

February 27, 2014

To: County of San Diego
Planning and Development Services
Project Processing Counter
5510 Overland Ave, suite 110
San Diego, CA 92123



Re: COMMENTS ON
SOITEC SOLAR DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PIER)

SOITEC SOLAR DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, LOG NO.PDS2012-3910-120005 (ER); 3800-12-010 (GPA); TIERRA DEL SOL, 3300-12-010 (MUP); 3600-12-005 (REZ); 3921-77-046-01 (AP); RUGGED SOLAR, 3300-12-007 (MUP); SCH NO.2012121018

ADDENDUM to previous comments of Feb. 17, 2014

From: Daniel Renard
41148 Old Highway 80
Boulevard, Ca, 91905

Dear Director and Staff;

We are concerned for the safety, health and wellbeing of our home, family and pets with imminent risks of the long term exposure to being surrounded by a high voltage solar farm witch deprives us of the quality of life we had a right to expect when we bought our home in Boulevard.

It came with an adequate supply of pure safe drinking water from a legally protected aquifer witch this solar program intends to drain beyond its fair share and further put at risk by pollution through the site preparation,

construction, maintenance, and cleaning these incompatible solar power projects. We currently share this aquifer with the residents of our next door neighbors, which Soitec denies exist. Despite the proponents claim to the contrary there is an existing occupied residence established in 1997 on the proposed site of LanEast. They are not related to our family but seem to be nice people.

12. A document entitled "Notice of Manufactured Home (Mobilehome) or Commercial Coach, Installation on a Foundation System" recorded JUNE 23, 1997 as Instrument No. 1997-0291411 of Official Records.

We had the protection of the general plan for San Diego County to indicate that that our magnificent view would not be totally obscured in every direction with a 30 foot tall unsightly and blinding obstruction. It is easy to determine that at or near sunrise and sunset these glaring panels will blind drivers coming around the curve with the sun behind them and its reflection in front of them on scenic Historic Old Highway 80 in front of our home. This same glare will also create a nuisance for our family and pets. It certainly reduces the value of our property as a residence.

Though it is no longer a store, the view from the highway, "Old Hiway 80" out front is still available and substantially the same as it was when California became a State in 1850 when this spot included an army mail stop and stage coach station. The scenic view and location is nostalgic and culturally and historically significant. It is well worth preserving.

We maintain an adequate supply of water to protect our property from fire. Such a source of high voltage electricity surrounding us would create an unacceptable life threatening hazard to use water to fight a fire. That same risk of electrocution should be assumed to exist any time you stand in a puddle surrounded by high voltage electricity, even in the rain.

The plans for these projects do not seem to include much designated parking or any parking that mitigates the increased risk of operating or storing gasoline powered equipment near the 180 degree plus operating temperature of these solar panels. Access roads are not for employee or visitor parking.

It is apparent and obvious that the water storage water tanks proposed to fight fire on a high voltage electrical project is essentially subterfuge to provide large quantities of our life sustaining potable water for maintaining

and cleaning solar panels. To truly assess the environmental impact of these projects on a program level concealing such information is not an innocent oversight it is a fatal flaw.

This also raises the question of what chemicals are appropriate to combat high voltage electrical fires and how do we keep them out of our ground water once they have been deployed? The first step to fight an electrical fire is normally to shut off the power source, but you cannot make a solar panel exposed to the sun stop producing watts. The first priority of fire fighters is always to protect lives first so let's not use water to put theirs in peril.

If large quantities of groundwater are for maintenance and cleaning, do not accept any lame excuse to mask the **true intent of their use of our most precious resource** and the plan for its drainage or recovery and reclamation and the resulting erosion and contamination that will result. If the intent of these water tanks is for firefighting on the neighboring agricultural and rural residential properties why lock it up behind a 10 foot fence?

We are very worried that the proposed construction will damage the structure of our residential/commercial building, well and water storage system and electrical systems. Pile driving and blasting over eleven hundred, 28 inch diameter posts, 20 feet into the earth on immediately adjacent or even nearby property can certainly be predicted to disturb existing foundations, structures, mechanical and electric systems, aquifers and the human occupants not to mention the habitat of all god's creatures and their nests scheduled to be obliterated by it.

We agree with the PEIR the consequences of our fears are significant but not unavoidable with the resounding effect of **not approving** this or any program with such missuses of any agricultural and residential rural property in Boulevard or scenic highways or corridors in San Diego County.

Thank you;



Daniel Renard

