Response to Comment Letter O4

Anza-Borrego Foundation
Paige Rogowski
February 14, 2014

Dear Mr. Hingtgen,

Please accept the attached letter with comments on the proposed SDI/TEC Development draft EIR. Anza-Borrego Foundation stands opposed to this project because of the impact it stands to have on Anza-Borrego Desert State Park.

Paige Rogowski, Executive Director
Anza-Borrego Foundation
PO Box 2006 | 587 Palm Canyon Drive, Ste. 111
Borrego Springs, CA 92004
760.767.0466 ext. 1001 office | 323.388.3088 cell
This comment is introductory in nature and does not raise an environmental issue for which a response is required.

The County of San Diego (County) acknowledges the commenter’s opposition to the Proposed Project and preference for the No Project Alternative. Comments related to the Ocotillo Wind project do not raise an environmental issue related to the Proposed Project and do not require further response. The information in this comment will be provided in the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (FPEIR) for review and consideration by the decision makers.
The County acknowledges the commenter’s concern about water use. Please refer to common response WR1. Given the depth of the on-site supply wells, the short-term nature of high water demand, and with implementation of M-B1-PP-15, the Proposed Project is not anticipated to result in appreciable impacts on surface waters in the Carrizo Gorge and Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. The commenter is also referred to the response to comment O10-23. Water use by any other project in the region has no bearing on the water demand for the Proposed Project. Please refer to the response to comment O4-7 related to the assertion that the Project is being “fast-tracked” such that the environmental analysis has been compromised.

O4-3

See response to comment O4-3.

O4-4

Potential impacts to each of the species listed by the commenter, as well as all other sensitive species in the Project area or likely to occur in the Project area were addressed in the DPEIR Section 2.3.3.

O4-5

Issues raised in this comment regarding wildlife movement and corridors were considered and addressed in the DPEIR (see Section 2.3.3.4).

O4-6

The County disagrees with the commenter’s assertion that it has allowed the “fast tracking” of the Proposed Project. The application for the Proposed Project has been processed by the County according to the County Zoning Ordinance and related regulations.
| O4-8 | The County appreciates this information and will take it into consideration. This information, however, would not affect the analysis in the DPEIR. See common response ALT2 for more information regarding the DPEIR’s consideration of a distributed-generation energy alternative. |
| O4-9 | The County acknowledges the commenter’s support for the No Project Alternative. The DPEIR found that the Proposed Project would have no significant impacts on those resources that the commenter seeks to safeguard - biological resources, cultural resources, or water resources. The decision makers will consider all information in the FPEIR and 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. |