

## Appendix B

---

Response to Comments Received  
from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing

This page intentionally left blank

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
00:41:45	001	Chris O'Brien	<p>Yes, can you hear me? Yes. Hi, I'm not. I'm not sure where to begin. The solar policy that residents have been speaking about is something that the supervisors have been discussing for 10 years and one of the zoning adjusters thought it might be unfair to the applicant, but the applicant certainly knew that the County has been developing a solar policy. Or working on or putting on hold for seven years.</p> <p>Also, going back to 2011 when the Board of Zoning adjustments approved the product project out by Mountain House, you guys should recall if you weren't on it that that property was not subject to the Williamson Act and this, this property is and several are the other properties.</p> <p>Coming up on the Aramis Project. The other thing is almost ridiculous is the calculation of the FAR. It's the opinion of staff that this conforms to measure D under that scenario, but that that is a you're talking about a sea of glass and the only reason it's not called the structure's 'cause the walls. It's certainly covering the ground.</p> <p>Uh, you should have received a fairly detailed letter from Faith North Livermore Valley's legal team, supplemented by environmental consultants and a biologist. I don't know if you've had time to absorb all that. If you have not, you should, because we find many inconsistencies. With the CEQA, we think it doesn't meet the findings that are required for you guys to approve the CPU. There are four findings. Staff says that it does, but we, we find arguments on all four that it certainly does not. We'd like to give you, have you guys give this a lot of thought.</p> <p>Maybe put it on hold so you can do proper research. If not, we certainly would encourage you not to approve this today. Thank you.</p>	<p>The commenter expresses an opinion about the need for a comprehensive policy for large-scale solar development in Alameda County. Development of a solar policy is a matter of County procedure and process and is not part of the proposed project evaluated in the EIR. The applicant is proceeding in accordance with all relevant County requirements as they currently stand.</p> <p>The DEIR incorrectly reported that a portion of the project site was under Williamson Act contract. The property owners of Assessor's Parcel Number 903-0006-003-07, Leland Stanley and Mary Stanley, entered into a Land Conservation Agreement for this parcel on February 23, 1971 (Land Conservation Contract No. 5496, Agricultural Preserve No. 1971-65). However, County staff found that a Notice of Nonrenewal of Agricultural Preserve Contract was filed on October 2, 1990 to notify the County of Alameda that the land conservation contract would not be renewed, effective January 1, 1991. Sections 3.0 and 4.2 of the EIR have been updated to reflect this information.</p> <p>Whether or not an object is determined to be a "structure" is not only determined based on whether it covers the ground. Other objects determined by the County to be "structures" for the purposes of calculating FAR, including horse exposition venues and storage facilities, are designed to provide shelter for a specific use beneath them that involves temporary occupation and human use. Solar panels, as proposed for this project, are not designed to provide shade or shelter or to facilitate any specific use below them.</p> <p>It is assumed that this comment is referring to the letter from Selna Partners representing Save North Livermore Valley, dated November 1, 2020. The comments raised in that letter have been considered and responded to; for that discussion, see responses to written comment letter 141.</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
00:56:52	002	Robert Selna	<p>I represent save North Livermore Valley, and I sent the board a lengthy letter yesterday. I hope you have a chance to read it. The project fails to meet all four findings required for a CUP and the project EIR fails to compile with frequent because it omits information the public needs to understand for the full scope of the project's environmental impacts. We urge you to deny the project, but if you are in.</p> <p>Anyway, considering approval, the County must revise the EIR, cure the sequel flaws, and recirculate a revised draft before, before it comes back to you. I'll try to hit the highlights here. No provision of Measure D authorizes industrial facilities on LPA lands and the LP's allowance of utility corridors, or quasi-public uses, does not apply to the project.</p> <p>Because the project isn't either one on zoning, a 2008 Planning Commission determination on 111-acre project in Mountain House does not equate to a zoning amendment there, but that would be the effect of the staff interpretation. That's inconsistent with state law. The project is also inconsistent with 12 specific ECAP policies started Number 13 and go from there. The project would illegally occupy more acreage than is permitted for solar panels. According to the county's Williamson Act uniform rules. Staff concludes that the project only occupies 6.5 acres, but that's leaving out counting the actual solar panels themselves.</p> <p>The uniform rules say that the actual panels themselves have to be counted in. In plain English, the rules state that quote solar panels, one quote, unquote, are only permitted, or, if they have, within the 10 acre limit, house staff believes it can remove the word panel from the rules, and the calculation is baffling when included. The panels equal 81.9 percent of the parcel. In addition, there is a glut of solar power in the last five years. California is generated 350% more power from solar. 35% of all renewables is utility scale solar, 15 is rooftop. There are 9460 megawatts of projects out there that have been permitted.</p>	<p>A letter was received from Robert Selna's law firm. The comments in that letter have been responded to; see responses to written comment letter 141 for complete discussion.</p> <p>The DEIR incorrectly reported that a portion of the project site was under Williamson Act contract. The property owners of Assessor's Parcel Number 903-0006-003-07, Leland Stanley and Mary Stanley, entered into a Land Conservation Agreement for this parcel on February 23, 1971 (Land Conservation Contract No. 5496, Agricultural Preserve No. 1971-65). However, County staff found that a Notice of Nonrenewal of Agricultural Preserve Contract was filed on October 2, 1990 to notify the County of Alameda that the land conservation contract would not be renewed, effective January 1, 1991. Sections 3.0 and 4.2 of the EIR have been updated to reflect this information.</p> <p>The Draft EIR discloses that approximately 367 acres of the project site are designated as Large Parcel Agriculture (LPA), 22 acres as Resource Management (RM), and 21 acres as Water Management (WM). There is not an independent requirement for consistency with Measure D. The Draft EIR assesses consistency with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, including those changes made by Measure D. In addition to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance consistency analysis in the EIR's Land Use chapter, the Agriculture and Forestry Resources section of the EIR also describes and assesses ECAP policies (including Measure D) that are applicable to the Project site's agricultural resources, including Policies 1, 52, 54 56, 73, 78, 79, 82, 85, 86, 93, 96 and 98.</p> <p>With respect to the LPA designation, the Draft EIR finds that solar development is comparable to other uses specifically allowed, including windfarms, utility corridors, and similar uses compatible with agriculture. The Project, inclusive of primarily solar arrays, vegetation, compacted dirt and graveled access roads, and activities including equipment maintenance, sheep grazing, and honeybee foraging, would be consistent with the LPA land use designation. Further, there is precedent within the County for</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>But not yet built. The problem is not too much solar. The problem is not enough storage and the oversupply of solar is negatively impacting the grid. The project 6 megawatts is totally unnecessary when the state is facing the oversupply problem, that is, that is well documented and can be found. In the news and all over the Internet. Thank you.</p>	<p>approving utility-scale solar projects within the LPA designation, including the GreenVolts and Altamont Solar Energy projects. As described in the Agricultural and Forestry Resources chapter of the Draft EIR, in 2008, the County Planning Commission made findings pursuant to Sections 17.54.050 and 17.54.060 (Determination of Use) of the Alameda County Municipal Code regarding district classifications of uses not listed within the ordinance. The Planning Commission found that a solar electric facility would not be contrary to the specific intent clauses or performance standards established for the Agricultural District and could be permitted under a conditional use permit. The County reiterated these findings to confirm the conditional permissibility of similar solar uses under the Agriculture zone district for the GreenVolts project, approved in 2008, and the Altamont Solar Energy Project, approved in 2011 (ECBZA 2008 and 2011).</p> <p>As discussed in a September 13, 2012 memorandum regarding draft solar policies for the ECAP, County Counsel determined that “solar facilities are consistent with ECAP policies. Solar facilities constitute quasi-public uses consistent with ‘windfarms and related facilities, utility corridors and similar uses compatible with agriculture,’ which are allowed on parcels designated Large Parcel Agriculture.” Operation of the Project would promote continued agricultural use of the project site through sheep grazing and planting and maintaining honeybee forage. Grazing would likely be confined to a 2-month period in the late spring and early summer, after the primary blooming period of onsite vegetation. This would allow for pollinator foraging prior to removal of vegetation by the sheep. The project operator would work with commercial beekeepers to promote pollination services in the surrounding area and honey production on-site. Pollinator-friendly species would be used in landscaping and seed mixes to promote honeybee forage. The proposed program for concomitant agricultural land uses during operation of the solar facility would be outlined in an Agricultural Management Plan prepared for the project. The Plan would be implemented to sustain agricultural operations on lands designated as grazing</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
01:18:00	003	Carol	<p>OK. I live in North Livermore and, um. It is beautiful out here. From my backyard, I have pastureland in Arroyo I can see Mount Diablo in the North, and brushy peak in the Diablo range on the East. It's a beautiful Valley and people voted on Measure D to preserve it.</p> <p>Frank Imhof asked a question about the raising of local temperatures. And I actually had written a letter in regards to the EIR, scoping comments for the proposed Aramis solar generation project, and, I belong to a lot of environmental groups. And there was a publication, which talked about how it killed a lot of wildlife because of the increased temperature of a solar farm and so just to let you know that solar power plants raised local temperatures, creating a solar heat island effect, according to the findings of 3 different desert ecosystems in Arizona that demonstrated that temperatures around a solar power plant were 5.4 to 7.2 degrees Fahrenheit warmer than nearby wildlands and, Um?</p> <p>If anyone's interested, I could provide website information in regards to this. There's a lot more that I can say, but since this is arid land and it's also very windy, I'm concerned about the increased temperature. The effects on wildlife and native plants.</p> <p>And also, the, the likelihood of an increase in fire. Thank you.</p>	<p>land and to address grazing operations throughout the project site for the duration of the life of the project.</p> <p>This commenter does not raise any specific issues regarding the adequacy of the EIR's analysis of visual impacts or its compliance with Measure D.</p> <p>Section 4.1 was amended to discuss this issue of potential heat island effect; please see Section 4.1 for a complete discussion. In sum, any heat island effect related to solar panels would be primarily due to heat trapped beneath the panels and limited in its ability to radiate out at night, raising temperatures by up to 3 to 4 degrees C (5.4 to 7.2 degrees F). This effect is generally most pronounced at night and negligible during the day. It is also extremely localized; in the Arizona article referenced in this comment, all three study sites (wildland, solar farm, and parking lot) were within the same one square kilometer area and the differences reported in that study were detected between them. To clarify, "3 different desert ecosystems" were not studied; one site was a solar farm, one site was an undisturbed arid landscape, and one site was a parking lot, all of which were within the same one square kilometer. Another study cited in the EIR found that at a distance of 300 meters (984 feet) from a solar array the temperature anomaly was less than 0.3 degrees C (0.5 degrees F). Vegetation further serves to mitigate any effect of heat becoming trapped under solar panels; the panels studied in the Arizona study were in an unvegetated area; the panels in the proposed project would be intermixed with forage grasses. The effect, if any, would be extremely localized and would have no detectable effect on climate, wildfire risk, or the viability of agriculture in the vicinity. It is unclear what the commenter is referring to when they state, "it killed a lot of wildlife because of the increased temperature of a solar farm." The study from Arizona did not state that and the commenter did not cite any other evidence.</p> <p>See Section 4.4 for a discussion of biological resources, including wildlife and native plants. The commenter does not raise any</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
				<p>specific concerns regarding the adequacy of the EIR’s analysis of wildlife and native plants.</p> <p>See Section 4.18 for a discussion of wildfire risk. That section has been amended to include more detailed background information and to clarify training, coordination, and reimbursement requirements in response to other comments that were already received. This commenter does not raise any specific concerns regarding the EIR’s analysis of fire, and no further response is needed here.</p>
