

Comment Letter I73

Hingtgen, Robert J

From: THEMIGHTYQ <themightyq@inbox.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 16, 2014 12:14 AM
To: Hingtgen, Robert J
Subject: RE: Additional issues RE: PDS2012-3910-120005, Soitec Solar Development Draft PEIR

The environmental study doesn't indicate what are the know hazardous materials in the solar panels. This needs to be additionally discussed in the context of placing thousands of solar panels in a very high fire prone community. What are the dangers to the air, groundwater, animal and human health in the reasonable chance that the panels are caught in a wildfire?
 What is the probability that such a large collection of electrical equipment would cause a fire in a very high fire prone area?
 There was a lot of discussion about the area having no preexisting toxins. There does not seem to be a discussion about all of the toxins being brought into the area by the projects.

Barrance Q Zakar
 Alpine & Boulevard, Ca.

-----Original Message-----

From: themightyq@inbox.com
Sent: Thu, 13 Feb 2014 21:36:42 -0800
To: robert.hingtgen@sdcountry.ca.gov
Subject: Additional issues RE: PDS2012-3910-120005, Soitec Solar Development Draft PEIR

Please allow this to serve as an amendment to my prior Soitec/ Boulevard opposition letter attached:

Please stipulate that essentially 100 percent of the community at a recent meeting are opposed to these projects. Hopefully that would carry great weight with anyone deciding the issue.

The County General Plan calls for protection of scenic vistas, prominent ridge lines and scenic vistas. The environmental study says that there are minor impacts. This is not true. Looking straight out from the front of my property on Tierra Real Road I can see the mountains of Mexico and beautiful chaparral in between. Instead if the Soitec Tierra Del Sol project is done, I would have to look across thousands of acres of three story high solar panels.

The developer is supposed to develop natural features into the project. The only way that this could be done effectively is to relocate the project to where no one lives. This is doable by moving to Imperial County where they want such projects in their vast desert areas. There they have access to water from the Colorado River. We do not have sufficient water, as we rely on ground water only.

Alternatively the project should be placed in a national or state park so that the population would bear the brunt equally, instead of placing it next to someone's house and trying to claim with a straight face that it has minor scenic impact.

The developer is supposed to use appropriate scale, materials and design to compliment the area. In this regard the developer gets zero points. There is nothing like this project anywhere near this area. The materials are foreign, except for the developer abusing the precious ground water. The design of thousands of three story

I73-1

I73-2

Response to Comment Letter I73

Barrance Zakar
 February 16, 2014

I73-1

The applicants have submitted technical analysis that substantiate that the CPV trackers do not exhibit characteristics of toxicity due to heavy metals, although the CPV trackers do have detectable levels of nickel, copper, and vanadium, but in each case, in levels below the Soluable Threshold Limit Concentrations and Total Threshold Limit Concentrations. (Letter to Ms. Manpreet Singh, Regulations Coordinator, Department of Toxic Substances Control [July 11, 2013].) Hazardous materials and hazards associated with wildfire were considered and discussed in the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report; see Section 3.1.4. With regard to the risk of wildfire in the Proposed Project area, see the response to comment O10-80. With regard to the potential for the trackers to produce toxic fumes, see the response to comment O10-83. The risk of fire due to the electrical nature of the Proposed Project is further addressed in the response to comment O10-82.

I73-2

Refer to the response to comment letter I64.

I73-3 Refer to the response to comment letter I2.

solar panels next to each other over thousands of acres is completely out of place. There are no three story houses in the area at all to my knowledge. There are no houses next to each other, such as housing developments. This is completely a rural area.

Presumably the proposed massive industrial complex would be surrounded by chain link fence with barbed wire and prominent high voltage signs. All of the above would lead to lower property values in the community.

The array of such a landscape of solar panels may be an attraction to rural children to enter and explore or throw rocks from the outside at the glass. This danger has not been addressed appropriately. Such projects should be away from all populations.

The hazard to the health of people of the materials being used in the project has not been adequately addressed. We should know the dangers. This includes the vapors and how the ground water may be affected in the event of fire. There likely are thousands of materials in the solar panel glass, inverters, electrical circuits, wires, connectors, terminal boxes, fuses, circuit breakers, fans, etc. Ground management may include herbicides.

All of the electrical equipment pose additional fire danger to an area already very fire prone. There was a thousand acre fire about a year ago about a mile from the Tierra Del Sol proposed project. There has been inadequate analysis of the temperature of the panels. To the extent this could be discovered on the internet, it seems that each panel can be about 77 degrees Fahrenheit hotter than the surrounding area. That would mean on a 100 degree day, which is not unusual in the summer, the panels would be 177 degrees. There may also be a collective effect from such heat. This is a high wind area also. Combustible dust, leaves and branches would undoubtedly blow on to these baking solar panels and may burst into flames. The proposed project and the ecology in Boulevard are a bad and unnecessary combination. On the contrary, the Imperial Valley projects mostly have dust made of sand and not combustible.

The solvency of Soitec has not been adequately addressed. It is relevant to the environmental study. Even if the project were environmentally sound, it would have dire consequences if the developer could not meet their financial obligations and have to shut down partially completed. It is not unusual for solar companies to go bankrupt. Financial experts should study the facts. A "solyndra" type ending will not got over well with the public.

I73-2
Cont.

-----Original Message-----

From: themightyq@inbox.com
Sent: Tue, 14 Jan 2014 10:19:48 -0800
To: robert.hingtgen@sdcounty.ca.gov
Subject: RE: PDS2012-3910-120005, Soitec Solar Development Draft PEIR

I73-3

RE: Soitec Solar in Boulevard,CA

Please submit this and consider it as my objection to the industrial "solar" businesses

planned in Boulevard, Ca 91905.

Aesthetically they are completely out of place. They should not be implanted anywhere near country home sites in the mountains. The counter cliché argument that beauty is in the eye of the beholder is a canard. Yes some people think that a crucifix in a jar of urine is art. However, 99.9 percent do not believe that or that miles of solar panels look good in the majestic mountains.

Boulevard is in a fire hazardous area. This is fact proven by history. Solar heat collecting devices should not be placed in this area obviously. Heat can cause water pipes in such systems to burst, conducting electricity. We don't have a fully staffed or equipped fire department. It is improbable that the fire personnel are trained in the special hazards of solar panel electrical fires. There are 215 firefighters injured each year in the U.S. due to electric shock responding to calls. Has there been research done or training of the firefighters regarding the potential of electrocution by these projects? Should the solar panels burst or become inflamed in our fire prone area, we have the additional hazard of falling glass, slippery surfaces, potential explosions and the increased risk of toxic vapors. Firefighters and the local residents should be provided with special respirators. The insurance costs to the residents become escalated. Have the particular solar products been tested in these large quantities in this type of climate and terrain?

Industrial solar power also has and will require construction of many miles of new high voltage power transmission lines in order to optimize the connections into existing Power Grids. This further increases the fire hazards.

Recent articles have brought to light bird deaths due to miles of solar panel reflections drawing these creatures into the intense heat of the glass. Other wildlife are upset due to complete disruption of the natural surroundings.

In addition to obstructing views, creating fire hazards and destroying habitats, large solar power projects take a toll on the area's scarce water supply. Mirrors and solar panels have to be washed, and some solar projects incorporate steam turbines, which require even more water. In addition, solar projects call for grading the land and sometimes spraying it with chemicals to inhibit dust or plant growth that can reduce the efficiency of solar panels. Also, materials in the panels likely contain toxins that could leak into groundwater, which is the only source of water in this community. There could be a five or ten year latency period before the toxins show up in the aquifers but by then it is too late.

Sites that require huge amounts of land, and water, to generate solar electricity, further restrict any other type of development or use, including any recreational component.

By and large local residents strongly oppose these project for health, safety, environmental, aesthetic, ethical and other reasons. The inhabitants should have the freedom to control the area in which they live and not have industrial blight dictated to them by outsiders, especially when the community plan has always called for an open natural country atmosphere. That's why we moved here. The negative impacts on property values will be in a direct ratio to the proximity to such totally out of place industrial businesses.

There are serious doubts about whether solar is a sustainable industry rather than an unaffordable, infeasible initiative, dependent on subsidies and for the real purpose of promoting crony capitalism. The beneficiary "industrialists" and absentee land owners, i.e.

the bag men then funnel a chunk of the money back to the politicians that approve such projects. If we had honest U.S. and California district attorneys, they would seriously

I73-3
Cont.

investigate the corruption of this cabal that is obvious to the victims.

Boulevard is not a wasteland but rather a beautiful mountainous rural scenic countryside with a night sky that you won't find in the city or near the industrialization that is planned by intruders.

These projects if built should rather be placed in completely uninhabited areas. There are such places, as in only 5.2 percent of continental U.S. land is considered to be developed. Alternatively, they could be located next to the populations that would use most of the output, ideally in an already industrialized location. That would be a fair and reasonable way to handle it. Either bother nobody with it or molest only those that want industrial solar electric. Also, roof top point of use solar is a reasonable voluntary method (except for the forced co-payment by taxpayer subsidizers).

To the the extent that the proposed disruptions to Boulevard are to solve the "global warming crisis," the battle is a complete nugatory mythological bugaboo. An elementary education reveals ice age cycles and melting of them prior to mankind. Cloud cover on any day can cause a temperature change of 5 degrees in minutes. Boulevard can have a 40 degree change in temperature within one day. An alleged projected change of 2 degrees in 100 years is speculative and irrelevant. To the extent that one location would allegedly suffer from such a change, another location would benefit. There is a reason why most of our Canadian neighbors live on their southern border. When Peking, Mexico City and Baja California, just across the border from Boulevard come close to solving their air pollution mess then we could take some additional action here; otherwise it would be a singular vain attempt to solve a global phenomena.

The persons deciding on the proposed industrial projects should determine whether it would be appropriate to place them next to their own families homes. If the answer is no, then they should not abuse their power to the detriment of their neighbor's family. Have you read the bible or do you have fundamental ethics?

Thank you for considering these matters.

Very truly yours,
Barrance Q Zakar
Alpine & Boulevard, Ca.

I73-3
Cont.

[Inbox.com News](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Terms of Use](#) | [Browser Requirements](#)

Copyright © 2014 Inbox.com. All rights reserved.