

Comment Letter I42

Hingtgen, Robert J

From: Ken Daubach <dumtruck.01@wildblue.net>
Sent: Sunday, March 02, 2014 9:30 PM
To: Hingtgen, Robert J
Subject: Comments on PEIR

Mr. Robert Hingtgen,

Our family resides and volunteers in the Boulevard community, where Soitec and many other large projects are planned. We understand that you'd like to receive different comments since you've "heard them all", so we are going to try to make this different and try to give you the opinions of local service providers who can not state their opinions publicly.

We helped found the Real East County Fire Safe Council. We are very much committed to our communities and know the facts about CalFire and Fire Authority. Publicly, the fire service providers do not want everyone to know that their stations are not career staffed 24/7. Boulevard's fire station in 2013 was completely unmaned 135 days. Not only is this misleading to your reports about fire safety or the reassurance of fire protection, it also hurts the home owners. This is because the insurance companies are aware that the stations are not career staffed 24/7. We are already in a low income area with high unemployment rates and a lot of seniors. There are a number of foreclosures in our area all the time, as well as plummeting property values. This project will not help a single resident towards getting consistent insurance coverage or securing them fire insurance at all. According to regulations, fires in electrical areas have to be left to burn as it is too dangerous to fight them. More projects give less room for fighting wildfires.

The frequent high winds can exceed 70 mph. We have to tie everything down that we own. According to Soitec, these panels can only handle 35 mph. This is a danger to residents and to the fire fighters that protect us.

As for Border Patrol, agents have stated that the fencing deters them from going into property and illegal immigrants can use those properties for hiding. The Border Patrol's infrared doesn't work in that situation since they are based on heat. The border crossing numbers have been high. The Tierra Del Sol property is known as an illegal drug dealing site.

We volunteer with Mountain Empire Health/Collaborative in many different facets. There are currently 9 different food pantries, monthly, feeding the people in our area. These projects will not be bringing any local jobs to an area with high unemployment. There's many reasons that they won't, such as, the people in this area would not be qualified for the kind of jobs offered, there is a huge drug and alcohol problem, our sexual predator population is going up due to the area having cheap housing and a low population, etc. What we're getting at is that Soitec admits they are building these projects on government subsidies. They've also admitted that there are deals with the County, but they won't tell us what they are. Most likely, these deals probably include tax breaks and exemptions. Our community relies on grants and taxes to put together programs to help the seniors, children, the addicted, etc. Since we don't have systems in place (and will never have if the area continues to just draw industrial projects which take the focus off of the people), we need these monies to support our communities.

Our roads are inadequate now and rarely maintained. Bringing in these projects tears the roads up even more. The projects claim that the highly increased traffic will not further damage our substandard roads. It is common sense that extensive repairs will need to be made after such heavy use.

We may not be water professionals, but it's pretty obvious that water is a concern as the Governor has issued water warnings. The locals rely on wells to supply their water and the projects are not offering them any

Response to Comment Letter I42

Ken Daubach/The Daubach Family
 March 2, 2014

I42-1

The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (FPEIR) for review and consideration by the decision makers. Issues related to fire insurance rates/coverage or property values were not discussed in the DPEIR since these topics are not related to environmental impacts pursuant to CEQA Guidelines (see 14 CCR 15131). The DPEIR's evaluation of wildfire risk and emergency response capabilities is based on extensive analysis conducted in coordination with the fire agencies, including the San Diego County Fire Authority, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, and San Diego Rural Fire Protection District, and is consistent with industry standards and procedures. Additionally, it should be noted that the Proposed Project would provide funding targeted for emergency services capabilities in the project area (see project design feature (PDF) PDF-PS-1 in Section 3.1.7.3.1 of the DPEIR). Please refer to the response to comment O10-82 related to fighting electrical fires.

I42-2

Based on proprietary data from a meteorological (MET) station located on site that has been operational since August 2012, wind speeds at the Proposed Project sites would exceed 15 miles per hour

	<p>approximately 6.5% of the time. Additionally, the trackers would go into horizontal “stow” mode (for high winds) approximately 0.01% of the time. The wind speed at which a tracker would go into “stow” mode ranges from 14 meter per second (m/s) to 18m/s, which equates to approximately 30 miles per hour (mph) to 40 mph. As described in Section 1.0 of the DPEIR, each tracker would be mounted on a 28-inch steel mast and would be installed taking into consideration wind loading and soil conditions at the site. Specifically, the masts would be installed by either (1) inserting the mast into a hole up to 20 feet deep and encasing it in concrete, (2) vibrating the mast into the ground up to 20 feet deep, or (3) attaching the mast to a concrete foundation sized to adequately support the trackers. In addition, trackers would be positioned in a horizontal “stow” mode during any high wind condition. Based on the environmental evaluation, it has been determined that the solar trackers would not pose a danger to residents and fire fighters during high winds.</p> <p>I42-3 This comment raises concerns related to border safety and illegal immigration. As stated in Chapter 1.0, Project Description, the Tierra del Sol solar farm would have two points of emergency egress/ingress at the project’s southwestern and northwestern points to facilitate U.S. Customs and Border patrol access. These access points can be used by Border Patrol</p>
--	---

	<p>agents should the need arise to access the site. Furthermore, the Proposed Project sites would be fenced according to National Electrical Safety Code requirements for protective arrangements in electric supply stations and would include remote-monitored infrared cameras and alarm systems and motion-sensor perimeter and safety lighting. These security measures are anticipated to deter trespassing on the sites.</p> <p>I42-4 Social and economic concerns were not evaluated in the DPEIR since they are not related to environmental impacts. The DPEIR discusses economic characteristics of the Project in Section 1.2.2.2. Anticipated employment figures, both temporary and permanent, are provided in Tables 1-3 and 1-5. The County disagrees with the commenter’s assertion that the applicants are receiving “deals” from the County.</p> <p>I42-5 This comment raises concerns regarding the deterioration of roadways from heavy traffic use. See common response TRAF1.</p> <p>I42-6 Potential impacts related to groundwater supply were considered and addressed in Section 3.1.5.3.4, Groundwater Resources, and Section and 3.1.9.3.1, Water, of the DPEIR. As provided 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 on-site wells in order to prevent interference with off-site wells. As</p>
--	---

<p>guarantees that they will help them if the projects ruin their wells. These people have no recourse to fight back if something does happen.</p> <p>We've heard rumors that the developer plans on building a community center. A meeting place is definitely a need in the Boulevard area, but to have a building that will need to be manned, maintained, etc., it could just become abandoned. There has to be something put into place to sustain the building. I think the developers need to look at what can be good for the community. Something to give a return to the community, such as a guarantee for our property values and wells and that our fire stations can have 24/7 career staffing and our Sheriff department be funded to have more Sheriffs on duty.</p> <p>We support the choice of no project, because we do not see how this beneficially impacts the lives and economy of the local communities. If there is a huge fire disaster up here, no one would be able to get fire insurance and the County will be liable.</p> <p>The Daubach Family</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">↑ I42-6 Cont.</p> <p>I42-7</p> <p style="text-align: right;">I42-7</p> <p style="text-align: right;">I42-8</p> <p>such, the County does not anticipate that wells of neighboring residents will be significantly impacted as a result of the Proposed Project.</p> <p>The Proposed Project does not include plans to fund or construct a community center. As discussed in Section 3.2.1, Parks and Recreation, of the DPEIR, the Proposed Project includes development of a solar energy generation facility and is not expected to result in an increase in workers and their families in the area such that new or expanded recreational facilities or services, such as a community center, would be necessary. However, as discussed in Section 3.1.7, Public Services, of the DPEIR, implementation of PDF-PS-1 would address emergency services capabilities in the project area and the the Proposed Project would not contribute to a cumulatively significant impact associated with the need for new or expanded emergency services.</p> <p>This comment raises concerns regarding property values. This topic was not evaluated in the DPEIR since it is not related to environmental impacts (see 14 CCR 15131). However, this information will be included in the FPEIR for review and consideration by the decision makers.</p> <p>I42-8</p> <p>The County acknowledges the commenter's support for the No Project Alternative. The decision makers will consider all information in the FPEIR and related</p>
--	---

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. See the response to comment I42-1 related to concerns regarding fire insurance.

References

14 CCR 15000–15387 and Appendices A–L. Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, as amended.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK