

Response to Comment Letter I112

Various Individuals – Petition Signatures

- I112-1** The comment is the envelope addressed to the County and states “Important Signatures.” The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I112-2** The comment states, “We, the undersigned, oppose the 90MW Jacumba Valley Ranch (JVR) Energy Park.” In response, the County acknowledges the commenters (signatures to petition) 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.
- I112-3** The comment states this industrial-sized project seeks to put 300,000 photovoltaic cells on 643 acres immediately adjacent to Jacumba residences, the senior center and community park, the Jacumba airport, and along both sides of Old 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.
- I112-4** The comment states, “If approved, the project will destroy scenic vistas, lower our property values, displace wildlife, and introduce mechanical noise into our quiet, rural landscape.” In response, Section 2.1 Aesthetics of the Draft EIR analyzes the Proposed Project’s impacts on panoramic or focal vistas. The Draft EIR states that due to the wide distribution of solar panels within the 643-acre facility, the Proposed Project would substantially reduce the quality of existing views toward the solar facility from I-8, Old Highway 80, Jacumba Community Park, Anza-Borrego Desert State Park, and Bureau of Land Management lands (**Impacts AE-1 through AE-9**). Implementation of mitigation measures (**M-AE-1 through M-AE-6**) would reduce the visual impacts, but not to a level of less than significant. The impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires the decision making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits of a proposed project against its significant and unavoidable impacts when determining whether to approve the project. When a lead agency approves a project, the agency must state in writing the specific reasons to support its action; this statement is referred to a “Statement of Overriding Considerations.” Under CEQA, the County must make a Statement of Overriding Considerations” to approve the Proposed Project. In regard to property values, CEQA requires analysis of physical changes to the environment. Please refer to Global Response GR-1 for a discussion of CEQA and socio-economic

Volume II – Individual Responses to Comments

- impacts. Section 2.3 Biological Resources of the Draft EIR analyzes the Proposed Project’s potential impacts to wildlife, including impacts to wildlife habitat. Section 2.9 Noise of the Draft EIR analyzes the Proposed Project’s noise impacts, including potential impacts during construction and operation. Potentially significant impacts to wildlife and noise impacts would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures, as described in the Draft EIR.
- I112-5** The comment states, “More importantly, the JVR solar park squanders Jacumba’s ability to expand by consuming the best available land for at least the next 38 years.” The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I112-6** The comment refers to a visual simulation of the Proposed Project, which is included in the comment letter. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I112-7** The comment states, “As a resident of Jacumba, I want our elected leaders to vote for the No Project Alternative” of the Draft EIR. The comment also states please help save our town. In response, the County acknowledges the commenters opposition to the Proposed Project and their support for the “No Project Alternative.”
- I112-8** The comment includes six signatures. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.