

Comment Letter I12

EVELYN SEPIN
 P. O. Box 26
 Jacumba, CA 91934
 Telephone: 619/994-0928

June 1, 2015

[via email to ashley.gungle@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:ashley.gungle@sdcounty.ca.gov)

Ms. Ashley Gungle, Project Manager
 Department of Planning and Development Services
 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
 5500 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
 San Diego, CA 92122

RE: Comments on Draft EIR – Jacumba Solar Major Use Permits PDS 2014-
 MUP-14-041 and PDSS2014-ER-22-001

Dear Ms. Gungle:

I wish to have you consider the comments in this letter regarding the Draft EIR recently distributed for the above-referenced project permits.

I am a native San Diegan and have lived in the East County mountain area for many years. I have been active in water issues in the southern part of California for the last twenty (20) years. As a result, I am familiar with many of those involved in renewable energy, the studies they have provided to local agencies in support of their endeavors, and the numerous instances of inadequate facts offered in support of those projects. At the same time, I am also aware of the warnings given by Professor Victor Miguel Ponce, Dr. David Huntley, and the County's Groundwater Geologist, Jim Bennett, regarding projects that would affect our groundwater and its residential usage.

Just last week, the hydrologist from Dudek, Trey Driscoll, advised the Jacumba Service District Board of Directors that monitoring the District wells, in addition to wells on an adjacent agricultural site and the Border Patrol facility, confirmed recharges were taking place. A closer read of the graphs and map from Mr. Driscoll shows that six wells were monitored between the years of 2007 and 2012 and only two wells were said to be monitored as late as 2014. However, there was no data on those two wells prior to 2014. When asked, Mr. Driscoll admitted no domestic wells on private property had been monitored. Hardly an up-to-date study of the area's groundwater.

I12-1

I12-2

Response to Comment Letter I12

Evelyn Sepin
 June 1, 2015

I12-1 The County acknowledges receipt of Evelyn Sepin's input and appreciates the comments regarding the potential impacts associated with implementation of the project. The County acknowledges this comment; however it does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, therefore no further response is required.

I12-2 The County acknowledges this comment; however it does not address the adequacy of the DEIR. To clarify, Dudek presented water level data at the JCSD Board Meeting for select wells monitored on Jacumba Valley Ranch that indicate water levels have recovered since the cessation of pumping by Bornt Farms and the fallowing of the agricultural lands. Water levels for several of the Jacumba Valley Ranch wells were monitored the day of the JCSD Board Meeting on May 26, 2015 and the handouts provided during the meeting only presented historical data. Dudek also presented groundwater production data obtained from Bornt Farms' hydrogeologist that indicates pumping in excess of 18,000 acre-feet from the Jacumba Valley Alluvial Aquifer from 2006 to 2012. For comparison, the construction water demand for the Proposed Project is 59 acre-feet. Domestic wells

Ms. Ashley Gungle, Project Manager
Department of Planning and Development Services
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
June 1, 2015
Page Two

The many conversations I have had with local residents with private wells revealed that all have experienced a drop in the water level of their wells. With the District approving sale of non-potable water at the rate of 100,000 gallons per day for at least six months, I can only speculate how adversely that will affect all residents in this area.

In the interest of time and redundancy, I wish to confirm my support of the comment letters of Howard Cook, Danielle Cook and Boulevard Planning Group. Conversely, I do NOT support the Jacumba Solar Major Use Permits.

Yours truly,



Evelyn Sepin

ERS.ms

I12-3

I12-3

within 0.5-mile of the JCSD Wells that may supply the project are eligible to be included in the groundwater monitoring program.

The County acknowledges this comment; however it does not address the adequacy of the DEIR, therefore no further response is required.