

## Response to Comment Letter I57

### Alta Murphy

**I57-1** The comment states the commenter is a resident of Jacumba and strongly opposes the JVR Energy Park as described in the 2020 Draft EIR. The comment also states this Project would place thousands of solar panels on 643 acres in Jacumba Valley adjacent to the village. 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.

**I57-2** The comment states the “project is wrong...it will lower property values, destroy important wildlife habitat, negatively impact community character, block scenic vistas, introduce fire danger risk into our rural landscape, and squander land that could support a future border crossing.”

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.

Regarding impacts to wildlife habitat, Section 2.3 Biological Resources of the Draft EIR includes an analysis of the Proposed Project’s impacts to wildlife habitat. With implementation of mitigation measures, impacts to wildlife habitat would be reduced to less than significant.

Regarding impacts to community character and scenic vistas, Section 2.1 Aesthetics of the Draft EIR includes an analysis of visual impacts to community character and focal or panoramic vistas. The Draft EIR concluded that the Proposed Project would conflict with the established visual character of Jacumba Hot Springs (**Impact AE-1**) and would conflict with the small-town characteristics and open characteristics of the Project site (**Impact AE-2**). The Draft EIR also determined that the Proposed Project result in significant impacts to focus or panoramic vistas. Implementation of mitigation measures (**M-AE-1 through M-AE-6**) would reduce the visual impacts, but not to a level of less than significant. The impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including regionwide or statewide environmental benefits of a proposed project against its significant and unavoidable impacts when determining whether to approve the project. When a lead agency approves a project, the agency must state in writing the specific reasons to support its action; this

## Volume II – Individual Responses to Comments

---

statement is referred to a “Statement of Overriding Considerations.” Under CEQA, the County must make a Statement of Overriding Considerations” to approve the Proposed Project.

Fire risks are discussed in the Fire Protection Plan (Appendix N) and Section 2.12 Wildfire of the Draft EIR. With implementation of mitigation measures **M-WF-1** (Fire Protection Plan), **M-WF-2** (Construction Fire Protection Plan), and **M-WF-3** (Fire Protection and Mitigation Agreement), impacts associated with wildfire risk would be less than significant.

Regarding a future border crossing, please refer to Response to Comment O7-166.

- I57-3** The comment states that the Project conflicts with the community vision as described in the 2011 Mountain Empire Sub-Regional Plan. 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 with applicable land use plans and policies, including the Mountain Empire Subregional Plan.
- I57-4** The comment states, “If built, this project’s closeness to a rural village would set a bad precedence that could affect other backcountry communities.” The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I57-5** The comment states, “The Planning Commission and County Board of Supervisors must reject this project by choosing 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.