01:27:37	004	Maria DeLuz	<p>Hi, my name is Maria Deluz. I live on North Livermore Ave. We're located South of the Sunwalker project and actually our property is on borders the southernmost border of the. These are both industrial solar installations. They are in direct conflict with the Measure D and the scenic route element of the County’s General plan I emphatically request that the County that this board place recommend disapproval of these two projects.</p> <p>And also recommend moratorium on any sense of solar policy established for our County. There are alternatives which should, should not include. To which should not include taking away our limited remaining agricultural land. We have only lived here about six years. What attracted us to this area was the beauty, the, the elements of Measure D and the Williamson Act protected this land.</p> <p>From development and all of our ranching neighbors, farming neighbors are real. Take care of their land. Take care of water. Are real environmentalists. This is in direct conflict with any of those, those items so thank you for your time and that's it.</p>	<p>The commenter expresses an opinion about the need for a comprehensive policy for large-scale solar development in Alameda County. Development of a solar policy is a matter of County procedure and process and is not part of the proposed project evaluated in the EIR.</p> <p>See the discussion of consistency with Measure D in Section 4.11 of the EIR. See discussion of aesthetic impacts, including discussion of scenic route designations, in Section 4.1. This comment does not raise any specific concerns regarding the EIR’s adequacy discussing either of those issues, and no further response is needed.</p> <p>Whether or not the County has a solar policy is not within the scope of the EIR and is not the responsibility of the applicant. The applicant is proceeding in accordance with all relevant County requirements as they currently stand.</p> <p>The DEIR incorrectly reported that a portion of the project site was under Williamson Act contract. The property owners of Assessor’s Parcel Number 903-0006-003-07, Leland Stanley and Mary Stanley, entered into a Land Conservation Agreement for this parcel on February 23, 1971 (Land Conservation Contract No. 5496, Agricultural Preserve No. 1971-65). However, County staff found that a Notice of Nonrenewal of Agricultural Preserve Contract was filed on October 2, 1990 to notify the County of Alameda that the land conservation contract would not be</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
01:23:50	005	Richard Lescalleet	<p>OK, I'll try and be brief. My name is Richard Lescalleet. I'm a senior wildlife biologist with Olberding Environmental. We managed nearly 1000 acres of mitigation land immediately to the west of both the Aramis and Sunwalker sites.</p> <p>Today, my comments pertained to the E. Alameda County Conservation Strategy and the EIR. I have not been able to find EACCS worksheet for these projects and combined the EIR lacking in the biological mitigations. I've looked over the EIR and I don't see any compensatory mitigation for California Tiger salamander or red legged.</p> <p>Frog, of which both species exist in significant numbers on our adjacent property. These projects will create barriers to migration for these species from other CTS and red legged frog populations to the East. There are at least a half dozen suitable breeding ponds within 1.2 miles of these project sites. There's hundreds of ground squirrel burrows in the vicinity.</p> <p>And if these projects don't need to provide compensatory mitigation for their projects as part of the EACCS, why should anybody in the area have to provide compensatory mitigation? So those are my comments and thank you.</p>	<p>renewed, effective January 1, 1991. Sections 3.0 and 4.2 of the EIR have been updated to reflect this information.</p> <p>The County recognizes that the East Alameda County Conservation Strategy (EACCS) is a collaborative effort between willing land-owners, local agencies, and resources agencies for the preservation of endangered species and their habitat through conservation and that participation in the EACCS by the project applicant is voluntary. The project is located within the EACCS area, and the project has been designed to be implemented on previously disturbed agricultural land. The project site will be managed and operated in a similar capacity for grazing of livestock and honey production from bees with the inclusion of PV solar arrays for the next 50 years. Through the implementation of project design and mitigation measures, the project site will continue to provide habitat for wildlife that already occur in the project site, which falls in line with the goals and purpose of the EACCS.</p> <p>The County is knowledgeable of CTS biology, life history, and dispersal capabilities. Based on the results of numerous biological surveys on site including thorough habitat assessments by CTS permitted biologists, there is minimal upland habitat for CTS and CTS use of the site is expected to primarily be limited to the proximity of Cayetano Creek. Mammal burrows are scarce on the central portion of the site and burrows are limited to cracks in the clay soil or in California ground squirrel burrows primarily located in the area north of Manning Road or adjacent to the site along Cayetano Creek. Pre-construction MM BIO-2a, in conjunction with the other measures for CTS including biological monitoring, are considered adequate to detect presence of CTS on the site.</p> <p>No CTS were observed on or adjacent to the project site during any biological surveys, including two full seasons (16 surveys) of protocol surveys for CRLF, which were conducted by individuals with federal recovery permits for CTS (Stephen Stringer, Jennifer Gonterman, Patrick Martin). None of the streams in or adjacent to the project site, including Cayetano Creek and its tributaries</p>



**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
				<p>adjacent to the central and southern parcels and the ephemeral drainage adjacent to the northern parcel, meet the habitat requirements for CTS breeding because they are too shallow (if they have water at all) and do not provide water of sufficient depth for a long enough duration to support larval development of CTS. Potential dispersal by CTS could occur on or adjacent to the site, primarily within and adjacent to Cayetano Creek and its tributaries. However, no CTS were observed during protocol surveys for CRLF, several of which were conducted during light rain events to target amphibians moving through uplands. With implementation of the mitigation measures prescribed in the DEIR, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in take of a protected species or require authorization under federal or state incidental take permit or require compensatory mitigation.</p> <p>The DEIR concludes that the project site does not provide suitable breeding habitat for CTS or CRLS and is not being used by CTS or CRLS for breeding based on the results of a variety of biological surveys including 16 protocol surveys for CRLF within aquatic habitats on and adjacent to the site over two wet seasons. Therefore, concerns regarding eggs and tadpoles remaining within breeding habitat on-site for several months are not warranted. The project site provides potential dispersal habitat for CTS and CRLF since the project site is within the current range of CTS and CRLF. Potential dispersal by CTS could occur on or adjacent to the site, primarily within and adjacent to Cayetano Creek and its tributaries, although no CTS or CRLF were observed during protocol surveys for CRLF, several of which were conducted during light rain events to target amphibians moving through uplands. For the foregoing reasons, BIO-2b is considered to be feasible. With implementation of the mitigation measures prescribed in the DEIR, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in take of a protected species or require authorization under a federal or state incidental take permit or require compensatory mitigation.</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
01:25:13	006	Mark Kwan	<p>Yes, hi thank you. Thank you for taking this call and I appreciate the position that you guys are in, but I've been a resident of Alameda County for over 30 years and I guess I would just like to say that I really have no confidence right now that this or that these projects, I should say the Aramis and the Sun walker projects are in the best interest of, of our community. I think it's I'll try not to repeat anybody else. So I just want to make a point that just the number of oppositions to these projects right now for the various, various stated reasons is to me evidence that this is really not currently the way it's being presented and the plan is not in the best interest of this Community.</p> <p>I would also like to point to the facts that the Sunwalker representative himself pointed out, which is the closest facilities, solar facilities, are located on a wastewater facility and right next to the Oakland Airport. And the largest one, the Oakland airport one is, is he estimated 25 to 30 acres, next to the airport. We're talking about 800 plus acres along the scenic corridor, right behind a rural neighborhood on Williams to math land, an unmeasured land. So, I'm definitely opposed to current the way it's currently being presented. I'm opposed to this.</p> <p>The both of these projects and last thing I would say with 30 seconds is I know was mentioned I think by, by Mr. Eddy that well do these guys check the boxes or not and I guess I would like to point out that that's why we're here that that you as a board have the ability even if they check the boxes to say you know what?</p> <p>There are other boxes that should be on this thing. There are not enough boxes. We've checked the ones that they have now, so thank you for your time. That is all.</p>	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis presented in the EIR. For more information about climate change, please see Section 4.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions. No further response is required.</p>
01:27:27	007	Taska O'Brien	<p>Thanks, yes, I just want to thank you guys for taking the time to listen. I know you going through a ton of calls and it's hard to pay attention to everyone. So, thank you, we do appreciate your time.</p>	<p>It is assumed that this comment is referring to the letter submitted by Selna Partners. For a full response to the concerns raised by that letter, see the response to written comment 141.</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>You guys have heard many arguments at this project doesn't fit the needs required to qualify for a CUP in regards to that, I would once again urge you guys to look at the long letter that was submitted by Psomas [?] Partners on behalf of the same with more Valley. It very much details the lackings in the EIR. Very concisely, I'll speak to other issues that come up, especially the FAR designation that these structure doesn't qualify as a structure doesn't have walls, which seems somewhat ridiculous. I mean, these panels are going to cover the ground, and to say that simply because they don't have walls, they don't qualify as structures is ridiculous. Maybe I should build a commercial building and just put it on stilts.</p> <p>There you go. I think this case by case approach really needs to end. I mean, as Mr. I'm half pointed out, one of these projects that was approved. I think in 2011, the concrete pylons are still there.</p> <p>So, we really do need a comprehensive solar plan to keep everybody accountable and have a plan in place that keeps that accountability coherent through every project that gets proposed. You know the view corner is obviously going to be, you know, marred permanently. You could see by the slides provided by Sunwalker themselves at the ridgeline and mountains.</p> <p>The view of those are impeded. They brought up wildfires and droughts. And yet, if you look at the EIR, it really fails to address whether or not this project with above ground transmission lines will contribute to additional wildfire risk in the area and what the ecological impact of a type of fire would be. You know what kind of pollutants would be released into the atmosphere in the local area?</p> <p>There was a fire in this region. I don't see the EIR addressing that. And finally, this concept of sheep. The EIR doesn't differentiate between sheep, grazing cattle grazing, and they're</p>	<p>Whether or not an object is determined to be a "structure" is not only determined based on whether it covers the ground. Some installations with roofs or overhangs are considered structures despite having no walls. Other objects determined by the County to be "structures" for the purposes of calculating FAR, including horse exposition venues and storage facilities, are designed to provide shelter for a specific use beneath them that involves temporary occupation and human use. Solar panels, as proposed for this project, are not designed to provide shade or shelter or to facilitate any specific use below them.</p> <p>Whether or not the County has a solar policy is not within the scope of the EIR and is not the responsibility of the applicant. The applicant is proceeding in accordance with all relevant County requirements as they currently stand.</p> <p>See Section 4.18 for a discussion of wildfire. It has been updated in response to other comments to clarify existing conditions, training and coordination, and reimbursement requirements.</p> <p>Section 4.2 has been amended to add more details about proposed grazing and to discuss the impacts of cattle grazing versus sheep grazing. Cattle are more are more likely than sheep to damage soil structure given their much greater size and weight. Currently up to 820 sheep are proposed to use the site over a two month period each year.</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>proposing 400 sheep out here, but out here all we have is cattle. There's a reason for that they, they don't eat the ground to the nub. They have a better return of nutrients and sheep return more parasites to the soil, so it has a deep impact that's not being addressed by the EIR.</p> <p>I think more research needs to be done to highlight this difference between sheep and cattle grazing. I've been a resident here for 20 years. I was ten years in the 4H Club of Crane Ridge, so I have a lot of experience in agriculture and I hope you guys will put this project on hold or deny it. Thank you.</p>	
01:30:17	007	Bob Schock	<p>Yes, I had. The button to unmute myself. My name is Bob Schock. I spelled SCHOCK, let me just I. I just have a very simple question for Damian and Sunwalker. But before I do that, let me just.</p> <p>Just quickly say that I was a director of the energy programs at a fairly sizable laboratory nearby, and I was also a member of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change dealing with, with.  <i>(His connection stopped and comments could not be heard)</i></p> <p>Hello, supplies electric lines were going wait a minute. Can you hear me? Yeah, yeah, OK I broke up ago let the electric lines over to the substation we're running under underground at the I assume that's under that's obviously underneath log North Livermore Ave.</p> <p>But my question is back in the project itself are all of the lines also underground and I ask that because the Aramis project talks about solar towers or not solar towers, electrical towers up to 100 feet high.</p> <p>Uh, carrying the, the, the line between the electricity between the various modules and I and I ask that because at as as I think many of us know the. When PG&amp;E put the the lines into the substation. They looked at it and they were</p>	Please see Section 4.1 for a discussion of aesthetics, including scenic route designations.

