

Response to Comment Letter I20

Alex Lievanos

- I20-1** The comment states the commenter is a resident of Jacumba and is against the industrial-size JVR Energy Park that would place 300,000 photovoltaic cells and 75 battery storage containers, and additional electrical infrastructure on 643 acres of the best agricultural or residential land in Jacumba. 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.
- I20-2** The comment states this “project as described in the DEIR is bad for our rural property values and community identity.” In response to the comment regarding property values, CEQA requires analysis of physical changes to the environment. Please refer to Global Response GR-1 in the Final EIR for a discussion of CEQA and socioeconomic impacts.
- I20-3** The comment states, “Our local school has been closed for two years because parents with children have moved away in search of jobs and local education.” 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.
- I20-4** The comment states a “solar park of this magnitude jeopardizes Jacumba’s future by squandering the best land that could support new homes and businesses.” In response, as stated in the Draft EIR the lifespan of the Proposed Project is 35 years, not including construction and decommissioning. Accordingly, the Project is not a permanent land use and will not preclude the potential for the Project site from being used differently in 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.
- I20-5** The comment states the Project also eliminates a future border crossing with Mexico. In response, please refer to Response to Comment O7-166.
- I20-6** The comment states the JVR Park does not conform to the Mountain Empire Subregional Plan adopted on August 3, 2011. In response, an analysis of the Proposed Project’s consistency with the Mountain Empire Subregional Plan is included in Section 3.1.4 Land Use and Planning of the Draft EIR. Specifically, please refer to Table 3.1.4-5. The Draft EIR concluded that the Proposed Project would not conflict

Volume II – Individual Responses to Comments

with applicable land use plans and policies, including the Mountain Empire Subregional Plan.

- I20-7** The comment states “The County Planning Commission and County Supervisors must reject this project and choose the no project alternative.” The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.