Response to Comments

Response to Comment Letter I56

Donna Tisdale
February 3 and 10, 2014

I56-1 This comment is introductory in nature and does not raise a significant environmental issue for which a response is required.
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I56-1 This comment is introductory in nature and does not raise a significant environmental issue for which a response is required.
The County disagrees with the commenter’s attempt to discredit work performed by County-approved hydrogeologists by reference to a separate controversy that does not concern the Proposed Project or the analysis supporting the conclusions reached in the DPEIR. Contrary to the commenter’s assertion, the County does not approve firms to prepare County environmental documents. Rather, it approves individuals. Please refer to common responses WR1 and WR2, and response to comment I10-1 and Appendix 9.0-2 of the DPEIR for a response to Dr. Ponce’s whitepaper.

The County notes that the water use by the San Diego Gas & Electric ECO Substation cited by the commenter does not concern the Proposed Project. Please refer to response to comment I32-8 for the comparison of the ECO Substation to the Proposed Project. Please also refer to response to comment I56-2.