

## **Response to Comment Letter I113**

**Mary Hicklin**

- I113-1** The commenter states her firm opposition to the JVR Energy Park Project. The commenter also states “Park” is “deceptive name for something so dreadful.” 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.
- I113-2** The commenter states she is from San Diego and did major and graduate work in biology and systems ecology. The commenter also states as an avid back country hiker, she “watched in horror as the dangerous Sunrise Powerlink towers marched across our precious, fragile desert.” The commenter further states if the money had been invested in helping homeowners install rooftop solar, solar on public buildings, and developing small local energy storage projects, our energy needs could have been met without destroying our fragile desert. In response, the comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I113-3** The commenter then describes the Ocotillo wind farm’s negative impacts including noise, blinking lights, endangered species habitat destruction, impacts on local hydrology, impacts to Native American burials and sacred sites. In response, the comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I113-4** The commenter states the Proposed Project would destroy the small town of Jacumba, and such projects continue to devastate open space in East County, ruining the area for locals and visitors. The commenter states that the residents of Jacumba oppose the Project and provides a link to East County Magazine outlining objections of residents. In response, the comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR and therefore no further response is required. Please refer to Response to Comment I113-5, which discusses the objections referenced in the East County Magazine article linked in the comment. Further, please refer to Global Response GR-1 Socioeconomic Impacts and Environmental Justice in the Final EIR, which discusses socioeconomic considerations and CEQA.
- I113-5** The commenter states this Project will cause the following impacts: depletion of already diminishing water resources; property values decreasing; temperature increases known as heat island effect; noise; increased fire hazards; loss of natural spaces and rural characters; impact on local wildlife and plants which includes scenic

## Volume II – Individual Responses to Comments

---

aspect; impacts to Old Highway 80 (Historic U.S. Route 80); no employment benefits to locals; jeopardizes current reliance on tourism and peaceful rural atmosphere. In response, the Draft EIR analyzes the topics raised by the commenter as follows: potential impacts to groundwater resources in Section 2.7 Hydrology and Water Quality; potential noise impacts in Section 2.9 Noise; potential wildfire impacts in Section 2.12 Wildfire; potential impacts to biological resources in Section 2.3 Biological Resources; and potential aesthetic impacts in Section 2.1 Aesthetics. Further, regarding impacts to tourism and employment, please refer to Global Response GR-1 Socioeconomic Impacts and Environmental Justice in the Final EIR. Regarding potential temperature increases from solar panels, please refer to Global Response GR-2 Photovoltaic Heat Island Effects in the Final EIR.

- I113-6** The commenter states that the Proposed Project is yet another destructive project that will not benefit people or the environment, only big corporations. The commenter also states that there are other ways to better meet energy needs, not at the expense of the local desert environment and small town of Jacumba. The commenter states please do not approve 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 and therefore no further response is required.