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			originally gonna bring towers 100 foot towers across. They didn't do it, they put it all underground as as we have and so that's kept the scenic beauty and the scenic route element saying. So that's my question. Sorry for taking so much time answer.	
01:32:33	008	Jean King	<p>My name is. Excuse me, my name is Jean King. I'm a long-time resident of Livermore. Please do not approve this project. Recommend a moratorium on solar until a policy is established. I support the issues that the many previous speakers have voiced. There have been many interesting things about the biological.</p> <p>Questions the lines that the solar power, batteries, etc. I agree with all of those. I very much except the dire consequences of global warming and the need to establish renewable energy. But we do not want to do it in the wrong way. We do not want to sacrifice a valuable resources of agricultural land in the establishment of solar energy. There is a finite amount of agricultural land and we need to be very careful when we deal with it. There are opportunities and choices that can be made about the location of solar. Comprehensive studies must be done followed by community input. People will sign a petition in favor of solar.</p> <p>But not necessarily supporting solar panels in agricultural areas in North Livermore there can be talk about case by case decisions, but cases should follow a policy such as ECAP or zoning or other policies. There needs to be a specific solar policy. A County solar policy that evaluates the land that is best for the solar is very important. We should not move forward before that policy is completed. This property is large parcel agriculture and this these solar panels are an urban use, not an agricultural use. The land is under their Williamson Act and I do not believe that it is compatible with the Williamson Act, even though there is not much ground contact. Having panels that shade the property were certainly affect the agricultural value. Please</p>	<p>The commenter expresses an opinion about the need for a comprehensive policy for large-scale solar development in Alameda County. Development of a solar policy is a matter of County procedure and process and is not part of the proposed project evaluated in the EIR.</p> <p>The applicant is proceeding in accordance with all relevant County requirements as they currently stand.</p> <p>See Section 4.11 for a discussion of land use and zoning requirements.</p> <p>The DEIR incorrectly reported that a portion of the project site was under Williamson Act contract. The property owners of Assessor's Parcel Number 903-0006-003-07, Leland Stanley and Mary Stanley, entered into a Land Conservation Agreement for this parcel on February 23, 1971 (Land Conservation Contract No. 5496, Agricultural Preserve No. 1971-65). However, County staff found that a Notice of Nonrenewal of Agricultural Preserve Contract was filed on October 2, 1990 to notify the County of Alameda that the land conservation contract would not be renewed, effective January 1, 1991. Sections 3.0 and 4.2 of the EIR have been updated to reflect this information.</p> <p>This comment expresses general opposition to the project but does not raise any other specific concerns regarding the adequacy of the EIR, and no further response is needed.</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			reject this application and wait for a comprehensive solar policy from the County. Thank you.	
01:42:12	009	Dick Schneider	<p>Thank you. My name is Dick Schneider. Good afternoon members of the board. As you heard, staff has been directed to finish instead of policies for solar industries facilities that was begun some 10 years ago. These policies will become part of the general plan and zoning ordinance to guide where solar facilities can be cited. We expect that the County will undertake it's been called the least conflict. Lands mapping study because a large and successful effort was done in central in the Central Valley. At least conflict study for Alameda County would identify those areas with significant solar potential that have the fewest conflicts with agriculture and other natural resources. We think this can be done in house.</p> <p>With the knowledge that staff has and with the help of the Advisory committee, which has firsthand knowledge of the potential of agriculture in most areas of the County, aided by the Resource Conservation District which has expertise in natural resources.</p> <p>Because it will take several months for the County study. However, because two projects Sunwalker and Aramis have been proposed, friends Livermore engaged in a very preliminary exercise to see if other lands besides North Livermore could be suitable for utility scale and distributed generation solar facilities principles. Livermore engaged a consulting firm that works nationwide to identify solar sites. Sites for solar energy facilities. The consultants looked mainly for solar potential, that is topography and proximity to grid connections and only a week that firm came up with seven possible sites for solar energy facilities in Alameda County. It was not meant to be an exhaustive study, simply wanted to show that alternative sites exist that they're closer examination. Three utility scale sites totaling, totaling 756 acres were identified with a total generating potential of 135 megawatts. Because a number of locations could exist for large scale solar energy facilities, and because the County will initiate at least conflict study this fall.</p>	<p>The commenter expresses an opinion about the need for a comprehensive policy for large-scale solar development in Alameda County. Development of a solar policy is a matter of County procedure and process and is not part of the proposed project evaluated in the EIR.</p> <p>The applicant is proceeding in accordance with all relevant County requirements as they currently stand.</p> <p>The commenter does not raise any issue with the analysis presented in the EIR. No further response is required.</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>Friends of Livermore urges the BZA to pause consideration of the two projects in the pipeline until the lease County lease conflict study is done in this way, it may be possible to avoid the intense controversy we now see over the North Livermore Valley. Thank you.</p>	
01:59:23	010	Francesca O'Brien	<p>Good afternoon, thank you for my for your time. My name is Francesca. I'm a Livermore Valley resident. I'd like to say that biodiversity loss is a macroeconomic risk. Biodiversity is the economic backbone in the sense that it pops up the natural system that underpins economic activity. The San Joaquin kit Fox.</p> <p>The California least tern the San Bruno elephant butterfly. The large flower fiddleneck palmate, bracted birds, beak the Alameda County, which state the California red legged Frog California Tiger, Salamander Valley, elderberry, Longhorn, beetle. These are the endangered or threatened mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, insects and flowering plants that are dependent on the Livermore Valley, their habitat for survival.</p> <p>Allen's Hummingbird the bald eagle, the burrowing owl, the Golden eagle, Lewis's woodpecker long billed, curlew Nuttall's, woodpecker, Oak, Oak titmouse, song Sparrow, spotted towhee, tricolored Blackbird, yellow billed magpie. These are 12 of the 18 migratory bird species of conservation concern that migrate in the Livermore Valley. Biodiversity is valuable, which is why banks across the world are incorporating biodiversity assessments.</p> <p>The decision-making process for debt finance. Carbon sequestration is another system "sustainalytic" metric that should be analyzed before project is a quote. Clearly, the proponents of both solar projects care less about the value of this land now and in the long term, as much as they care about the value in their pockets, the CDC and the California Department of Health both designate the project site as an area that may contain</p>	<p>The text of EIR Section 4.3 Air Quality was amended to address concerns regarding Valley fever. In sum, background information about the disease was provided, the risk at the project site was discussed, and worker safety measures were proposed. The site is not in an area that would require Valley fever safety training for workers and supervisors in accordance with AB 203, but the applicant has agreed to provide such training anyway out of an abundance of caution. Existing measures in place to control fugitive dust and sedimentation would also reduce the risk of Valley fever.</p> <p>See Section 4.4 for a discussion of biological resources, including species of conservation concern that are known to or are likely to utilize the project site at some point during their lifetime. Species were chosen for inclusion on that list based on site visits and surveys by qualified biologists, consideration of species' ranges and life histories, consultation with the California Natural Diversity Database, and other considerations. Mitigation measures have been proposed, and Section 4.4 has been updated to clarify and improve background information and mitigation and monitoring measures in response to several other comments that have been received.</p> <p>Carbon sequestration is not a required consideration under CEQA.</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>Valley Fever and the EIR does not address the potential of Valley fever being released into the air. For these reasons, as well as the failure to meet the standards to qualify for the conditional use permit, I ask that you deny the CUP. Thank you very much for your time.</p>	
02:01:34	011	Gene Broadman	<p>Ready. My name is Gene Brodman. Our family owns 160 acres right across the street. Uh, from the big project and right to the North of the one we're talking about today. Uh, my wife was raised on this ranch. She's 86 years old so she's seen a lot of changes here and Livermore Valley. We've been married. I came in the family in 1958, so I've been there 62 years so we can see what's going on.</p> <p>Uh. This is dryland agriculture. We have not made an economic break even in 40 years on that property.</p> <p>And so economics is starting to become an issue. We're being approached by marijuana farmers that make awful, attractive proposals. We've been approached by house developer proposals. You can see that in the near future because of the housing demands and the delightful open space in the North Livermore Valley. It becomes an attractive place to put houses. Uh, I think solar isn't a bad, bad option for the area.</p> <p>Uh, I don't like the aesthetics, so I would say let's make sure that it's aesthetically as attractive as some of the other things that are in our area, which include a lot of old cars and park trucks and other things that aren't too great to look at. I, I think it can be made compatible.</p> <p>If we hold their feet to the fire, they can put in good landscaping, fencing; bury the electrical so we don't see the poles.</p> <p>And oh, by the way, make sure that there is a bond that makes sure they perform and keep things up over the life of the project and then take it out and return land to what it was today. Thank you.</p>	<p>See Section 4.1 for a discussion of aesthetics. Section 3.0 of the EIR has been amended to include a new portion, 3.8.10, which includes discussion of proposed landscaping, including proposed species and sizes at installation, at five years post installation, and at maturity.</p> <p>Section 3.7 of the DEIR outlines plans for site decommissioning and restoration following the project's useful life, if repowering is not pursued at that time. As stated in Section 3.8.1, "In order to ensure that the County or other public agency is not burdened with the cost to remove equipment and debris from the project site in the event of default by the applicant to operate, maintain, and eventually decommission the facility, however unlikely such bankruptcy may be, the project applicant would post a decommissioning security bond to Alameda County." See 3.8.1 for a complete discussion including stipulations.</p> <p>The other issues raised by the commenter address the merits of the project and does not raise any issue with the analysis presented in the EIR. No further response is required.</p>



**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
02:04:24	012	Lucia Ingram	<p>My name is Lucia Ingram. I am currently against the proposed solar power plants for North Livermore. I'm a frequent visitor to the area and I enjoy seeing the broad landscapes and the wildlife as well as photography is one of my favorite hobbies.</p> <p>I'm afraid for the natural habitat, homing boxes, deers, coyotes, frogs, Eagles, owls and other predatory birds to hunt field mice, rats, squirrels, and rabbits. If we truly love our area and our wildlife, it is extremely important to consider that every action we take affects both items. We must protect all aspects of our wildlife, their food source, their migration patterns, as well as the natural beauty they inhabit. That's all, thank you.</p>	<p>See Section 4.1 of the EIR for a discussion of aesthetic impacts. See Section 4.4 of the EIR for a discussion of biological resources, including wildlife. This comment does not raise any specific concerns regarding the adequacy of the EIR, and no further response is required.</p>
02:10:43	013	Kelly Brue	<p>My name is Kelly Brue. The goal of Measure D was not just to preserve open space that urban boundaries. It was urban growth. Boundaries is also supposed to enhance agriculture an agricultural lands. The County began planning for solar 10 years ago, but in 2011 deliver more independent. Reported that quote.</p> <p>AG Advisory panel says don't rush solar policy End Quote also another clone. Alameda County supervisors are going too fast in trying to put a policy in place for location of solar arrays in rural areas. The haste could cause big problems and quote that was in 2011, but now things have turned upside down. Now people are demanding a solar policy and they want one like yesterday we, we, we, we got bogged down in 2013, 2017 trying to do this. But how soon we forget?</p> <p>The environmental reports and studies discussed today are defective with respect to the second project. The Aramis Project, because they love together solar panels with batteries for storage and grid stabilization. They're mixing up apples and oranges. The land requirements are different. The per acre construction costs are vastly different. The battery storage is usually cited near transmission lines and at critical nodes of the electrical grid. There's you can't just throw battery storage anywhere out in the desert. There's no one size fits all policy that can lump together batteries and solar panels. The battery</p>	<p>The commenter expresses an opinion about the need for a comprehensive policy for large-scale solar development in Alameda County. Development of a solar policy is a matter of County procedure and process and is not part of the proposed project evaluated in the EIR. The applicant is proceeding in accordance with all relevant County requirements as they currently stand.</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>storage element is misunderstood, it's mischaracterized it's being zoned, senselessly and it's being regulated recklessly in this environmental impact report. And in in all the the discussions that have been happening up until now. Thank you.</p>	
03:23:18	014	Joseph Cruz	<p>OK, my name is Joe Cruz. On behalf of the laborers, local business Manager, Local 304 business manager Fernando Estrada, and the nearly 10,000 working families who live in Alameda County in close to 600 families who live directly in Livermore, we want to express our strong support of the Aramis Solar Project Draft EIR. This well-planned project will power 22,500 Alameda County Homes with clean local renewable energy each year and create a many good paying jobs for local residents. We appreciate the staff work that had been done to date to check all the boxes and to ensure their project is environmentally and community friendly.</p> <p>The Aramis project moves California in Alameda County, closer to achieving a decarbonized economy in a healthier environment. So, on behalf of the laborers Local 304, I respectfully urge you to approve the DEIR at the appropriate time. Thank you again.</p>	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issue with the analysis presented in the EIR. No further response is required.</p>
03:24:41	015	Tim Mason	<p>Sorry about that. Good evening and thanks so much for having this hearing. I'm in Alameda County resident and I am strongly in support of the project. I don't have any personal relationship to it. However, I do have a lot of relationship to California's carbon policy and current California's renewable policies.</p> <p>And if California is going to achieve 100% renewable and the County is going to meet its greenhouse gas goals, we need to have renewables. And that today is wind and solar, and they need to be developed throughout the state. We can't put them on the Central Valley or in the deserts they need.</p> <p>To be spread throughout the state, that's the way the grid operates. This is an ideal location. A lot of the commenters have talked about the fact that you know this is pristine land. It is not. It is degraded agricultural land and when we talk about</p>	<p>The commentator offers general support for the project, which is acknowledged. Section 4.1 of the EIR has been amended to discuss the potential for a heat island effect and to address concerns raised regarding the Arizona study that this commentator and many others mentioned. The comment does not mention any other specific concerns regarding the adequacy of the DEIR, and no further response is required.</p> <p>Please see Impact AES-4 in Section 4.1 Aesthetics of the EIR for an updated discussion of potential impacts including the heat island effect raised by the commenter. In sum, any heat island effect related to solar panels would be primarily due to heat trapped beneath the panels and limited in its ability to radiate out at night, raising temperatures by up to 3 to 4 degrees C. This effect is generally most pronounced at night and negligible during the day. It is also extremely localized; in the Nature article that this</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>least conflict land that is by definition what it is. So, there's no notion that we're destroying the ecosystem. Also, it's located near the energy loads and most of us are part of East Bay Community Energy, and if you remember the value proposition for EBCE was to have local in clean energy. This project meets both of these criteria. Then it's being sold to East Bay Clean Energy.</p> <p>I also wanted to comment for a minute and the Heat islands. I'm familiar with the Arizona that most of the commenters have cited, but there's a whole bunch of other studies that are out there, including a very good one by Columbia, which shows de minimis impacts and the Arizona study was in a very different climate, and I think all of us.</p> <p>No, it's windy in Livermore and we're not going to have a heat island effect. Finally, the other thing that I would, I would suggest that you do when you look at visual impacts is drive down Vasco Rd South in Livermore past Lawrence Livermore National Lab. There is a large-scale wind facility at the lab which is shaded by the type of shading that the proponent is developing here. And I think that you'll find that that will alleviate a lot of your concerns. So, with that, thank you very much for your time.</p>	<p>comment is likely referring to (the commenter did not provide a citation for the study they referenced), all three study sites (wildland, solar farm, and parking lot) were within the same one square kilometer area and the differences reported in that study were detected between them. Another study cited in the EIR found that at a distance of 300 meters (984 feet) from a solar array the temperature anomaly was less than 0.3 degrees C (0.5 degrees F). Vegetation further serves to mitigate any effect of heat becoming trapped under solar panels; the panels studied in the Nature article were in an unvegetated area; the panels in the proposed project would be intermixed with forage grasses. The effect, if any, would be extremely localized and would have no detectable effect on climate, wildfire risk, or the viability of agriculture in the vicinity.</p>
03:27:10	016	Joe Thompson	<p>I am a longtime resident here in Livermore. I also am a business owner in Alameda County and the, the one thing that we should all be looking toward is clean energy. I don't think that California's met those requirements that have been stated earlier, and I just want the, to be on the record here that this land I've, I've been passed this land before very dry. There's no row crops there, there's nothing like that. It is, it's, there wasn't even cattle there I didn't see any evidence of anything like that to me there's there's no habitat that's being destroyed.</p> <p>Uh, and if this project is going to move forward there, allowing sheep grazing, they're also planting in between the arrays to assist with the bees that are disappearing so um to me, they</p>	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issue with the analysis presented in the EIR. No further response is required.</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>are assisting in the, the environment. With that with those ways also.</p> <p>You know the last couple of years we've had rolling blackouts, and with four hours of capacity that they're going to provide, instead of having our power shut off and all of our you know, home alarms resetting, you know we wouldn't have to go through that. Um, I'm for this project and I really urge you to pass, pass this project. Approve it as soon as possible because this we just can't keep delaying on this. This is ridiculous. Thank you.</p>	
03:29:08	017	Mike Frederick	<p>Hi, I'm like Frederick, I spoke earlier. Everything I had to say against the earlier project, I would say tenfold for this one. Measure D was intended to stop development in northern Livermore. This project is development. It's an industrial installation. This is.</p> <p>The applicants comment of this is a least conflict land, really? Is, was that a joke? You've just heard three hours of objections?</p> <p>The applicant doesn't want to spend the money on real mitigation. They would need to do ongoing studies to show that they are not impacting sensitive species, they don't intend to do that.</p> <p>Where are they going to get the water to maintain the miles and miles of landscaping they propose? PG&amp;E couldn't do it for a tiny little spot. They tell us that we're going to have recreational facilities there. It's going to be a trail where you're going to be walking between solar panels, but that's the kind of recreation I want to do.</p> <p>The visual impact is horrendous and they admit it. They just said, well, that's, that's just the way it's going to have to be. I'm all for renewable energy. I have had solar panels on my roof for 10 years. North Livermore is not the place for this project. We</p>	<p>For consistency with Measure D, see the discussion in Section 4.11. For a discussion of biological mitigation and monitoring, see Section 4.4. For a discussion of hydrology and water quality, see Section 4.10.</p> <p>Water supplies considered in the WSA for project construction, operation, and decommissioning include groundwater pumped from the Livermore Valley Groundwater Basin via an on- or off-site groundwater well, surface water imported to the project area and distributed via the Zone 7 Water Agency, and local groundwater banking operations that receive surplus water supplies during wet years and provide supply reliability during dry years. Washing of panels would be done once annually with water only. See Section 4.10 for a complete discussion of hydrology and water quality. Additional water for dust suppression may be trucked to the site during construction. See Section 3.5.2 for that discussion and Section 4.16 for project transportation impacts.</p> <p>Section 4.15 states: "the project applicant proposes to dedicate an easement to Alameda County (or Livermore Area Recreation and Park District) along Cayetano Creek in the project area, outside of the development footprint of the solar facility, for their potential use to construct a public hiking trail in the future, if desired. The construction of a public hiking trail along Cayetano Creek is not proposed as part of this project. The decision to construct a trail, and the timing and design of the trail, are not</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>should be developing infill solar energy before we go out and destroy this relatively pristine area. Thank you very much.</p>	<p>controlled by the applicant and therefore any analysis of trail construction is speculative at this time. The County (or Livermore Area Recreation and Park District) would be required to undertake a separate CEQA review if trail construction is ultimately proposed by the County or Livermore Area Recreation and Park District.”</p> <p>See Section 4.1 for a discussion of aesthetic impacts, including significant and unavoidable impacts.</p>
03:30:53	018	Kelly Abrillo	<p>Hi, I'm here. The battery storage buildings occupied 2 acres, the, the storage is so small that it doesn't even show up on the map. The lithium batteries are cutting edge, they just entered, entered large scale use on grids a few years ago; Tesla has built the largest storage facility in the world in South Australia in 2017 using lithium. I'd ask whether this project would use batteries from that local manufacturer Tesla, similar to what they have in their cars. That's a question the capital investment that goes into the storage would be roughly equal to the capital cost of all the rest of the 400 acres of solar panels put together.</p> <p>Uh, storage is very valuable and very costly. Storage is used for arbitrage over a period of hours, and that's what everybody thinks about. They think about storing electricity for hours, but in this case it also is performing the function of grid frequency stabilization over the time period of milliseconds or seconds or a few minutes. It's a completely different function.</p> <p>Recent fire power outages have demonstrated the instability of our electric grid and we need to employ employ, the latest and greatest technologies to upgrade the power grid and a battery storage. Thus, is the most useful and essential element of this project. It shouldn't be treated as an afterthought like it's being treated here in this EIR and in all the discussions.</p> <p>They're just ignoring this, this storage element. The coronavirus pandemic, has also exposed the need for public parks and recreational facilities. So regardless of what happens with this</p>	<p>The commentor offers general support for the project, which is acknowledged. Information about battery storage is included in Section 4.14 Hazards and Hazardous materials. The comment does not mention any specific concerns regarding the adequacy of the DEIR, and no further response is required.</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>proposed Aramis project, we would be delighted to welcome the opening of a new hiking trail that would support public health. And really, really do something for our community and that's going to be part of this right along that Creek there. Thank you.</p>	
03:33:08	019	Chuck McCallum	<p>There we go now. I can unmute myself. Yeah, hi, my name is Chuck McCallum as I mentioned before. I'm a resident here in Livermore for since 1994. My, my family and I have enjoyed amazing locations in the North area, like Brushy Peak.</p> <p>The Morgan Territory trails even stuff in spring town that where we used to live when we first moved here. This area does not even resemble any of those areas and I think this is a great opportunity, specially with the trail invested in here to show our kids the opportunity to go after renewable energy. I know that this area has been sitting here for a very long time and that this opportunity to actually build something that can give 4-hour storage and help our environment is like a key for, for the future.</p> <p>I have not seen any farming up there. It's it that I have not seen. I seen dry land. I've seen this land sitting around for a very long time and I do enjoy hiking and some of those other, other things that are going on, but I think renewable energy this is a perfect to use this. It's in the zoning code. It's, it's a great opportunity for the area and it's it I think it's the right approach for this property and an it fits within Measure D. So that's how I feel about it.</p>	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis presented in the EIR. No further response is required.</p>
03:35:02	020	Tony Slayton Barker	<p>My name is Tony Slayton Barker. I'm calling in support of the project. I'm a principal and professional engineer with Coffman engineers and I run our Energy Sustainability Group. We have 17 offices in the US and four in California. Well, we're working with Aramis to assist them with their battery system design and to ensure it's a safe design focusing on prevention of problems.</p> <p>We have Coffman has been around 40 years. We've been working on lithium ion projects for about four years. Kind of</p>	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis presented in the EIR. No further response is required.</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>when this industry first started. Have about 20 active battery projects across the US at the moment. We've been hired to support the mechanical engineering thermal management to make sure you know, these batteries are kept to their proper temperature so they work properly and, and don't, don't degrade or, or have other issues.</p> <p>Also, can support some of the structural components for anchoring the batteries. So, in seismic events we don't have problem. We'll be working with the local Fire Marshall as well as a local firefighters for Fire Protection requirements, sprinkler systems of other stuff. Explosion control is another big component of that. We'll be working, make sure the system is in compliance with all the applicable codes. Alameda County requirements, fire codes, manufacturer equipment standards, structural codes, as well as some of the insurance carrier requirements that they have some specific requirements to reduce risk on these projects.</p> <p>Again, our basic rules to prevent, prevent issues be working. There's a battery management system that will you know, be checking individual cell temperatures, voltage, current charge on a continuous basis, basis, and again the manufacturers are designing these battery systems with some cases built in sprinkler systems within their batteries.</p> <p>As well as a lot of dividers between the cells between the modules between the racks, so these, these systems are very safe. An again will have early detection for, for gas smoke, fire alarm and things like that, as well as providing you know fire hydrants on site water is required and things like that. Thank you.</p>	
03:37:25	021	Antonia Munoz	<p>OK, thank you. Good afternoon everyone. My name is Tony Munoz. You know I'm a field representative for the Carpenters Union Local 713 out of Hayward which covers Alameda County and I am also lifelong resident of Alameda County calling in support of this Aramis Project. You know, as a resident of Alameda County I would like to see a project that will benefit</p>	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis presented in the EIR. No further response is required.</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>the people to live out here in this area and the Aramis project does exactly that.</p> <p>You know, like many folks that live out here, I enjoy taking the hikes with my family with this going to Gary Park or Coyote Point, or sometimes just taking a drive to Mines Rd. No to lick Observatory and enjoy the scenic rose. Alameda County has to offer.</p> <p>Interstate Power was very tough on the design of this project and considerate of the surrounding areas.</p> <p>By dedicating land to accommodate for public hiking trail for recreation, and it came up with a great vision for the perfect landscaping idea to screen the project and maintain the scenic views.</p> <p>We're all the way right now of all these record breaking temperatures, they have that we've had recently and now we have more families relying on the AC to keep their homes cool during these heatwaves and we also have these rolling blackouts coming back.</p> <p>But the newborn child at home and my two daughters, you know, doing their schoolwork at home often think about the effect it would have on my family if our home was to lose power in one of these heatwaves.</p> <p>Now this project will provide County residents with a renewable source. Look straight enough energy for up to around 2 to 5000 homes. It will be built next to the existing PG&amp;E substation and store energy for whenever it's needed. This project will also create good paying union jobs and will create work opportunities for apprentices. Was going to be the workforce of the future. So, we're close to 5000 members here in Alameda County. Our carpenters are ready for the opportunity to make a difference. Build for a better future and build this project for Alameda County. Thank you.</p>	



**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
03:39:30	022	Chuck Ott	<p>Hello again and I spoke earlier and pretty much the same stance on this one. This Aramis project Draft EIR, 506 pages long and obviously takes considerable time to review and comment. Couple this with the Sun Walker projects Final EIR view at the same time being done simultaneously places and burden on all stakeholders to review, comment and oppose or whatnot.</p> <p>This project is a monumental moment for the County and for Livermore specifically, that is never nothing of this size has been undertaken anywhere in the Bay Area, nor in Northern California as far as I'm aware of. And it's all at the sacrifice of Livermore.</p> <p>Yes, it will create some short-term jobs 6 to 12 months, then nothing. Then it just sits there. If North Livermore had sufficient water the whole Valley be buying Grapevine, staying in South would want their does not have the bulk water distribution out there in order to utilize the soils. The claim that the soils are inadequate. Well, maybe for growing hay, or you know anything other than dry farming. At this point it's all because of the water.</p> <p>You can grow grapevines in just about any soil. Rootstocks are genetically engineered to be able to grow and whatever it's required. All we can ask is, is give it time. Read the comments through to the period. For that we have to November 2nd. Postpone it and really dig deep into the thoughts of what this will do to Livermore. Thank you.</p>	<p>This commenter seems to generally oppose the project, and specifically asks the County to postpone its decision and consider comments more carefully and at greater length. The County is considering every comment submitted in writing and at this public forum, and is offering written responses to each and revisions to the EIR where they are warranted. Full responses and revisions to the EIR will be published concurrently to allow members of the public to see that comments were considered adequately and that changes were made where needed. This commenter does not raise any specific issues regarding the adequacy of the EIR, and no further response is required.</p>
03:41:23	023	Linda Newton	<p>Hi. I am a return caller. I called earlier this morning. My name is Linda Newton and I live in the North Livermore Valley. The Aramis Solar Facility is being proposed on agricultural land along North Livermore Ave, which Alameda County identified as a scenic rule recreational route. This route was adopted in 1966. That's over 54 years ago.</p> <p>For the Protection and enhancement of scenic values along the designated routes. The proposed Solar Facility expects to install</p>	<p>The commenter expressed concerns regarding the project's aesthetic impacts. As discussed in Section 4.1, Aesthetics, of the EIR, the proposed project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to the surrounding scenic vistas and visual character or quality of public views. The implementation of a landscape buffer is intended to lessen the visual impact of the proposed solar facility. The EIR concludes that even with the implementation of the landscape buffer, the aesthetics impacts</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>nearly 320,000 solar arrays. Overhead lines from 30 to 100 feet tall, approximately 5 miles of fencing with barbed wire on more than 700 acres of agricultural land, creating a solid visual barrier.</p> <p>Just to name a few, the industrial sector will, structure will do nothing to enhance or protect the scenic route and will have a major impact on the natural habitat. This is a desirable area for cattle grazing and are natural, beautiful habitat and many locals out of the area.</p> <p>Excuse me and many locals and visitors from out of the area enjoy North Livermore. We see joggers, walkers, cyclists, painters, and photographers that are seen enjoying the area on a daily basis. This Draft EIR, Section 8.2 on the aesthetics impact finds the proposed project would result a significant adverse impact to the County designated scenic corridor.</p> <p>Therefore, the 50, the Aramis 50-year Conditional Use Permit would lead to destruction of the North Livermore Valley Scenic Corridor, which has been preserved for half a century. I appreciate your time and thank you for taking your time for reviewing this proposal. Thank you.</p>	<p>would be significant and unavoidable and would alter the visual character and quality of the public views.</p> <p>The proposed landscape buffer would be located along the North Livermore Avenue and Manning Road street frontages and would not be located within sensitive natural communities or wildlife habitat. The plant palette proposed includes only native plant species and would not introduce non-native or invasive plant species.</p>
03:43:20	024	David Nelson	<p>Hello, thank you for allowing me to speak. My name is David Nelson. I'm a longtime Livermore resident for over 30 years. I currently live in the North Livermore area.</p> <p>I would I. You're hearing a lot of people tonight so I'll make this as short as possible, but I am in support of the Aramis Renewable Energy project. I think we have to start doing something. It seems like the past three summers in a row we've had to wear masks because of fires somewhere in in California, so I think it's time we start trying to really make a change. Like I said, I live in the North Livermore area. I am for this project and I think we must move forward with any kind of renewable energy. Thank you.</p>	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issue with the analysis presented in the EIR. No further response is required.</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
03:44:27	025	Jean King	<p>OK, thank you. I spoke earlier on the climate change and the, the, the relationship to the solar panel. So, if you could review that I won't repeat it. I would like an extension of the time for the review of this DEIR because it's 500 pages long. It's very involved and I think it would be good to extend it beyond the November 2nd time.</p> <p>Solar is good if there is storage which this has, but I think we need more information on the five acres of batteries. Questions about the batteries, how they are produced, their safety and all of the environmental impact of the batteries. They are of a great concern to me.</p> <p>I don't believe, I believe there's inadequate review of the biological issues. I think some of the people brought us some things. It isn't just necessarily the animals that you find there at one time. They may be in migration patterns for the local animals. Would like more information on the towers, how tall are these towers going to be?</p> <p>How many are there going to be and where are the utility lines gonna be? I think there should be a good review and, and peer review I guess of the different studies that have been done on the heat. If some of them are done in Arizona, Arizona has hot weather like we do. I think it would be very applicable.</p> <p>I agree with removing the natural resources and the water resources lands. I certainly think that they should be taken out because they need to be preserved. Again, I'm for solar and we need to have a moratorium and a solar policy in place before we move ahead with any solar uses.</p> <p>The first one that we talked about in the Aramis one now. The applicant calls the soils impaired or degraded, but I have heard that they are really very good and what they need is water to make them productive. On jobs, how many and how long will the jobs last? And again, I'm very concerned about the scenic corridor, so thank you very much.</p>	<p>The public comment period began on September 18, 2020 when the Draft EIR was published and ended on November 2, 2020. The duration of the comment period was 45 days, which is consistent with CEQA guidelines for an EIR. Section 15105 (a) of the CEQA guidelines which states:</p> <p>“The public review period for a draft EIR shall not be less than 30 days nor should it be longer than 60 days except under unusual circumstances. When a draft EIR is submitted to the State Clearinghouse for review by state agencies, the public review period shall not be less than 45 days, unless a shorter period, not less than 30 days, is approved by the State Clearinghouse.”</p> <p>The public review period of 45 days for this draft EIR is consistent with the guidelines set forth by CEQA. The four week extension requested by the commenter would extend the review period beyond the maximum of 60 days allowed by CEQA. The lead agency finds this to be sufficient review time for this EIR and has not elected to extend the public review period.</p> <p>The commenter states that there has been inadequate review of the biological issues related to the project but does not cite any specific deficiencies in the EIR. For a complete discussion of the biological issues related to the project, including the methodology used in the analysis, please see Section 4.4 Biological Resources.</p> <p>The battery storage of the proposed project would be constructed as described in the EIR in Chapter 3.0 Project Description. Please see Section 4.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials for a discussion potential hazards related to battery storage.</p> <p>Please see Impact AES-4 in Section 4.1 Aesthetics of the EIR for an updated discussion of potential impacts including the heat island effect raised by the commenter. In sum, any heat island effect related to solar panels would be primarily due to heat trapped beneath the panels and limited in its ability to radiate out at</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
				<p>night, raising temperatures by up to 3 to 4 degrees C. This effect is generally most pronounced at night and negligible during the day. It is also extremely localized; in the Nature article that this comment is likely referring to (the commenter did not provide a citation for the study they referenced), all three study sites (wildland, solar farm, and parking lot) were within the same one square kilometer area and the differences reported in that study were detected between them. Another study cited in the EIR found that at a distance of 300 meters (984 feet) from a solar array the temperature anomaly was less than 0.3 degrees C (0.5 degrees F). Vegetation further serves to mitigate any effect of heat becoming trapped under solar panels; the panels studied in the Nature article were in an unvegetated area; the panels in the proposed project would be intermixed with forage grasses. The effect, if any, would be extremely localized and would have no detectable effect on climate, wildfire risk, or the viability of agriculture in the vicinity.</p> <p>The commenter expresses an opinion about the need for a comprehensive policy for large-scale solar development in Alameda County. Development of a solar policy is a matter of County procedure and process and is not part of the proposed project evaluated in the EIR.</p> <p>For more information on the specific features of the project including the location of utility lines and the number of jobs, please see Section 3.0 Project Description.</p>
03:47:02	026	Tyler O'Brien	<p>No problem. First off, I'll say. Yeah you guys definitely deserve your overtime for all this work, that's for sure. I just want to address some things in the EIR first.</p> <p>Or it might be lacking. I mentioned this or my wife did in the Sunwalker project, 'cause you know the potential for Valley fever is recognized with the CDC in California Health Department. This area and it's definitely something that needs to be addressed and studied. Also, you know with the wildfires</p>	<p>The text of EIR Section 4.3 Air Quality was amended to address concerns regarding Valley fever. In sum, background information about the disease was provided, the risk at the project site was discussed, and worker safety measures were proposed. The site is not in an area that would require Valley fever safety training for workers and supervisors in accordance with AB 203, but the applicant has agreed to provide such training anyway out of an abundance of caution. Existing measures in place to control fugitive dust and sedimentation would also reduce the risk of Valley fever.</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>that recently in California, I think a study or some sort of increased study.</p> <p>Or the potential for fire, and the ecological effects of a fire. Should the panels catch fire or the building? The lithium storage building itself catch fire. There should be a study on what the impact on the area would be as well. Also, I think that there should be a study on bringing sheep instead of cattle to graze in this area. I know Mr. Imhof is a farmer himself. You know, we might be aware that sheep have a much higher parasitic load in their feces, and I think it's worth you know, looking into what impact that increased parasitic load in the soil itself might have on the local fauna.</p> <p>Um, aside from that, there's also the water issue. I think that perhaps is the condition of approval. There should be an in depth study of the current water table as well as local wells, and there should be assurance built in that Intersect will be held accountable and liable for any contamination to the water supply, whether it's indirect or directly because of them.</p> <p>I just want to answer some questions that people have raised. You know to say this is distressed AG land is a little ignorant. Little disheartening hearing people that live in the city and not in the rural area and say that there is an agriculture out here. I mean, like I said, there aren't cattle while I'm looking out my window on the proposed property and there's 250 head of cattle across the street on the proposed project right now, they just had to (unclear) there's about 30 new calves out there.</p> <p>You know, what we have here is a water distressed area which could be mitigated if water was brought out here, crops would grow. You know this is a prime area for AG restoration. And you know, on the "prod," across the project site you know about 5-10 years ago there was a large strawberry Patch that operated for a good seven years and was very profitable. And the only reason I went away is 'cause the leasing issues. That's my time is up, so I'll stop there. Thank you.</p>	<p>For additional information about the risk of fire related to the project, please see Section 4.18 Wildfire.</p> <p>For additional information about agriculture in the vicinity of the proposed project as well as an analysis of the proposed project's potential effects on agriculture, please see Section 4.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources.</p> <p>For additional information about water resources in the vicinity of the proposed project, please see the discussion of existing conditions and analysis of potential impacts in Section 4.10 Hydrology and Water Quality.</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
03:49:20	027	Karen Swaim	<p>OK, I'm a return as well. My name is Karen Swaim. I'm a wildlife biologist and mostly with reptiles and amphibians and a practicing consultant. Very familiar with EACCS, the eastern Alameda County Conservation Strategy. Also, be submitting in the writing for the DEIR.</p> <p>Uh, the land that one caller said is useless and sitting around doing nothing needs to recognize that the North Livermore Valley, including both Sunwalker and Aramis sites, provide incredible biological resources for both wildlife and plants in their current state, as ranchlands open areas in this location are critical wildlife habitat corridors and are not useless in that respect as well.</p> <p>Aramis is pretty much 10 times Sunwalker in the destructive value for wildlife, habitat and species. The EIR consultant mentioned to Berkeley study about citing solar. If you want to cite solar, you need something specific to this site, not some simulation or checkboxes on another, another location. Just like Sunwalker, you write in your document, all you want that you follow EACCS on every one of the 500 pages, but that does not make it true. Neither of these projects should be saying that they comply with the EACCS and trying to push the mitigations and land compensation well to the agencies later after they get approval.</p> <p>That's not a fair way to do it. Neither of these projects has identified a federal nexus either, and that would not even allow you to go through the EACCS permitting mechanism that would point to an HCP. Regarding the protocol surveys, there has not been a protocol survey for the California Tiger salamander. That's a two-year trapping survey in good winters, rains with a finding negative may not even be accepted by the agencies because they're all over the area.</p> <p>. That survey has not been done. I challenge you to go out and drive along the roads in the rain in November through February in every single rainstorm and see what you find.</p>	<p>The project was sited and designed to avoid impacts to high quality habitat for CTS and CRLF and extensive mitigation measures are included to avoid impacts to any state or federally listed species, including CTS and CRLF. The project has been designed to avoid impacts to Cayetano Creek and its tributaries, which has the highest likelihood of providing habitat for listed species. The project site provides only marginal upland habitat for CTS and CRLF. As described in the EIR and supporting Biological Technical Report, the site will be revegetated to provide habitat for CRLF and CTS in the understory of the solar panels once the facility is operational. Permanent impacts to habitat will be less than significant.</p> <p>In addition, numerous mitigation measures are included to avoid impacts to special-status species during construction and operation of the project. We acknowledge that CTS and CRLF are abundant in the region but they were not found on the site during numerous biological surveys by CTS and CRLF permitted biologists with extensive experience with these species. This includes two seasons of protocol surveys for CRLF that were also sufficient to conclusively determine that CTS is not breeding on the site.</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>I say this as someone who has federal and state recovery permits for both of these species, and it worked with them longer than either of them has been listed. The red legged frog surveys do follow some aspects of the protocol, but they do not indicate absence for the frog. They were done in drought years and the surveys are not intended to provide absence anyways. 03:51:46</p> <p>This species is located immediately in the area and your maps are very misleading and don't show an adequate buffer around this site and all the known observations. If Sun Walker or Aramis want to pass the CEQA or state and federal Endangered Species Act guidelines and mandates, they need to mitigate.</p> <p>There will be permanent and temporary impacts in these species and analyze all the real potential impacts on these listed species.</p>	
00:00:26	028	Stephen Cassidy	<p>Yeah, thank you so much. I want to thank the Commissioners for your action on Sunwalker for, you know, choosing to take this in a deliberate manner, not rushing, making sure that you really feel comfortable and that all your questions are answered; and, I hope that you'll take the same approach with the Aramis project 'cause you know someone mentioned it's 10 times bigger. Um, it's just I think it's unrealistic to think that this project is going to be reviewed on November 24th. There's going to be a mountain of paper filed of comments and objections on November 2nd, and it's going to take you and a considerable amount time to go through that. After course staff goes through that and that's just not going to happen in three weeks.</p> <p>Now, in terms of looking at the project, one thing I hope that you would press Aramis on right after we're done with the public comments is to actually provide accurate visuals. Every single visual of the project that I've seen in the Draft EIR, and then their video and other marketing. None of them show the overhead electrical transmission lines. None of them show the battery storage facility. None of them show the extent of the</p>	<p>The commenter expressed concerns regarding the project's aesthetic impacts. As discussed in Section 4.1, Aesthetics, of the EIR, the proposed project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to the surrounding scenic vistas and visual character or quality of public views. The implementation of a landscape buffer is intended to lessen the visual impact of the proposed solar facility. The EIR concludes that even with the implementation of the landscape buffer, the aesthetics impacts would be significant and unavoidable and would alter the visual character and quality of the public views.</p> <p>The proposed landscape buffer would be located along the North Livermore Avenue and Manning Road street frontages and would not be located within sensitive natural communities or wildlife habitat. The plant palette proposed includes only native plant species and would not introduce non-native or invasive plant species.</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>fencing and the internal roads. There's been a concerted effort, I believe, to you know, deceive the policymakers as to what this project will actually look like.</p> <p>Um, and you know, I'd be happy to be proved wrong, but that requires Aramis to actually present real visuals of what this project will be. Even look at the trail map photo that they gave you or the visual that she was just presented. It's from an incredible distance away from the project. And again, there's going to be according to the Draft EIR overhead electrical transmission lines over the creek, and there's going to be fencing and vegetation. So, who's going to want to walk on a trail that's in an industrial area? At least you know, I truly request that you, as the Commissioners force Aramis, require Aramis to give you accurate visuals of what this project will look like before you review it, thank you so much.</p>	
00:02:45	029	Mark Buck	<p>Yes, hi my name is Mark Buck. My lifelong Bay Area resident. I'm a 20-year member plus member of IBEW Local 595, I support this project. I appreciate all your patience.</p> <p>I listened to the whole thing so far and I appreciate the staffs and if it the councils the same to everyone, but I do support this and I hope we move this forward it would be good for my kids, my grandkids, my great grandkids and everyone else's kids. But thank you so much and have a good evening.</p>	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issue with the analysis presented in the EIR. No further response is required.</p>
00:03:24	030	Joseph Gurchar	<p>Can you hear me? Yes, yes, alright, I want my name is Joseph Gurchar. I want to say three things. First, as with the Sunwalker project, I want to emphasize that the Sierra Club has taken no position for or against either Sunwalker or Aramis. The planning people might have received a letter that was written without authorization by the any executive Board of the club.</p> <p>Now the two things I want to talk about. You probably haven't heard about before are what's really going on here. OK, the previous power plant built in Alameda County is a fossil fuel plant on the Hayward shoreline near the San Mateo Bridge. OK, this is the single most valuable piece of land in southern Alameda County, but the supervisors in Oakland who run this</p>	<p>Two letters were received during the public comment period that were signed as being from the Sierra Club. On October 24, 2020, a comment letter was received with the Sierra Club San Francisco Bay logo at the top and signed as follows:</p> <p>Igor Tregub  Representative, Alameda County Community Choice Energy Issues  Sierra Club San Francisco Bay Chapter</p> <p>For response to this letter, please see the response to written comment 132.</p>



**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>County they don't respect the people who live in southern Alameda County.</p> <p>So, they allowed a power plant to be built on Hayward's most valuable piece of real estate, which forever forbids it being used for hotels or scenic parks or whatever. And that's precisely what they're doing to Livermore, which is even further away from Oakland and further out of mind.</p> <p>This is disrespecting the Valley and disrespecting southern Alameda County. And Secondly, I want to explain what Aramis Power is really about. It's a fly by night operation run by a bunch of Ivy League youngsters, the chairman of the Board lives at in Lake Tahoe. OK? He gives hundreds of thousands of dollars to political candidates and what they do is they pull permits for power plants like this. They sell the permits to somebody with deep pockets like East Bay Community Power and then by the time the plant goes up, they're on to the next project. So, it's just a shame that Livermore is being used this way the same way that Hayward was. Thank you.</p>	<p>On November 2, 2020, a comment letter was received with the Sierra Club logo at the top and signed as follows:</p> <p>Luis Amezcua  Senior Campaign Representative  Beyond Coal Campaign</p> <p>For response to this letter, please see the response to written comment 148.</p> <p>The issues raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and other projects in Northern California that are not within the scope of this EIR. This comment does not raise any issue with the analysis presented in the EIR. No further response is required.</p>
00:05:44	031	Robert Selna	<p>Thank you, yeah. I'm Rob Selna again. I represent safe North Livermore and again, please read the letter I sent yesterday. It's lengthy and I'm sorry it came in so late, but I think it could be very useful for this discussion. With respect to the Aramis EIR, Aramis EIR needs to do much more complete job of addressing Measure D and ECAP policies.</p> <p>There's more than 300 policies and many of the land use and AG specific policies apply to the Aramis Project directly, but they haven't been addressed. Staff in the EIR act as though the solar projects don't have to be consistent with those policies, but under state law they absolutely do. Chair Imhoff noted in the last agenda item that LPA conditionally permits quarries and landfill. First of all, those uses are not connected to an industrial power grid in the way that Aramis and Sunwalker would be. But even if you accept that generally, than industrial</p>	<p>Measure D and ECAP Policy 13 provide that the County shall not provide nor authorize public facilities or other infrastructure in excess of that needed for permissible development consistent with Measure D. However, this Policy shall not bar 1) new expanded or replacement infrastructure necessary to create adequate service for the East County, 2) maintenance, repair or improvements of public facilities which do not increase capacity, and 3) infrastructure such as pipelines, canals, and power transmission lines which have no excessive growth inducing effect on the East County area and have permit conditions to ensure that no service can be provided beyond that consistent with development allowed by Measure D. "Infrastructure" shall include public facilities, community facilities, and all structures and development necessary for the provision of public services and utilities. The project is a solar development that provides a source of renewable energy for existing development; the project is not growth-inducing as described in the Chapter 7 of the Draft</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>solar meets the LPA, projects must still be consistent with all relevant ECAP and Measure D policies.</p> <p>And this goes to a question that member Bayer asked. If you look at policy 13, policy 13 focuses on limits of infrastructure development on Measure D land it only allows infrastructure to create, create adequate service for East County and not increase capacity.</p> <p>If the Aramis Project will sell power to other communities, it clearly contemplates more power than what is adequate for East County. And it clearly contemplates increasing capacity by Miss Mitchell's own admission, the project is inconsistent with Policy 13. She says that power will be sold to SF Clean power, but the EIR doesn't even analyze the project's compliance with policy 13 and many other policies. In addition, battery storage increases capacity by definition.</p> <p>So, there are many policies that need to get a closer look finally notions about the need for solar to meet state goals and address climate change. Please read my letter. Cal Energy Commission CAL ISO are struggling with solar oversupply. Solar is far outpacing any renewable energy and it's causing stress on the grid.</p> <p>That means that there are is plenty of solar power throughout the state of California, and this notion that Los Angeles is the only place where that problem is occurring is not consistent with the California Energy Commission studies and CAL ISO studies.</p>	<p>EIR. The project would not cause population growth. No residential uses are proposed and the jobs created would be short-term, temporary, and the workforce would likely be drawn from the region. The project would not include the extension of utility infrastructure or construction of new roadways that could induce development in the area. The project would assist California in meeting its air quality and GHG emissions reduction goals. As such, the project would not directly induce growth related to provision of additional electric power. Rather, energy demand, as determined by the CPUC with input from the CEC, drives generation procurement; procurement does not drive an increase in either utility customers or energy consumption. Furthermore, implementation of the project would not permit any investor-owned utility to expand its service territory.</p>
00:08:25	032	Ron Sadler	<p>Hi, this is Ron Sadler. I'm a 40-year resident of Livermore.</p> <p>First, I want to thank the folks on the Board for hanging in here for this mock marathon meeting and, and listening to and hearing everybody's thoughts and opinions. And thank you for the effort. It's very apparent that you put in reviewing these projects. I'll just wing this a bit. The fact is. We're, we're in big trouble. Our world is warming quite rapidly. I'm, I'm in a</p>	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issue with the analysis presented in the EIR. No further response is required.</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>student of global warming for a long time. I have a good understanding of it and we as a world are in deep trouble.</p> <p>We have to radically stop producing carbon emitting carbon dioxide, meeting electricity and converting to clean electricity. These projects predicted the Aramis with its storage is really the best solution right now that we have to address that.</p> <p>It's true there sometimes during the year there's too much storage. I mean, too much solar going on. That's only a few times a year and but most of the time the solar that's online is offsetting carbon emitting produced electricity from gas fired plants. So again, thank you for the board for your time and your efforts on this.</p> <p>I encourage you to move forward this project. I encourage for you, for your grandchildren, and my grandchildren. Thank you.</p>	
00:10:11	033	Jim Irvine	<p>Yeah, hello can you hear me? Jim Irvine resident, resident of Livermore for us since I guess 26 years and I spoke earlier and, and same comment. This EIR does not, as near as I can tell it, it does not appear to address the volatic heat Island effect whatsoever and this isn't scientific literature, and it is a phenomenon that has been documented and to the two speakers before said that it's not a, it's a trivial effect. But the EIR specifically, the EIR should address that there should at least be some words, at least a literature review of this subject, and I realized that the, the amount of the effect it can be as much as three to four degrees Centigrade, 5 to 7 degrees Fahrenheit in a desert area of Arizona; and it can vary greatly depending on ambient humidity and, and you know the temperature profile of the area that you're putting it in; and it's not entirely generated by just the, the, the, the glass, you know the cells themselves. It is partly an effect because you're putting an array of panels over hundreds and hundreds of acres.</p> <p>Uh, and, and it, it stills the wind at the surface level it, and so it helps retention of heat in an area and in one way or another,</p>	<p>Please see Impact AES-4 in Section 4.1 Aesthetics of the EIR for an updated discussion of potential impacts including the heat island effect raised by the commenter. In sum, any heat island effect related to solar panels would be primarily due to heat trapped beneath the panels and limited in its ability to radiate out at night, raising temperatures by up to 3 to 4 degrees C. This effect is generally most pronounced at night and negligible during the day. It is also extremely localized; in the Nature article that this comment is likely referring to (the commenter did not provide a citation for the study they referenced), all three study sites (wildland, solar farm, and parking lot) were within the same one square kilometer area and the differences reported in that study were detected between them. Another study cited in the EIR found that at a distance of 300 meters (984 feet) from a solar array the temperature anomaly was less than 0.3 degrees C (0.5 degrees F). Vegetation further serves to mitigate any effect of heat becoming trapped under solar panels; the panels studied in the Nature article were in an unvegetated area; the panels in the proposed project would be intermixed with forage grasses. The effect, if any, would be extremely localized and would have no</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>whether it makes the area hotter or colder. This is in effect on the wildlife and on the environment in, you know, relatively enclosed valley is what they're showing.</p> <p>Uh, and it should be included in the EIR, some, some sort of study, or at least evaluation and what that effect will be. And, the other, the only other comment I'll make is that I, I did some Google mapping, while, while I was sitting here and there is akin to Quinto Solar TV station and it's in Merced County, Santa Nella, probably about 2 hours away. It's, it's relatively comparable in size to what you're proposing here.</p> <p>And there's also the Avenal Solar Facility in King County a little bit further away, maybe as far as four or five hours from, well, I'm, I'm judging from Livermore. But those are comparable sized arrays, and I just comment it when I go on Google Maps. Every one of these other comparable sized industrial scale solar PV facilities there and out of way, areas that are in nowhere near any towns there on very flat land, usually very arid areas. This one you're proposing to put is, is, you know, pretty close. Well you know people like me don't wanna see it! Be honest with you and that's all I have to say.</p>	<p>detectable effect on climate, wildfire risk, or the viability of agriculture in the vicinity.</p>
