

## Response to Comment Letter I101

Janet Miner

- I101-1** The commenter states that she does not want solar panels because the groundwater would be poisoned and that would be the worst thing for Jacumba. In response, please refer to Section 2.7 Hydrology and Water Quality of the Draft EIR which analyzes the Proposed Project’s potential impacts to surface and groundwater quality. As discussed in Section 2.7.3.3, the Proposed Project would be required to submit and implement a Project-specific Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) during construction and a Standard Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) for operations and maintenance activities. The Proposed Project would comply with all federal, state, and local laws addressing water quality and in stormwater and non-stormwater discharges. Impacts would be less than significant.
- I101-2** The commenter states that the pesticides associated with the Proposed Project would blow in the wind. In response, the Proposed Project will not include pesticide use. Mitigation measure **M-BIO-8** (prevention of chemical pollutants) in the Final EIR has been revised to clarify no pesticides shall be allowed.
- I101-3** The commenter asks why this Proposed Project could not be put in the Imperial Valley. 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 Chapter 4, Project Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, which discusses alternative locations for the Project. Please also refer to Global Response GR-6 Alternatives in the Final EIR. Further, note that the County does not have jurisdiction within Imperial Valley.
- I101-4** The commenter states that too many trucks would destroy the peace and roads would cause noise pollution while the people like their peace. In response, Section 2.9 Noise of the Draft EIR analyzes the Proposed Project’s noise impacts. The analysis did not identify significant noise impacts from trucks on roads. Please also refer to Section 3.1.7 Transportation of the Draft EIR which analyzes the Proposed Project’s transportation impacts. Project Design Features are incorporated into the Proposed Project which require preparation of a Traffic Control Plan (**PDF-TR-1**), a Construction Notification Plan (**PDF-TR-2**) and notification of property owners (**PDF-TR-3**).
- I101-5** The commenter states that this is agricultural land and asks why is the land not being preserved for agriculture. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no response is

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

---

- required. However, please refer to Section 3.1.1, Agricultural Resources which analyzes the Proposed Project’s impacts to agricultural resources. Please also refer to Section 3.1.4 Land Use and Planning which analyzes the Proposed Project’s consistency with applicable plans and policies. Impacts were determined to be less than significant.
- I101-6** The commenter states that the people want more of our town as a scenic highway. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no response is required.
- I101-7** The commenter states that the solar panels will block the view residents have of the Jacumba Airport and the glider planes. In response, please refer to Section 2.1, Aesthetics, which analyzes the Proposed Project’s potential impacts to aesthetic and visual resources, including views from the Jacumba community.
- I101-8** The commenter states that the people do not want a chain link fence in our town that changes the trails. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I101-9** The commenter states that the people want their old dairy and do not want the buildings to be torn down. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I101-10** The commenter asks if the temperature in the area will rise. The commenter states that the people do not want the temperature to rise. In response, please refer to Global Response GR-2 Photovoltaic Heat Island Effects in the Final EIR.
- I101-12** The commenter states that the people want a bigger buffer on the east side and the south side of the project site. In response, subsequent to public review of the Draft EIR, the Proposed Project has been revised to include increased setbacks along Old Highway 80 and adjacent to Jacumba Community Park. Please refer to Section 1.2 Project Description in Chapter 1 of the Final EIR.
- I101-13** The commenter states the people want their school to open and need more houses and people not an industrial park. In response, the County acknowledges the commenter’s opposition to the Proposed Project. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.