

<div data-bbox="793 240 982 264" data-label="Section-Header"> <p>Comment Letter I31</p> </div> <div data-bbox="216 342 371 367" data-label="Text"> <p>February 7, 2014</p> </div> <div data-bbox="216 406 588 511" data-label="Text"> <p>Robert Hingtgen County of San Diego Dept. Of Planning &amp; Development Services 5510 Overland Ave., Suite 110 San Diego, CA 92123</p> </div> <div data-bbox="718 319 919 440" data-label="Image"> </div> <div data-bbox="216 545 814 571" data-label="Text"> <p>I'll start by saying that I'm against the Soite's Solar Project in Boulevard.</p> </div> <div data-bbox="216 586 798 613" data-label="Text"> <p>In the EIR Analysis I have issues, Mostly in the mitigations as follows:</p> </div> <div data-bbox="216 631 348 656" data-label="Section-Header"> <p>AESTHETICS</p> </div> <div data-bbox="216 667 909 717" data-label="Text"> <p>How can six feet tall landscape screening be a solution to significant impacts to the vistas in this area.</p> </div> <div data-bbox="216 735 348 760" data-label="Section-Header"> <p>AIR QUALITY</p> </div> <div data-bbox="216 773 926 904" data-label="Text"> <p>I find no provision for dust control during operation and maintenance of the sites. I make reference to Soitec's site near Borrego Springs. The area is constantly fighting the dust problem from the sight although the area was promised that there would be dust control. With the Boulevard area having more winds than are experienced in Borrego Springs, I urge a review of this site and force Soitec to control the dusty conditions that the sites will produce.</p> </div> <div data-bbox="216 920 327 946" data-label="Section-Header"> <p>LAND USE</p> </div> <div data-bbox="216 959 812 987" data-label="Text"> <p>Reference Para. 2.5.3.2: Conflict with Plans, Policies and Regulations</p> </div> <div data-bbox="216 1000 930 1068" data-label="Text"> <p>When a project goes against the Plans, Policies and regulations of the area, why has the project allowed the progress to this level when the Mitigation solution is "UNAVOIDABLE". Did anyone read this paragraph?</p> </div> <div data-bbox="216 1086 390 1112" data-label="Section-Header"> <p>GROUND WATER</p> </div> <div data-bbox="216 1123 945 1218" data-label="Text"> <p>The 10 feet draw down threshold is too drastic. The sites are located mostly in lower lying areas. Most home sites with private wells are elevated above these sites. Lowering the ground water table will certainly affect the private wells in the surrounding home sites.</p> </div> <div data-bbox="216 1234 315 1258" data-label="Section-Header"> <p>TRAFFIC</p> </div> <div data-bbox="216 1273 711 1299" data-label="Text"> <p>Reference Para. 3.1.8.3.2: Roadway Segment Operations</p> </div> <div data-bbox="1178 191 1778 233" data-label="Section-Header"> <p>Response to Comment Letter I31</p> </div> <div data-bbox="1331 269 1623 349" data-label="Text"> <p>Earl Goodnight February 10, 2014</p> </div> <div data-bbox="1050 386 1136 420" data-label="Text"> <p>I31-1</p> </div> <div data-bbox="1186 386 1925 589" data-label="Text"> <p>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.</p> </div> <div data-bbox="1050 628 1136 660" data-label="Text"> <p>I31-2</p> </div> <div data-bbox="1186 628 1925 998" data-label="Text"> <p>Issues raised in this comment related to aesthetics were considered and addressed in the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (DPEIR). It has been determined that the Proposed Project would have certain significant and unavoidable impacts on scenic vistas and visual character and quality. If approved, implementation of all feasible mitigation to reduce these impacts would be required, including the landscape screens provided for in M-AE-PP-1.</p> </div> <div data-bbox="1050 1036 1136 1070" data-label="Text"> <p>I31-3</p> </div> <div data-bbox="1186 1036 1925 1399" data-label="Text"> <p>Issues raised in this comment related to dust were considered and addressed in the DPEIR. Fugitive dust during operation of the proposed project would be controlled through dust reduction measures (including the annual application of a nontoxic soil stabilizer or other acceptable methods) that would be implemented as conditions of project approval. With the implementation of these measures, fugitive dust emissions would be further reduced during project operations. In addition to</p> </div>
---

	<p>soil stabilizers, Mitigation Measure M-BI-PP-5, as described in Chapter 2.3 of the DPEIR, requires the development of a project-specific fugitive dust control plan to control fugitive dust during construction. See also the response to comment I27-2. Given the project and site-specific evaluation and mitigation was provided for the Proposed Project only, the comment related to the applicant's project near Borrego Springs is not relevant.</p> <p><b>I31-4</b> The County disagrees that the Proposed Project “goes against the Plans, Policies and regulations of the area”. Section 2.5.3.2 analyzes each proposed solar farm’s consistency with General Plan land use designations, the zoning classification of the parcels, County ordinances, Board of Supervisors policies, General Plan policies, and applicable subregional plans. The DPEIR found that the Rugged and Tierra del Sol solar farms would be in conformance with all land use regulations, plans, and policies (DPEIR Section 2.5.3.2). In addition, the Wind Energy Ordinance adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 2013, which amended the Boulevard Subregional Plan, has been upheld in <i>Protect Our Communities Foundation v. San Diego County Board of Supervisors</i> (San Diego Superior Court case no. 37-2013-00052926-CU-TT-CTL).</p> <p>Potential significant unmitigable impacts related to land use were found with respect to the LanEast and LanWest solar farms, due to their proximity to Interstate 8. It was determined that both the LanEast</p>
--	--

	<p>and LanWest projects would not be in compliance with General Plan policy COS-11.3 that protects scenic highways, corridors, and scenic landscapes and requires the minimization of visual impacts in rural areas (see DPEIR Section 2.5.3.2). If the Proposed Project is approved, a Statement of Overriding Considerations will be prepared for approval by the decision makers.</p> <p><b>I31-5</b> The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) significance thresholds related to groundwater were developed by a technical panel and the County Geologist. The County has discretion under CEQA to set thresholds of significance for a project (see <i>Save Cuyama Valley v. County of Santa Barbara</i> (2013) 213 Cal. App. 4th 1059, 1067–1068). Without any comments directed at the project-specific groundwater resources investigation reports, or evidence showing the Proposed Project would exceed the County’s CEQA significance thresholds specifically, the County cannot provide a more specific response. However, this comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.</p> <p><b>I31-6</b> As stated in Section 3.1.8.3.2, Roadway Segment Operation Impacts, of the DPEIR, the temporary addition of construction traffic to existing traffic would not cause roadway segment operations to fall below acceptable level of service (LOS) levels. For local County of San Diego Mobility Element Roads, LOS D is acceptable. Per County <i>Guidelines for</i></p>
--	--

<p>Impact is specified as "none identified". The construction traffic over the county maintained roads will be a significant impact.</p> <p>I reference the construction of SDG&amp;E's sub station at the end of Jewel Valley road. Over the months, and their project is still not completed, the heavy volume of their construction traffic has destroyed the surface of Jewel Valley road.</p> <p>Paying into the TIF will not assure that the funds will be allotted directly to the damage of county roads caused in the construction phase.</p> <p>ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>This section of the EIR is the most disturbing to me and my family. Our property is located on the north boundary of the Los Robles site (ref. APN 612-040-20). In 1990 we bought this parcel, that was raw land, overlooking a beautiful working cattle ranch. Over the next ten years with a lot of sweat and hard labor, we single handily cleared and improved the land for building our retirement home. In 2002 we moved into our new home and have enjoyed the peace and quiet of the area and the beautiful view over Jewel Valley.</p> <p>Even considering Los Robles as an alternate site is something I cannot understand. Having an absentee owner that has no involvement in the Boulevard area makes the property an easy target for foreign companies such as Soitec to move onto and take advantage of the community.</p> <p>I support the "NO PROJECT" alternative as my first choice. Reducing the entire proposed project as covered in the EIR would reduce the impact to the area.</p> <p>Earl Goodnight 1902 Jewel Valley Lane Boulevard, CA 91905 blvdgoodnight@aol.com</p>	<p><i>Determining Significance</i>, if a project causes roadway segment operations to fall below LOS D then a potentially significant impact could occur. The analysis in the DPEIR demonstrates that the Proposed Project construction would not cause roadway segments on local Mobility Element Roads to operate below LOS D. No changes to the environmental document is required as a result of this comment.</p> <p>The comment regarding the San Diego Gas &amp; Electric substation on Jewel Valley Road is noted. This comment does not address the Proposed Project or the adequacy of the DPEIR.</p> <p>The Proposed Project does not propose paying into the County of San Diego TIF program as a mitigation measure to address construction traffic. The TIF program provides funding for construction of transportation facilities needed to support traffic generated during the operational phase of new development. Please also refer to common response TRAF1, which addresses the maintenance of Proposed Project area roads.</p> <p><b>I31-7</b> The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the Los Robles site as an alternate location and their support for the No Project Alternative. Please refer to common response ALT1 regarding the selection of the Los Robles site as an alternative location. The County decision makers will consider all information provided in the FPEIR and</p>
--	---

	related documents before making a decision on the Proposed Project. The information in this comment will be provided in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.
--	--

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK