

To: California Energy Commission

Re: Carrizo Energy Farm
Docket #07-AFC-8

DOCKET 07-AFC-8
DATE _____
RECD. AUG 08 2008

The Issue Resolution Workshop held August 5, 2008 for the Carrizo Energy Solar Farm was very comprehensive and very productive. However, many questions and issues were not answered or resolved at the workshop. They are of great concern to me and to ensure they are addressed and resolved, I am sending a list of these issues and questions:

1. Visual Impact

- A. The applicant explained that after a certain distance, what they consider as glare from the mirrors will dissipate and that there are no residences within that distance to be affected by what they consider to be glare. However, from experience viewing other solar mirror facilities, it is apparent that the mirrors will reflect light whose shiny appearance will be a detriment and annoyance to the landscape. The 6 ½' high fences they propose will not mask this. Further visual screening should be included.
- B. Local residents were originally told significant landscaping would be provided on our individual properties to screen our views of the power plant. However, the landscaping plan subsequently submitted by the applicant showed only minimal landscaping at very few homes. This plan provided no visual screening for most of the residents on the Carrisa Plains. This is inadequate and the applicant should provide appropriate landscaping to mitigate the visual impact of the project.

2. Water Resources

- A. The applicant needs to be responsible for any affect their water use has on local wells. The CEC suggested the applicant be responsible for drilling deeper wells for residents should wells be affected. This is not an option as the depth of quality water is limited. A viable plan needs to be in place to guarantee that any negative affect the applicant has on our water supplies will be corrected.

3. Transportation

- A. The applicant needs to have a traffic plan that will ensure Hwy 58 is available and traffic is flowing for use by commuters. Delays created by loads requiring pilot cars should be limited to non-peak hours.
- B. Truck traffic should be limited to working hours, 7:00 am to 7:00 pm, Monday through Friday, to limit disturbance to local residents.

4. Noise

- A. It is apparent the applicant either did not take their sound survey at the Strobridge residence or they failed to document the presence of construction crews, operational construction equipment, working environmental crews and aggressive barking dogs on site. This survey needs to be taken accurately on site under normal daily living conditions.
- B. Thirty-five months of construction noise is an enormous annoyance for local residents. To lessen the nuisance, noise should be limited to Monday thru Friday working hours of 7:00 am to 7:00 pm. A decibel limit needs to be established for noise created outside of these working hours to ensure it is not a disturbance to neighbors.
- C. A decibel limit needs to be established for operational noise generated at night including maintenance and repair activities.

5. Lighting

- A. Maintenance task lighting needs to be identified. It must be minimal and not affect our nighttime skies.

6. Biological

- A. CFDG stated the migration corridor in the Carrisa Plains should be modeled to accurately evaluate the projects impact on it. All necessary studies should be done. This is only opportunity to access these impacts correctly and shortcuts should not be taken.

7. Cumulative Impacts

- A. All cumulative impacts should be evaluated. In addition to Optisolar who has already applied for a permit for their solar power plant and Sunpower expects to apply within the month for a permit for another solar plant. Together, the three projects present the potential for enormous cumulative impacts on transportation, biological resources,

visual resources, water resources and etc... These impacts should be fully evaluated.

Additionally, I feel it is important to mention that the only two people to speak in favor of this plant were Darrel Twisselman and Susan Cochran. Both have enormous land holdings and plan to make millions and millions of dollars by selling a minuscule percentage of their vast holdings to solar companies. They are not representative of the small land owners who will live in close proximity to these plants and who will receive no financial benefits from these plants.

And finally, I would like to discuss mitigation. While great lengths seem to be taken to mitigate the impact of this project on the environment and all its wildlife residents, the impact on human residents seems to be considered collateral damage. I for one do not want to endure three years of construction nuisance and am confident this project will have a negative impact on my property. Since the applicant is willing to relocate burrowing owls and kit fox, and since the applicant needs to purchase mitigation land, why can't their mitigation purchases include the property of residents that don't want to live near their plant? Of course, we would prefer not to see our community ruined but, if it can't be stopped, this seems like the closest thing to a fair arrangement.

Sincerely,

Jim and Robin Bell