

## **Response to Comment Letter I89**

**Nancy Cordova**

- I89-1** The commenter state “as a resident of Jacumba, I am completely opposed to the solar project proposed for our small town.” 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.
- I89-2** The commenter states that the influx of the workers alone is enough to make her oppose the Proposed Project. In response, as described in Chapter 1 of the Draft EIR, construction is anticipated to last approximately 13 months with up to 500 workers on the Project site at during peak construction. These workers are not anticipated to relocate to the area with their families and are not expected to induce substantial population growth in the area, as it is anticipated that construction workers from the San Diego region to the west or Imperial Valley to the east would construction the Proposed Project. A County-required Traffic Control Plan to provide safe and efficient traffic flow in the area and on the Project site would be prepared prior to Proposed Project construction. During the operational phase, the Proposed Project would not have any full-time personnel on-site but may include up to five people during operation inspections, maintenance and repair activities. These operational workers are not anticipated to relocate to Jacumba Hot Springs or the Mountain Empire Subregion.
- I89-3** The commenter states that she has been negatively impacted by the construction of the border wall close to her home. The commenter also states the solar project will ruin the view from her home. The commenter further states she moved to Jacumba for its beauty and quiet atmosphere, the natural beauty of nature. In response, please refer to Section 2.1 Aesthetics of the Draft EIR which analyzes the Proposed Project’s potential impacts to aesthetics and visual resources. Mitigation measures are identified which would reduce visual impacts; however, the Draft EIR concludes that the Proposed Project would result in significant and unavoidable aesthetic impacts. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I89-4** The commenter states that Carrizo Gorge Road and old Historic Highway 80 will be negatively impacted with the additional traffic, and Carrizo Gorge Road is already in bad shape. In response, Section 3.1.7 Transportation of the Draft EIR analyzes the Proposed Project’s potential impacts. Implementation of Project Design Features

## Volume II – Individual Responses to Comments

---

(PDFs) will be required to ensure that construction-related traffic would not impede the movement of vehicles, transit, bicyclists, and/or pedestrians along Carrizo Gorge Road and/or Old Highway 80. Implementation of Project Design Features **PDF-TR-1** (Traffic Control Plan), **PDF-TR-2** (Preparation of a Construction Notification Plan), and **PDF-TR-3** (Notification of Property Owners and Provision of Access) would ensure impacts are less than significant.

**I89-5** The commenter states that she is not opposed to solar power but is concerned that it is bad for the community of Jacumba and would be better suited somewhere else without disrupting and existing town. In response, please refer to Chapter 4, Project Alternatives, which considered but rejected alternative locations for the Proposed Project. Please also refer to Global Response GR-6 Alternatives in the Final EIR. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.