

## Response to Comment Letter I9

### Aisha Acevedo

- I9-1** The comment states the commenter lives in Jacumba and is completely against the proposed JVR Energy Park described in the Draft Environmental Impact Report released for public comment in October 2020. 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.
- I9-2** The comment states this massive solar farm is not compatible with the small rural village nor land uses in the Mountain Empire Subregional Plan adopted by County Supervisors in 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 with applicable land use plans and policies, including the Mountain Empire Subregional Plan.
- I9-3** The comment questions “How anyone could think that the placement of 300,000 solar cells on 643 acres of the best available real estate in Jacumba is an appropriate use, be fuddles the imagination.” 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.
- I9-4** The comment states the Proposed Project is six times the size of the Jacumba community and will negatively impact property values, ruin the natural environment and destroy community character. In response to the comment regarding property values, CEQA requires analysis of physical changes to the environment. Please refer to Global Response GR-1 for a discussion of CEQA and socioeconomic impacts. Regarding impacts to the natural environment, Section 2.3 Biological Resources of the Draft EIR analyzes the impacts to vegetation communities, special status plants, wildlife, and other biological resources. The Draft EIR determined that with implementation of mitigation measures, impacts to biological resources would be less than significant. With respect to community character, Section 2.1 Aesthetics of the Draft EIR includes an analysis of visual impacts to community character. 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**). Implementation of mitigation measures (**M-AE-1 through M-AE-6**) would reduce

## Volume II – Individual Responses to Comments

---

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 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.

**I9-5** The comment states the Proposed Project’s “placement on both sides of a scenic Old Highway 80, next to the Jacumba Airport, the senior center and park, as well as homes, will only accelerate the exodus of residents and businesses away from our community.” In response, please refer to Global Response GR-1 regarding CEQA and socioeconomic 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.

**I9-6** The comment states “County Supervisors must reject this 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.