From: <u>Cherry Diefenbach</u>
To: <u>Koutoufidis, Nicholas</u>

Cc: <u>Jeffrey Osborne</u>; <u>GREG CURRAN</u>; <u>jacari cousins</u>; <u>Anderson</u>, <u>Joel</u>

Subject: JVR Solar project

Date: Thursday, March 18, 2021 2:45:56 PM

Attachments: draft minutes of Mar 16, 2021 Jacumba Sponsor Group mtq.docx

Hi Nick,

Due to a lack of a quorum, the Jacumba Sponsor Group (JCSG) had previously been unable to provide comments on the original JVR Solar project and alternatives laid out in the DEIR before the end of the comment period. With the recent seating of our new members, the JCSG unanimously approved a much reduced JVR project footprint at our March 16, 2021 meeting. (See attached draft meeting minutes.)

The applicant's massive JVR solar project provides no economic or quality of life benefits to Jacumba while destroying what remains of the area's agricultural and scenic qualities. Residents of Jacumba Hot Springs would support a 200-acre, no switchyard solar facility, located at the northern end of the project area—one that would restrict the placement of solar arrays south of scenic Highway 80, and one that would also require 1,500 foot setbacks from all private residences and public roads. We also request that power generated from the JVR solar facility would be sent from the JVR collector substation to the nearby SDG&E's ECO substation via underground transmission lines.

Residents of Jacumba Hot Springs are not opposed to green energy generation. We supported the placement of the 20MW Jacumba Solar facility on 108-acres east of Airport Mesa. Nor did we object to the construction of the nearby 58-acre SDG&E ECO Substation. However, we believe that allowing the JVR Solar Park to consume the best available land adjacent to our village core would be a huge impediment to any future growth of our community, and it would also set a disastrous land use precedent for our county. Jacumba Valley Ranch lands could be better used to support a mixture of land uses such as residences (small ranches), agricultural enterprises (perhaps a large drive-through nursery), or recreational activities (an off-road park or?). Eliminating solar panels south of scenic Highway 80 would ensure the continued safety of glider/small aircraft operations at the Jacumba Airport. It would also reduce visual and noise impacts to the SFR located near the airport. Finally, it would reserve land that might someday be used to support an international border crossing—a land use that would provide a real economic benefit to the community.

We hope the JVR project applicant will consider the adoption of a much smaller scale northern project footprint as they revise their project map. That option would still permit the generation of green energy without forever destroying Jacumba's community character and the scenic vistas currently enjoyed by residents of our small disadvantaged rural village.

Cherry Diefenbach JCSG Chair 619-743-5224