

**Response to Comment Letter I100**

**Dan Lehman**

- I100-1** The commenter states he is writing to give personal feelings and opinions on this Project and that he has several concerns. In response, this is an introductory comment to comments that follow. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I100-2** The commenter states the project is an eye sore and would create significant visual problem for the area, taking away from mountain views. The commenter also states it would take away from hiking areas and mountain climbing. In response, please refer to Section 2.1, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, which analyzes the Proposed Project’s potential impacts to aesthetic and visual resources. As stated in the Draft EIR the Proposed Project would result in potential significant impacts to visual character and panoramic or focal vistas. Mitigation measures would reduce these visual impacts; however, they would remain significant and unavoidable.
- I100-3** The commenter states the batteries along with the chemicals that would be used to clean and maintain the array would send fumes and smells into the town, not to mention respiratory issues. In response, please refer to Section 2.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials which analyzes the Proposed Project’s potential hazardous materials impacts. The analysis determine that the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact with respect to hazardous materials. Further, Section 2.2, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, analyzes the Proposed Project’s potential impacts to air quality, and concludes the Proposed Project will have a less than significant impact with respect to toxic air contaminants, objectionable odors, and carbon monoxide hotspots. The comment does not provide any specific evidence of “fumes and smells” emanating from the Proposed Project that would impact the community of Jacumba Hot Springs; therefore, no further response can be provided.
- I100-4** The commenter states this would create a huge amount of extra water usage to build and maintain the Project for 38 years. The commenter also states that the in this area they do not have City water supplies to provide water, that they must rely upon groundwater, and that groundwater is not an unlimited supply. The commenter further states this would seriously impact the amount of ground water that those who live in Jacumba need. The commenter further states that water bills have gone up and the Project would likely raise them even more. In response, the Draft EIR analyzed the Proposed Project’s impacts on groundwater, during construction, operation and

## Volume II – Individual Responses to Comments

---

- decommissioning. A Groundwater Investigation Report was prepared for the Proposed Project and is included as Appendix J to the Draft EIR. A Groundwater Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (GMMP) is included as a Project Design Feature (**PDF-HYD-2**), as discussed in Section 2.7 Hydrology and Water Quality of the Draft EIR. The GMMP details thresholds for off-site well interference and ensures that groundwater pumping for the Proposed Project does not significantly impact existing well users and groundwater dependent habitat. Therefore, the Draft EIR found that the impacts of the Proposed Project to groundwater would be less than significant.
- I100-5** The commenter states that the community has been dealing with the construction of the border fence and associated construction semi-trucks which create dust and noise that effect the community. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no response is required. However, please refer to Section 2.2 Air Quality and Section 3.1.7 Transportation, which discuss air quality and traffic impacts as they relate to the Proposed Project.
- I100-6** The commenter describes the town of Jacumba and the surrounding area as a natural mountainous area that provides hiking, history and a quiet small-town atmosphere. The commenter states that in recent years the area has been plagued with development, electrical towers, the sub-station, and similar renewable projects. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no response is required. However, please refer to Global Response GR-1 Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice in the Final EIR, which discusses the relationship between socioeconomic considerations and CEQA.
- I100-7** The commenter states that the Proposed Project would kill the town and surrounding environments, and that the residents of the town are the ones who will suffer from the negative impacts of the Proposed Project. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no response is required. However, please refer to Global Response GR-1 Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice in the Final EIR.
- I100-8** The commenter states that other solar fields have been built in the desert in uninhabited areas, and this Proposed Project should similarly be sited in such an area as well, away from existing residents. The commenter also states that the Project location is currently zoned as agricultural land, and although it is not currently used for agricultural purposes, someone may want to use it as farmland in the future. The commenter concludes with a statement of appreciation for allowing him to comment on the Proposed Project. In response, regarding the comment that the Proposed Project should be sited at another location, please refer to Chapter 4, Project

## **Volume II – Individual Responses to Comments**

---

Alternatives, which discusses alternative locations for the Project, and a No Project Alternative. Further, the Proposed Project would not preclude the use of the site for agricultural purposes after decommissioning of the Project.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK