

Response to Comment Letter I95

Karen and Richard Conshafter

- I95-1** The commenters state that they are protesting the JVR Energy Park for Jacumba, California. The commenters also state they are 14-year homeowners that love the town of Jacumba and the surrounding natural habitat that is used by many residents and visitors for hiking, festivals and vacations at Jacumba Spa and Resort. In response, the County acknowledges the commenters’ 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.
- I95-2** The commenters state that the Proposed Project has been blatantly put together and that the files were dropped at the Jacumba Library with only three weeks to study, get out to the community and to respond. In response, the public review period for the Draft EIR began on October 8, 2020. A hard copy of the Draft EIR was provided to the Jacumba Library by County staff and the Draft EIR was available on the County’s website on October 8, 2020. The public review period was initially scheduled to end on November 23; however, it was extended until December 7 at the request of a member of the public. Thus, the Draft EIR was available for public review for a total of 54 days, which is over 7 weeks in length.
- I95-3** The commenters state that there is no concern for the people of Jacumba, their animals or the wildlife in the area. The comment does not identify specific impacts to or concerns regarding the people of Jacumba, their animals, or wildlife; thus, it is not possible to provide a specific response. However, please refer to Global Response GR-1 in the Final EIR which discusses the relationship between socioeconomic considerations and CEQA. Please also refer to Section 2.3, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR which analyzes the Proposed Project’s potential impacts to wildlife.
- I95-4** The commenters state that the 75-foot buffers are too small for housing along the outlines of the project. In response, the comment does not identify specific concerns regarding impacts; thus, it is not possible to provide a specific response. However, please refer to Chapter 4, Project Alternatives, of the Draft EIR which analyzes the Community Buffer Alternative. This alternative includes a 300-foot buffer adjacent to private properties north of Old Highway 80 in the Jacumba Hot Springs community.
- I95-5** The commenters ask about the noise factor for both people and the animals. In response, please refer to Section 2.9, Noise, of the Draft EIR, which analyzes the Proposed Project’s potential noise impacts during construction and operation in regard to people. Please also refer to Section 2.3 Biological Resources which analyzes the

Volume II – Individual Responses to Comments

- Proposed Project’s potential impacts on wildlife. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I95-6** The commenters state that the “heat island effect” will be unbearable for the residents of Jacumba where the temperatures reach over 100 degrees in the summer and early fall. In response, please refer to Global Response GR-2 in the Final EIR for a discussion of heat island effect and solar facilities.
- I95-7** The commenters state that there is no benefit to the community and asks about the gliders and the Jacumba Airport. The commenters ask where will the gliders land and states that they are in danger of high voltage equipment, transformers, and overhead connections. In response, please refer to Section 2.6.3.4 Airport Hazards and Global Response GR-5 Airport Impacts in the Final EIR regarding potential impacts to glider operations at the Jacumba airport.
- I95-8** The commenters state that the Proposed Project takes away from the future growth of Jacumba. The commenters state that there are plans to refurbish the stores, the lake and parts of the old spa, and that the Proposed Project at the size that it is will only reduce property values and discourage visitors from visiting. In response, please refer to Global Response GR-1 in the Final EIR for a discussion of 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.
- I95-9** The commenters state that the use of water is in question and that having enough water for all is also a concern. In response, Sections 2.7 Hydrology and Water Quality and 3.1.8 Utilities and Service Systems of the Draft EIR analyze the Proposed Project’s impacts to groundwater resources and water supply.
- I95-10** The commenters state that they would appreciate the County addressing their concerns. The commenters also state that “Jacumba seems to be a dumping ground for unwanted projects (i.e. sexual predators!!).” The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I95-11** The commenters state there are five other larger projects planned and asks why the JVR Energy Park (MUP-18-022). The commenters also state that “Whoever bought this land for this project has no concern for the community, wildlife or the future of residents and the town of Jacumba!!” In response, the Draft EIR includes an analysis of cumulative projects, which include pending projects. Please refer to Table 1-4 in Chapter 1 of the Draft EIR for a list of cumulative projects. The comment does not raise

Volume II – Individual Responses to Comments

an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.

- I95-12** The commenters state that Jacumba has a long history of artists, community support and enjoyment of the natural beauty of all surrounding areas. The commenters ask that the County please re-consider approving this project as there is surely a better use for that land. In response, the County acknowledges the commenters' 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.

LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK