

Response to Comment Letter I134

Tammy Daubach

- I134-1** The commenter states that Jacumba has been “placed on the back burner with I-8 coming through, depleting their tourist draw.” The commenter also states new owners have purchased the spa and stores in town, planning on revitalizing the area. The commenter further states placing solar panels on both sides of Old Highway 80 will “probably reduce the future opportunities in this town.” In response, please refer to Global Response GR-1 Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice, which discusses the relationship between socioeconomic considerations and CEQA. The comment does not raise concerns related to the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I134-2** The commenter states that more permanent jobs could be created for locals with revitalization of the town. The commenter further states the solar project would offer only a few, mostly temporary work opportunities. In response, please refer to Global Response GR-1 Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice, which discusses the relationship between socioeconomic considerations and CEQA. The comment does not raise concerns related to the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I134-3** The commenter states that the “prison like look” of the Project will “deface the historic highway and views” and “likely reduce tourism.” In response, Section 2.1 Aesthetics of the Draft EIR analyzes the visual impacts of the Proposed Project. The Draft EIR identifies mitigation measures **M-AE-1 through M-AE-6** to reduce impacts; however, impacts to existing visual character and/or quality, valued visual character of community, views from Old Highway 80, and from other scenic vistas would remain significant and unavoidable. Subsequent to public review of the Draft EIR, the Proposed Project has been revised to include increased setbacks along the north and south sides of Old Highway 80. Please refer to Section 1.2 Project Description of Chapter 1 in the Final EIR for a discussion of the Proposed Project changes. Although the increased setbacks would reduce visual impacts, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. In regard to tourism, please refer to Global Response GR-1 Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice, which discusses the relationship between socioeconomic considerations and CEQA.
- I134-4** The commenter states that if this Project does go through, mitigation for the Project should be for “the lifetime of the project and [be] based on the kilowatt hours produced by the solar.” In response, mitigation measures included in the EIR are

Volume II – Individual Responses to Comments

intended to reduce the potential significant impacts caused by the Proposed Project in accordance with CEQA. Please refer to Chapter 5, Mitigation Measures, in the Final EIR which identifies the mitigation measures to be implemented during construction, operations, and decommissioning of the Proposed Project.