

Response to Comment Letter I109

Kathryn Graze

- I109-1** The commenter states she is a resident of Jacumba and that the land proposed for the Project site was formerly an organic farm that served as a greenbelt for the community. The commenter also states that even while the land was a farm, wildlife had free access to the area. The commenter further states that she has seen mule deer jump 20 feet and evidence of mountain lions. The commenter notes that recently mustangs with young came over from Mexico despite the border fence. The commenter expresses concern that expert advice does not cover the environmental setting experienced by the community. In response, Section 2.3 Biological Resources, of the EIR analyzes the Proposed Project’s impacts to wildlife species and wildlife movement. Potential significant impacts to wildlife species and their habitat, and wildlife movement, would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. Please also refer to Global Response GR-3 Biological Resources in the Final EIR.
- I109-2** The commenter states that she has seen one of the windmills blown over in half and that the community can get even stronger winds. The commenter also states that the northwestern portion of the Project site is often marshy in texture and has been subject to historical floods. In response, the Proposed Project does not propose any wind turbines, and high winds are not anticipated to affect the proposed solar panels. Section 2.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the EIR analyzes potential flood hazards.
- I109-3** The commenter states that in addition to harming wildlife by blocking their corridors, those corridors move to the more accessible town of Jacumba causing property, personal and wildlife harm. In response, Section 2.3 Biological Resources of the EIR analyzes the Proposed Project’s impacts to wildlife corridors and migratory routes. Potential significant impacts would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. Please also refer to Global Response GR-3 Biological Resources in the Final EIR.
- I109-4** The commenter states that in Tucson they are growing crops under solar panels but it is already a desert environment, unlike the proposed location of the Project. The commenter states that she is in favor of solar power but the proposed location is not the right space and opposes the Proposed Project as proposed. 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 Chapter 4,

Volume II – Individual Responses to Comments

Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, which considers but rejects alternative locations for the Project.