

Response to Comment Letter I107

Gabrielle Schultz

- I107-1** The commenter she is one of the family member at the Desert View Tower, a historic landmark that is part of the scenic historical Highway 80. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I107-2** The commenter states the people are against the proposed project because of land preservation for wildlife and the desert. 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 2.3 Biological Resources of the Draft EIR which analyzes the Proposed Project’s potential impacts to biological resources, including vegetation communities and wildlife. With implementation of mitigation measures, all impacts to biological resources would be reduced to less than significant.
- I107-3** The commenter states that the people are against the project to protect the water that is beneficial for healing, high in minerals and sacred. 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 2.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR, which analyzes the Proposed Project’s potential impacts to surface and groundwater resources.
- I107-4** The commenter states the people are against the proposed project to protect the landscape in its original state. 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 2.1, Aesthetics, which analyzes Proposed Project’s potential significant impacts to aesthetic and visual resources. Although mitigation measures would reduce the Proposed Project’s impacts to visual community character and scenic vistas, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
- I107-5** The commenter states the people are against the proposed project to protect the community from destruction in all means in terms of health, living quality and sleep deficiency. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I107-6** The commenter states the people are against the Proposed Project because of loss of tourism in the scenic town of Jacumba. The comment does not raise an issue

Volume II – Individual Responses to Comments

- 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, which discusses the relationship between socioeconomic considerations and CEQA.
- I107-7** The commenter states the people are against the Proposed Project because of less tourism at the Desert View Tower. 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.
- I107-8** The commenter states the people are against the proposed project because of the electro-magnetic field effecting the quality of living. 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-4 Electromagnetic Field Impacts in the Final EIR.
- I107-9** The commenter states the people are against the proposed project because the town of Jacumba needs more houses, more business and care for the community. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I107-10** The commenter states that all from the Desert View Tower support the town and are against the solar 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.