

Response to Comment Letter I102

Sarah Misquez

- I102-1** The commenter states she is a resident of Jacumba Hot Springs resident who opposes the Proposed Project. 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.
- I102-2** The commenter states the Proposed Project will negatively impact the community in a multitude of ways. The commenter also states the Proposed Project would create dirty electricity that ultimately radiates EMF radiation into the home. In response, please refer to Global Response GR-4 in the Final EIR, which discusses electromagnetic frequency and stray current (EMF).
- I102-3** The commenter states the Proposed Project will substantially change the natural environment and wetlands for both people and species. In response, Section 2.3 Biological Resources of the Draft EIR includes an analyzes of the Proposed Project’s impacts to biological resources. The Proposed Project avoids direct impacts to wetlands.
- I102-4** The commenter states that implementation of the Proposed Project would result in diminished property values which has already begun due to properties in the area being sold and bought for storage purposes. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further 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.
- I102-5** The commenter states that implementation of the Proposed Project would result in localized warming, and that it is typically 2-3 degrees warmer near a solar farm. In response, please refer to Global Response GR-2 Photovoltaic Heat Island Effects in the Final EIR.
- I102-6** The commenter states that there can be fires started by the solar farm when there is a malfunction, and considering the Project is proposed 0.25-acre to homes in the community the location of the Proposed Project is unacceptable. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required. However, please refer to Section 2.12 Wildfire of the EIR.

Volume II – Individual Responses to Comments

- I102-7** The commenter states that at certain times there will be a glare off of the panels that is harsh on the eyes, and although fencing is proposed around the panels they would be close enough to the tops of the fences for nearby residents to see the glare from their windows. In response, a Glare Study was prepared for the Proposed Project and is included as Appendix A to the Visual Resources Report (Appendix B) in the Final EIR. The glare analysis analyzed potential glare impacts, including to residences in Jacumba Hot Springs, and determined that the impacts would be less than significant.
- I102-8** The commenter states she is not opposed to a smaller version of the Project that allows the community to have a natural rural breathing space that they moved there for. The commenter also states that much larger buffer zones are needed, 0.5 to 1 acre, to shield the community and preserve the rural aesthetic, and help with watershed/wetlands/habitat issues. The commenter also states that better/updated County fire prevention guidelines could help in regard to comment I102-6. In response, subsequent to public review of the Draft EIR, the Proposed Project was revised to include increased setbacks from Old Highway 80 and Jacumba Community Parks. Please refer to Section 1.2 Project Description of Chapter 1 in the Final EIR. Also, Chapter 4 Project Alternatives of the Final EIR includes an analysis of alternatives to the Project, including the Community Buffer Alternative. This alternative was also revised in the Final EIR to include increased setbacks.