec Solar PEIR. Their gargantuan devices do not belong on this rural landscape. We in East county hope someone in the appropriate San Diego County office will read the "runes"—the ancient rocks and their stories, out here where history still lives—and begin the ultimate reversal.

Thank you for listening.  
 Judith Dupree  
 Pine Valley, CA  
 Assoc. Editor, Valley Views  
[adlib\\_pv@sbcbglobal.net](mailto:adlib_pv@sbcbglobal.net)

I63-1

I63-2

I63-3

I63-4

Response to Comment Letter I63

Judith Dupree  
 February 11, 2014

I63-1

The County of San Diego (County) acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project. Existing infrastructure projects in the East County, such as the Sunrise Powerlink, were taken into account in the environmental analysis of the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (DPEIR) as part of the baseline environmental setting in the vicinity of the Project.

I63-2

The County acknowledges the commenter's concerns related to impacts to wildlife and vegetation, groundwater resources, and aesthetics, as well as potential hazards created by the Proposed Project, including magnetic energy and transmission. The County has considered and addressed these impacts in the DPEIR. Based on the environmental evaluation, it has been determined that the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact to biological resources, including wildlife and vegetative communities, with the implementation of mitigation (DPEIR Chapter 2.3). With regard to groundwater, see Sections 3.1.5.3.4, Groundwater Resources, and 3.1.9.3.1, Water, as well as common response WR1 and WR2. The Proposed Project was analyzed for impacts to groundwater, and it was determined that impacts

	<p>would be less than significant impact. Related to scenic highways and the commenter’s concern for visual degradation, the County acknowledges that the Project would have certain significant and unavoidable impacts on visual resources (DPEIR Chapter 2.1). See response to comment I17-5 for details related to landscaping requirements to reduce visual impacts. Potential hazards are addressed in Chapter 3.1.4 of the DPEIR and it was determined that the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact related to hazards. A discussion related to electric and magnetic fields is provided in Section 3.1.4.5; please also refer to Appendix 9.0-1 of the DPEIR. The appendix consists of memorandum prepared by Asher R. Sheppard, PhD to support the electric and magnetic fields information provided in the DPEIR and to provide addition detail on the subject matter. The memorandum concludes that EMF from the Proposed Project are highly localized and pose no known concern for human health.</p> <p><b>I63-3</b> This comment does not raise an environmental issue. 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 provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.</p> <p><b>I63-4</b> This comment concludes the letter and does not raise an environmental issue.</p>
--	--