

Response to Comment Letter I125

Randy Hoyland

- I125-1** The commenter asks who thought to put solar panels on our mountain when it is clear that solar panels would work on the land just 20-30 miles east of Jacumba. The commenter further states that this area is desert and miles of solar panels could be put there instead of acres of panels without disrupting the community and natural wildlife trails that have thus far been protected from any development. 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, Section 2.4.2 of Chapter 4, Project Alternatives, of the Draft EIR discusses alternative locations for the Project that were considered but rejected. The Draft EIR rejected the Alternative Locations Alternative because there “are no other known readily available parcels of undeveloped land of similar size in the eastern portion of the County that could accommodate development of the Proposed Project that have not already been considered and rejected for development of a similar solar project, provide adequate site accessibility, and/or could be acquired by the Applicant within a reasonable period of time.” Also, please see Global Response GR-6 Alternatives in the Final EIR.
- I125-2** The commenter states that the building and installation of proposed solar panels would be against everything that keeps the wildlife trails safe for wildlife such as big horn sheep and wild horses. In response, Section 2.3, Biological Resources of the Draft EIR analyzes the Proposed Project’s impacts to wildlife and habitat. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce the potential impacts to biological resources to less than significant.
- I125-3** The commenter states that a new port of entry is being proposed at the end of Jacumba Airport that will move all truck traffic from Tecate along Highway 94. The commenter states that he used to work for Jacumba Towing and there have been countless lives lost due to truck traffic on Highway 94. The commenter states that it would be a good thing to put a port of entry the Jacumba Airport so that trucks would have easy access to the interstate and that truck traffic on Old Highway 80 causes damage to the road. The commenter also states that noise of the trucks is loud and sometimes run 6 to 7 days a week. 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 3.1.7 Transportation, which analyzes potential transportation impacts that may be caused by development of the Proposed Project. In regard to the port of entry, please refer to Response to Comment 07-165.

Volume II – Individual Responses to Comments

- I125-4** The commenter states that the construction of the Port of Entry would bring more steady, long term jobs instead of the short-term jobs created by the construction of solar panels that will end after the installation is complete. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I125-5** The commenter states that the port of entry will generate the growth of the community and that the farmland will be needed for homes and schools to handle this growth while maintaining the same standard of life that they have now and should be able to keep for the future. 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, which discusses socioeconomic impacts and environmental justice issues. In regard to the port of entry, please refer to Response to Comment 07-165.
- I125-6** The commenter states that the solar panels should be moved east of Jacumba from Ocotillo east through the wasteland. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I125-7** The commenter states that he has lived in Jacumba for more than 25 years and provides his name, address and phone number. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.