00:12:49	034	Merlin Newton	<p>Hi, my name is Merlin Newton. The Aramis Draft EIR on Page 5-10, under Hydrology and Water Quality, notes the proposed project with mitigation, I repeat with mitigation, would have a less than significant impact regarding water quality standards, water discharge requirements and degradation of surface or groundwater. Currently the project is being proposed to be built directly over our May School Ground. Drinking well. May school groundwater basins already on a list both by Alameda County N Zone 7 Water District as an area of special concern due to high nitrates. Throughout the draft EIR, it mentions various hazardous materials that will be used and stored on the 700 acres site. Plus, some of those are not limited to but large truck trailer size, lithium batteries, oils, lubricants, solvents, degreaser, transformer oil and not to mention the panels themselves. Should there be a catastrophic event such as a fire or explosion. Then there's the washing and the stormwater runoff of the 320,000 solar panels and the chemicals used to</p>	<p>The commenter has raised concerns regarding stormwater runoff from implementation of the proposed project. As discussed in Section 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, the project applicant would be required to enroll for coverage under the Storm Water Construction General Permit for the NPDES program. The Storm Water Construction General Permit requires the submittal of Permit Registration Documents to the SWRCB prior to the start of construction and a Notice of Intent (NOI), risk assessment, site map, annual fee, signed certification statement, SWPPP, and post-construction water balance calculations would be included in the submittal. A project-specific SWPPP would be prepared and BMPs would be implemented during construction. Typical BMPs would include: diversion of runoff from disturbed areas, protective measures for sensitive areas, temporary soil stabilization measures, storm water runoff quality control measures, concrete waste management, watering for dust control, and installation of perimeter silt fences, as needed. New</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>maintain the panels performance. Based on the fact that our Drinking well water is already on a list of concern by both Alameda County and Zone 7, and due to the recently identified 11 drinking water wells here in the Tri Valley, which were found to contain hazardous chemicals, a less than significant standard is not good enough. There should be no impact on our drinking well water.</p> <p>This is water that I drink my grandchildren drink and then is used for all other resources out here. This can be located somewhere else where it's not going to impact an already compromised groundwater. There's also a lot of talk about the scenic values when it comes to Aramis and looking at the Ridge lines, that's fine, but they're not looking at the scenic route element which was established in 1966, which talks about the views from the roadway and no visual barriers should be in in obstruct that in any way. Thank you. I know it's been a long day.</p>	<p>requirements by the SWRCB also require the SWPPP to include post-construction treatment measures aimed at minimizing stormwater runoff. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure HYD-1, which requires compliance with the Construction General Permit and preparation and implementation of a SWPPP and its BMPs, water quality impacts from stormwater runoff would be less than significant.</p> <p>As discussed in Section 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, the May School Subbasin has been identified as an area of concern by Zone 7 for high nitrate levels. The source of high nitrate levels at the Area of Concern has not been identified; however, it likely comes from agricultural land use in that area. Also, this unsewered area has a concentration of rural residences on Bel Roma Road that are served by OWTS (Zone 7 2015). In response to concerns that the proposed project would exacerbate existing groundwater conditions in the May School Subbasin, standard leaching tests of broken and end-of-life solar PV panels found that CdTe panels pass federal leaching criteria for non-hazardous waste. Additionally, because daily monitoring of the site would occur remotely and up to four permanent staff could be on the site at a time for ongoing facility maintenance, facility staff would immediately clean up and remove of any broken solar PV panels to further reduce any risk of contamination.</p> <p>The DEIR does analyze the May School Groundwater Basin and the proposed project's impacts in Section 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality. The May School Subbasin, which encompasses portions of the central section of the project site, has been identified as an Area of Concern by Zone 7 for nitrate levels above the Basin Objective of 45 mg/L (Zone 7 2015). There is currently only one Zone 7 monitoring well in this Area of Concern, and it had a nitrate concentration of 189 mg/L in 2013. The source of high nitrate levels at the Area of Concern has not been identified; however, it likely comes from agricultural land use in that area. Also, this unsewered area has a concentration of rural residences on Bel Roma Road that are served by OWTS (Zone 7 2015). Zone 7</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
				<p>stated in its Nutrient Management Plan that historical sources of the nitrate in the Livermore Valley Groundwater Basin are from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decaying vegetation (buried and surficial);</li> <li>• Municipal wastewater and sludge disposal;</li> <li>• OWTS (i.e., septic systems);</li> <li>• Concentrated animal boarding/ranching (horse boarding, chicken and/or cattle ranching); and</li> <li>• Applied fertilizers (crops and landscape).</li> </ul> <p>As discussed in Section 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, due to the project boundary's overlap with the May School Subbasin which has been identified as an Area of Concern for high nitrate levels by Zone 7, special On-site Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS) permit requirements have been developed for new OWTS applications received in Areas of Concern to reduce nitrogen loading (Zone 7 2015). The special permit provisions are designed to limit or reduce the amount of nitrogen loading from OWTS in the Areas of Concern over time by requiring parcels planned for new OWTS to meet a lower nitrogen loading standard than what exists for parcels located outside of the Areas of Concern. Approval of an OWTS permit from the County Department of Environmental Health for the septic system would require compliance with special requirements identified in the Nutrient Management Plan and reduce potential impacts on water quality standards, waste discharge, or degradation of surface or groundwater quality to a less than significant level.</p>
00:15:02	035	John Burke	<p>Hi. John Burke again. Obviously still opposed to both projects. Um, there are better places to put them. I mean, if solar is the magical, you know, fix all. That, apparently everybody seems to think that it might be. I mean now. Granted, I understand wanting to see what we can get with it or see what you can do with it, but this is this is the least.</p> <p>How do you put it? The least logical place to put it. If it wasn't upsetting all these people if it wasn't upsetting their lives if it wasn't upsetting the land, the agriculture, all the you know what could be?</p>	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issue with the analysis presented in the EIR. No further response is required.</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>Or what was or will be in the future?</p> <p>Um and yeah, everybody wants to have a job and that kind of stuff, but we're only talking about temporary jobs. We're talking about forever with this and, and to say that some company that might go belly up is gonna be there to fix it all. Really, I, I highly doubt it.</p> <p>Some of the stuff that they're putting out there sounds highly suspect, very unlikely. I just don't believe any of it. There, there. I mean, I get it. They have their bias and they want to. They want to make money and I think this is mostly money driven.</p> <p>And yeah, OK, maybe we do need solar. But let's, let's make it make sense where we've already got pavement. I mean, uh, I think it was LA. What is that? A Regional Park district and they put up their own solar on their own land over their own parking lot and they supply their own power.            What what's you know?</p> <p>It sounds like we're. It sounds like we're going for some magic, you know, sun is, you know, magic wheel in the Sky kind of thing with this whole plan. And I don't think it's gonna pan out. I don't think it's gonna do what you think it's gonna do and I don't think that's gonna happen. But thank you for your time. I do appreciate you listening. I know you've heard earful from everybody and I just wanted to let you know what my thought was.</p>	
00:17:12	036	Jason Galley	<p>Hi, can you hear me. Thank you very much and thanks for the opportunity to speak tonight. Hi, my name is Jason Galley. I am the president of the Ironworkers Local 378. On behalf of the iron workers Local 378, I am pleased to offer our full endorsement and support of the Aramis Renewable Energy Project.</p> <p>This project would be one of Northern California's, Northern California's largest projects, create nearly 400 union jobs,</p>	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issue with the analysis presented in the EIR. No further response is required.</p>

**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>power 25,000 barrier residents and businesses each year. Also, to offset 200,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide and gen, and generate economic opportunity for all our East Bay members.</p> <p>Local job creation is an enormously important benefit of procuring large scale, renewable energy. The Aramis Project and its developer, Intersect Power, have demonstrated their commitment to ensuring local labor will benefit from the project by entering into a labor agreement, ensuring 100% local union labor with five local trades.</p> <p>The five construction crafts represent thousands of members living in Alameda County who will benefit from local employment, reduce commute time, and utility scale solar construction experience. Iron Workers Local 378 is pleased to be a partner in this project. Many of our local members are second and third generation craftspeople are hardworking local men and women and their families will benefit from major projects being located close to home. Rather than commuting several hours to and from work, the local the local Aramis project will provide an opportunity for its members to work locally, provide a dramatic increase in other quality of life in a higher in a lighter carbon footprint. Ironworkers Local 378 endorsed the Aramis Renewable Project and we urge everyone to support this local resource without delay for the benefit of the community. Thank you.</p>	
00:19:21	037	Francesca O'Brien	<p>Thank you very much. I appreciate the two minutes. My name is Francesco O'Brien. I'm a Livermore Valley resident. I opposed the Aramis project as someone who lives on a North Livermore Valley property would solar. I can tell you that the people who have solar here are still subject to these power outages. That doesn't make a difference.</p> <p>Mr. Imhof I appreciate your response to the Valley fever concern and I wanted to let you know that there are maps and testing information available on the CDC website. I'd like to post three questions to you. How are the diminishing an possible extinction of flora and fauna of this area going to be</p>	<p>The text of EIR Section 4.3 Air Quality was amended to address concerns regarding Valley fever. In sum, background information about the disease was provided, the risk at the project site was discussed, and worker safety measures were proposed. The site is not in an area that would require Valley fever safety training for workers and supervisors in accordance with AB 203, but the applicant has agreed to provide such training anyway out of an abundance of caution. Existing measures in place to control fugitive dust and sedimentation would also reduce the risk of Valley fever.</p>



**Appendix B**  
**Response to Comments from October 22, 2020 Public Hearing**

Time	Comment #	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>valued in the bond in my comment. On the prior agenda item, I listed endangered and threatened species dependent on the Livermore Valley for survival.</p> <p>They depend on the project protection that only you can provide. The biodiversity loss for California will be incalculable with the recurring wildfires. We do not need to add stress to their remaining habitats.</p> <p>How is the released carbon that has been sequestered by these grasslands going to be measured and valued in the bond? Forest fires release carbon dioxide stored in trees back into the atmosphere. But grasslands store carbon dioxide underground, making it more valuable and for removing carbon from the atmosphere, they're going to have to grade this land, which will release stored carbon.</p> <p>These are assets that cannot be returned to (?) by the (?). I want to point out that a lot of people in support of this are members of local unions. And it should raise some eyebrows that the people with the potential monetary gain are the ones that represent the primary support for this project. Moreover, how does the development of solar energy on urban sites not also provide jobs for these union proponents at these solar projects?</p> <p>Finally, I invite you to review the Aramis project promotional video on YouTube in which they disingenuously replied to a comment in the question, question in the comments quote. We do not show transmission lines because one of the many cool things about this project is that no transmission lines are required since the project will connect to the grid directly on the site at the PG&amp;E substation, which is in direct opposition to their Draft EIR. Thank you so much.</p>	<p>An analysis of carbon sequestration is not required under CEQA and is not addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>For more information about the effects of the proposed project on local wildlife, please see Section 4.4 Biological Resources. For more information about fire risk, please see Section 4.18 Wildfire.</p>

This page intentionally left blank