

## Response to Comment Letter I5

### Cherry Diefenbach

- I5-1** The commenter states she has questions on the Draft EIR as outlined in comments I5-2 through I5-4. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I5-2** The commenter states that on page S-6 of the Executive Summary in the Draft EIR, other areas of controversy were listed as, impacts to a low income community; impacts to property value; impacts to tourism; lack of benefits to the community; and changes to local temperatures. The commenter asks where these topics are addressed in the Draft EIR. In response, these topics listed under Other Areas of Controversy were raised by agencies and the public during the NOP scoping/comment period. Discussion of these topics, in regard to CEQA, have been included in the Final EIR as Global Responses. With respect to changes to local temperatures resulting from solar facilities, please refer to Global Response GR-2 Photovoltaic Heat Island Effects in the Final EIR. In regard to property values, tourism, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires an analysis of physical impacts to the environment and does not require analysis of social and economic impacts. Please refer to Global Response GR-1 Socioeconomic Impacts and Environmental Justice in the Final EIR, which discusses the relationship between socioeconomic considerations and CEQA.
- I5-3** The commenter asks, regarding the Proposed Project’s Potential Mitigation Areas map (Figure 2.3-8), “Are mitigation /open space easements protected in perpetuity?” The commenter also asks, “is there anything that precludes the dark green areas located on the southwestern and northwestern areas of the same map from being used to expand the amount of solar panels at a later date?” In response, please refer to mitigation measure **M-BI-4**, which requires the open space easements to be dedicated to the “County in perpetuity, unless conveyed to another public agency subject to approval by the Director of PDS.” With respect to future expansion of the Proposed Project, any modifications or changes to the Proposed Project are subject to compliance with all applicable laws and regulations, including CEQA and the County’s land use authority.
- I5-4** The commenter asks for clarification on the financial relationship between the Project property owners and the Project Applicant. The commenter also asks who will be getting the federal solar described in the Draft EIR, and if it is likely that the Applicant will buy the current property owners out if and when the Project is ultimately approved by the Board. In response this question concerns a private issue

## **Volume II – Individual Responses to Comments**

---

between the Project applicant and the property owner that is not within the County’s purview. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.

**I5-5** This is a concluding statement thanking County staff in advance for clarifying the commenters questions. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.