

Comment Letter I106

Michele Strand
PO Box 1424
Boulevard, CA 91905
(619) 922-1318

March 3, 2014

County of San Diego
Attn: Mr. Robert Hingtgen, Planner
5510 Overland Ave, Suite 110
San Diego, CA 92123

Subject: Proposed Soitec Projects in Boulevard

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I bought my first (and only) home in Boulevard back in 2004. Living in a quiet, rural setting with lots of land seemed worth the sacrifice of driving at least 100 miles a day to work and back. The peace and solitude that Boulevard offers has been a very enjoyable aspect of living here for the last ten years.

The first morning after we moved in I opened the front door to see the most spectacular sunrise. I ran and got the camera! The next morning it was equally spectacular, so I again ran to get the camera. After a week of this, I realized that these sunrises were now my daily gift for choosing to live here.

Another treasure we have is McCain Valley. A few times a week, after work, we would drive out to the end of McCain Valley and enjoy the wildlife, scenery, and just plain quiet all along the 12 mile dirt road. One romantic evening, with the lights of El Centro glittering in the distance, and the starry skies above us, I was proposed to. It was perfect.

The Soitec solar projects proposed for Boulevard threaten to decimate our rural landscape, character, water, air, health, wildlife, property values, and increase our fire threat exponentially.



I106-1

Response to Comment Letter I106

Michele Strand
March 3, 2014

I106-1 This comment does not raise specific issues related to the Proposed Project or the adequacy of the environmental analysis in the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (DPEIR); therefore, no additional response is provided or required.

Potential impacts related to visual character, water, air quality, public health, wildlife, and fire hazards are considered and discussed throughout the DPEIR; see Chapters 2.0 and 3.0. Potential impacts to property values were not evaluated in the DPEIR since this topic is not related to environmental impacts. (See 14 CCR § 15131 and response to comment I76-2.)

I106-2 Please see response to comment letter C2. This comment does not raise specific issues related to the Proposed Project or the adequacy of the environmental analysis in the DPEIR; therefore, no additional response is provided or required.

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>The fear of these projects being approved has been a great burden to me and my family. I have already invested my life's savings into my home, but now question whether I will be able to live a good life here. By the way, Boulevard's motto is, "Boulevard - The Good Life". If these projects are approved, it will not be a good life for us.</p> <p>The impacts to the residents of Boulevard are too severe. These projects should be built far away from neighborhoods. With the current drought conditions, I am shocked that these projects are even being considered!</p> <p>In regards to what I have learned in the last few months, I am particularly troubled that a County employee quit his job to go to work directly for Soitec. How could there not be a conflict of interest while he was still employed by the County? Another SD County environmental planner recently admitted that sometimes the text in environmental documents can be biased but rarely can the numbers and facts be skewed too much. That is simply untrue. The amount of water needed for ECO substation is already 3 times what that EIR predicted. Were the facts or numbers skewed in <i>that</i> EIR?</p> <p>After reading Boulevard Planning Group's comments, it appears that there are MANY errors and omissions in the Soitec DEIR; too many to document entirely within the comment time frame.</p> <p>There is no recourse for residents whose wells will run dry. There are so many different entities involved that it makes it impossible to place blame when these projects fail or cause irreparable harm to the environment and community.</p> <p>We all know there is pressure from President Obama and Governor Brown to push these projects through, no matter the cost. But at the local level we DO have the power to say, "No". Not here. Not now.</p> <p>YOU have the power to stand up and do what's right. Our quality of life is in your hands. Please vote for the "No Project" option.</p> <p>We love Boulevard. Please do what you can to protect us.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted,</p> <p>Michele Strand</p> | <p>I106-3 Potential impacts related to groundwater use are considered and addressed in the DPEIR; see Sections 3.1.5.3.4, Groundwater Resources, and 3.1.9.3.1, Water. As stated in Section 3.1.9.3.1, the County will place conditions on the Major Use Permit that will restrict the amount of water that is permitted to be withdrawn from the on-site wells in order to prevent interference with off-site wells. As such, the County does not anticipate that wells of neighboring residents will run dry as a result of the Proposed Project.</p> <p>I106-4 The County acknowledges the commenter's support for the No Project Alternative. The decision makers have the approval authority for the Proposed Project and will consider all information in the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (FPEIR) and related documents before making a decision on the Proposed Project. The information in this comment will be in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.</p> |
|---|---|

