

Response to Comment Letter I136

Mark and Lori Summers

- I136-1** The comment is an introductory comment about the commenter, and notes that the commenters recently bought their first home on the far east end of historic Jacumba Hot Springs, closest end to the proposed location of the Proposed Project. The comment does not raise concerns related to the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I136-2** The commenters state they are “in shock” that this type of production plant is being considered so close to our populated town, the Jacumba airport where gliders are flown, the local businesses, busy Interstate 8, and the truck stop. In response to the Proposed Project’s permit application, please see Response to Comment I135-17 and I135-18. In regard to Jacumba Airport and glider use, please refer to Global Response GR-5 Airport Impacts. Please also refer to Global Response GR-1 Socioeconomic Impacts and Environmental Justice in the Final EIR regarding CEQA and socioeconomic impacts. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I136-3** The commenter states that the particulate matter alone from Interstate 8 and truck stop blowing over the massive amount of 300,000 solar panels “into our small town proposes a tremendous negative health impact on our community and the land this production plant would consume.” In response, Section 2.2 Air Quality of the Draft EIR analyzes the potential impacts to air quality from the Proposed Project. With implementation of mitigation measures **M-AQ-1** and **M-AQ-2**, potential air quality impacts would be reduced to less than significant.
- I136-4** The commenter states that the Project’s massive 90 megawatt storage facility will cause toxins to leach into our groundwater. In response, the Proposed Project proposes to use steel containers (customized Conex or similar, depending on supplier) to hold Lithium-ion batteries to protect against such leakage. (Section 1.2 Project Description in Chapter 1 of the EIR). The containers are typically made from 12 to 14-gauge steel and measure approximately 55-feet-long, 19-feet-wide, and 10-feet-high. Each container would be separated from adjacent containers by approximately 10 feet. Additionally, as discussed in Section 2.6.4.3 of Section 2.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR, existing environmental conditions (i.e., local depth to groundwater greater than 40 feet below ground surface), and strict adherence to federal, state, and local regulatory requirements for asbestos and lead-based paint abatement make potential groundwater contamination hazards less than significant.

Volume II – Individual Responses to Comments

- I136-5** The commenter states that the Jacumba community is quiet, serene, and calm and love the desert, “particularly the Mountain Empire’s clean air that is being threatened by this pollutant producing monstrosity.” In response, Section 2.2, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR analyzes the Proposed Project’s potential impacts to air quality. The Draft EIR determined that the Project would result in potentially significant air quality impacts during construction and decommissioning of the Project. Implementation of mitigation measures **M-AQ-1** and **M-AQ-2** would reduce these impacts to less than significant.
- I136-6** The commenter states that the sulfur dioxide produced from the solar panels and the sun when it binds with a host of particulates will cause damage that ranges from health issues from particulate matter inhaled. The commenter also states that the tainted particulate would cause corrosion of steel when it binds to steel on nearby power poles and power lines. In response, as discussed in Draft EIR, Section 2.2, Air Quality, the emission of sulfur oxides during construction, operation and decommissioning would not exceed thresholds of significance. The thresholds developed and used within the Draft EIR are protective of public health as described in Section 4.2 of the Draft EIR. In addition, the commenters provide no evidence to support their claim that Project emissions would corrode steel on power poles or power lines.
- I136-7** The commenter states that the Project will result in damage to health and steel energy lines as a result of the sulfur oxide particulate emissions. Please refer to Response to Comment I136-6.
- I136-8** The commenter states that some people will be “effected subconsciously” by the humming of this massive energy production plant. In response, the Proposed Project’s potential noise impacts during operation are analyzed in Section 2.9, Noise, of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR identified potentially significant noise impacts resulting from construction activity, PV panel washing equipment and stationary noise sources. Implementation of mitigation measures **M-NOI-1**, **M-NOI-2** and **M-NOI-3** would reduce these impacts to less than significant.
- I136-9** The commenter states that “the footprint of destruction is a massive 643 acres” and that this will be massive next to our historic small town. This comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I136-10** The commenter asks the County not to not allow this massive energy production plan to “destroy the small amount of clean mountain air we have left” to this air pollution producing, toxic leaching production plant that will produce little benefits for energy compared to the massive destructive impact it will have on the community. In

Volume II – Individual Responses to Comments

response, this comment is intended as a conclusion and restates concerns made in comments I136-2 through I136-9. Please refer to Responses to Comments I136-2 through I136-9.

- I136-11** The commenter asks the County to please support clean air, clean water, and serenity of Jacumba and deny the permit for the energy production plant. In response, the County acknowledges the commenter’s opposition to the Proposed Project. The comment does not raise concerns related to the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK