

**SUBJECT: Soitec Solar Development -- Rugged Solar: PDS2012-3300-12-007 (MUP);
Tierra Del Sol Solar: PDS2012-3600-12-005 (REZ), PDS2012-3921-77-046-01 (AP DIS),
PDS2012-3300-12-010 (MUP); PDS2012-3910-120005 (ER)**

This errata is submitted to the Board of Supervisors to make the following two corrections, with deletions shown in strikethrough and additions shown in underline:

- Section 6 of the Tierra Del Sol Solar Fire and Emergency Fire Services Agreement provided in Attachment H of the Planning Report as follows:

6. Installed Alternating Current Capacity

Section 4 assumes that the County grants Tierra del Sol a Major Use Permit for the development of approximately 60 MW AC and Tierra del Sol installs approximately 60 MW AC (the "Installed Capacity Amount"). If the County grants Tierra del Sol a Major Use Permit for less than the Installed Capacity Amount or Tierra del Sol constructs less than 60 MW AC (the "Actual Capacity Amount"), the Equipment Deposit, Equipment Rate, and Fire Prevention Amount shall be revised proportionally downward by multiplying them by the "Actual Capacity Factor", defined below:

$$\text{Actual Capacity Factor} = \text{Actual Capacity Amount} / \del{60} \underline{60}$$

The Paramedic Deposit and Paramedic Rate shall remain as stated in Section 4, irrespective of the Actual Capacity Amount.

- The Findings Regarding Significant Effects Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15090, 15091 and 15093 provided in Attachment K of the Planning Report as follows:

5) Significant Effect: Impact AE-TDS-3 - Two residences in the vicinity of the Tierra del Sol solar farm would have glare exposure of one hour or less a day throughout the year. Five residences in the vicinity of the Tierra del Sol solar farm would have glare exposure of 35 minutes or less per day during the spring. Glare produced by the trackers would be lower than that of other man-made surfaces and water and is not considered hazardous to vision, but would be visible to these identified residential properties. (2.1-49.)

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make other mitigation measures or the project alternatives identified in the FPEIR infeasible for the reasons set forth in Sections V and VI, below. (2.1-78.) This unavoidable impact is overridden by project benefits as set forth in the statement of overriding considerations in Section VII, below.

Mitigation Measures: M-AE-PP-1 requires the project proponent to install landscape screens in accordance with the Landscape Screening Design in EIR Appendix 2.1-4. The project proponent is responsible for continued maintenance and monitoring of the installed landscape screen. (2.1-77.)

Rationale: M-AE-PP-1 was proposed to mitigate the significance of AE-TDS-3. Alternative 2A would reduce the size of the Tierra del Sol solar farm. (4.0-31.) On the reduced Tierra del Sol site, trackers would be removed from areas of high visibility and would have greater setbacks from the property lines adjacent to public ROW. Removal of trackers and increased setbacks along public ROWs may reduce the glare anticipated to be received at residences and roadways near the Tierra del Sol solar farm site under this alternative, but would not reduce glare impacts to less than

significant with mitigation. (4.0-33.) While screens would partially block views of trackers, project glare would be received by residents in the immediate area and by motorists on Tierra del Sol Road, and therefore, even with implementation of M-AE-PP-1, direct impacts AE-TDS-3 would remain significant and unmitigable. (4.0-33.) In addition, changing panel operations to re-direct glare away from impacted residents during the period when glare would be received would be technologically and socially infeasible. Changing panel operations is technologically infeasible because it would require project operations managers to constantly monitor and adjust panel operations throughout the year based on changing sun position and potential glare affects to adjacent residences. To adequately assess and adjust panel operations, glare observations at adjacent residences would be necessary throughout the seasons, and such offsite access is uncertain. (POWER Engineers letter to Patrick Brown (January 28, 2015).) Changing panel operations is also socially infeasible because doing so would affect project electricity generation at the end of the day, when demand for renewable electricity is increasing as the supply of such electricity is rapidly decreasing. (Id.) CPV technology excels at generating renewable electricity at the beginning and end of the day, when other photovoltaic panels are unable to produce. (Soitec, Planning Commission Presentation (January 16, 2015).) By restricting panel operation during the end of the day—at exactly the period when CPV technology generates renewable electricity—this mitigation measure would be socially infeasible because it would reduce the project’s ability to satisfy project objectives 1, 2, and 7 over the life of the Project. Additional mitigation measures are infeasible because placement of any number of CPV trackers on the Tierra del Sol site would result in project glare to public viewpoints.

7) Significant Effect: Impact AE-R-2 - Five residences located west of the Rugged solar farm site would experience glare during the hour before sunset, for a total of less than 45 minutes. Two of the five residences would receive glare throughout the year and three of the five residences would have exposure to glare seasonally. Glare produced by the trackers would be lower than that of other man-made surfaces and water and is not considered hazardous to vision, but would be visible to these identified residential properties. (2.1-67.)

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make other mitigation measures or the project alternatives identified in the FPEIR infeasible for the reasons set forth in Sections V and VI, below. (2.1-77.) This unavoidable impact is overridden by project benefits as set forth in the statement of overriding considerations in Section VII, below.

Mitigation Measures: M-AE-PP-1 requires the project proponent to install landscape screens in accordance with the Landscape Screening Design in EIR Appendix 2.1-4. The project proponent is responsible for continued maintenance and monitoring of the installed landscape screen. (2.1-75.)

Rationale: M-AE-PP-1 was proposed to mitigate the significance of AE-R-2. Alternative 2A would reduce the size of the Rugged solar farm. (4.0-31.) Removal of trackers and increased setbacks along public ROWs may reduce the glare anticipated to be received at residences and roadways near the Rugged solar farm site under this alternative, but would not reduce glare impacts to a less than significant level without mitigation. (4.0-33.) Potential impacts associated with new sources of daytime glare would be slightly reduced through implementation of M-AE-PP-1, but the installation of landscape screening is not capable of fully screening affected properties from glare exposure. As such, even with implementation of M-AE-PP-1, impact AE-R-2 would remain significant and unmitigable. (4.0-33.) In addition, changing panel operations to re-direct glare away from impacted residents during the period when glare would be received would be technologically and socially infeasible. Changing panel operations is technologically infeasible because it would require project operations managers to

constantly monitor and adjust panel operations throughout the year based on changing sun position and potential glare affects to adjacent residences. To adequately assess and adjust panel operations, glare observations at adjacent residences would be necessary throughout the seasons, and such offsite access is uncertain. (POWER Engineers letter to Patrick Brown (January 28, 2015).) Changing panel operations is also socially infeasible because doing so would affect project electricity generation at the end of the day, when demand for renewable electricity is increasing as the supply of such electricity is rapidly decreasing. (Id.) CPV technology excels at generating renewable electricity at the beginning and end of the day, when other photovoltaic panels are unable to produce. (Soitec, Planning Commission Presentation (January 16, 2015).) By restricting panel operation during the end of the day—at exactly the period when CPV technology generates renewable electricity—this mitigation measure would be socially infeasible because it would reduce the project’s ability to satisfy project objectives 1, 2, and 7 over the life of the Project. Additional mitigation measures are infeasible because placement of any number of CPV trackers on the Rugged site would result in project glare to public viewpoints.

9) Significant Effect: Impact AE-PP-3 - The Proposed Project operation of trackers would produce glare. However, the severity of glare impacts would be determined by the angle of reflected glare and glare reflection height. Glare produced by the Tierra del Sol solar farm would be received by seven residences and by motorists on Tierra del Sol Road in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Glare produced by the Rugged solar farm would be received by five residences located directly west of the Rugged site and by motorists on segments of Ribbonwood Road and McCain Valley Road. While the daily duration of glare exposure would be relatively brief, and the generated reflection values of flare produced by trackers are not considered hazardous to vision, the Tierra del Sol and Rugged solar farms would create daytime glare that would be visible from adjacent properties and nearby local two-lane roadways. Although project-level information has not been developed at this time, glare generated during operation of the LanEast and LanWest solar farms would likely be received at four nearby residences and on local and regional roadways including McCain Valley Road, Old Highway 80, and I-8. (2.1-72.)

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make other mitigation measures or the project alternatives identified in the FPEIR infeasible for the reasons set forth in Sections V and VI, below. (2.1-78.) This unavoidable impact is overridden by project benefits as set forth in the statement of overriding considerations in Section VII, below.

Mitigation Measures: M-AE-PP-1 requires the project proponent to install landscape screens in accordance with the Landscape Screening Design in EIR Appendix 2.1-4. The project proponent is responsible for continued maintenance and monitoring of the installed landscape screen. (2.1-77.)

Rationale: M-AE-PP-1 was proposed to mitigate the significance of AE-PP-3. Alternative 2A would remove LanEast and LanWest solar farms. (4.0-32.) Alternative 2A would eliminate any glare impacts on the LanEast and LanWest site since they would not be developed. (4.0-33.) Removal of trackers and increased setbacks along public ROWs for the Rugged and Tierra del Sol solar farms may reduce the glare anticipated to be received at residences and roadways under Alternative 2A, but not to a less than significant level without mitigation. (4.0-33.) Potential impacts associated with new sources of daytime glare would be slightly reduced through implementation of M-AE-PP-1, but the installation of landscape screening is not capable of fully screening affected properties from glare exposure. As such, even with implementation of M-AE-PP-1, impact AE-PP-3 would remain significant and unmitigable. (4.0-33.) In addition, changing panel operations to re-direct glare away from impacted residents during

the period when glare would be received would be technologically and socially infeasible. Changing panel operations is technologically infeasible because it would require project operations managers to constantly monitor and adjust panel operations throughout the year based on changing sun position and potential glare affects to adjacent residences. To adequately assess and adjust panel operations, glare observations at adjacent residences would be necessary throughout the seasons, and such offsite access is uncertain. (POWER Engineers letter to Patrick Brown (January 28, 2015).) Changing panel operations is also socially infeasible because doing so would affect project electricity generation at the end of the day, when demand for renewable electricity is increasing as the supply of such electricity is rapidly decreasing. (Id.) CPV technology excels at generating renewable electricity at the beginning and end of the day, when other photovoltaic panels are unable to produce. (Soitec, Planning Commission Presentation (January 16, 2015).) By restricting panel operation during the end of the day—at exactly the period when CPV technology generates renewable electricity—this mitigation measure would be socially infeasible because it would reduce the project's ability to satisfy project objectives 1, 2, and 7 over the life of the Project. Additional mitigation measures are infeasible because placement of any number of CPV trackers on the Tierra del Sol and Rugged sites would result in project glare to public viewpoints.