

Response to Comment Letter I96

P Hanson

- I96-1** The commenter states that “I am protesting the proposed solar cell installation project in Jacumba, Ca.” In response, the County acknowledges the commenter’s opposition to the Proposed Project. The comment that does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I96-2** The commenter states, “We are working on developing a town that reflects the history & unique identity & once again we are being threatened from doing so.” The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I96-3** The commenter states that “We have a spa that once was the go-to place of movie stars & people the world over.” The commenter also states “Then a bypass was put around the town & the town lost business. It really hasn’t been the same since then - but now I-80 highway - Jacumba Airport - plans already going on have promised to bring back Jacumba as a tourist attraction & place to live.” The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I96-4** The commenter states that “Once again we are being threatened. Some people from a foreign country want to put up a really bad idea & once again threaten our dreams.” The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I95-5** The commenter states the “Chain link fence will provide an eye sore – certainly not complementing our vision of what we want our town to be.” In response, as discussed in Section 2.1 Aesthetics and shown in Figure 2.1-8b landscaping will be installed on the outside of the perimeter fencing in specified areas, including in accordance with mitigation measure (M-AE-5). In addition, tan slats or screening will also be installed in on the fencing in specified areas (M-AE-6).
- I96-6** The commenter states that we depend on ground water. The commenter also states that construction will use 14-acre feet of water from existing project area wells and 11-acre feet needed to wash panels four times annually. In response, for clarification Chapter 1 of the Draft EIR states the Project’s operational water demand will be 11 acre-feet per year, which includes 2.6 acre-feet per year for panel washing and 8.4-acre feet for irrigation of landscape screening. Please also refer to Section 2.7,

Volume II – Individual Responses to Comments

Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR, which analyzes the Proposed Project’s potential impacts to groundwater resources.

- I96-7** The commenter states that there will be an increased risk of fire hazards from high power equipment. In response, 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.
- I96-8** The commenter states that there is potential for Jacumba to experience a sizable increase in temperature of maybe 36 degrees warmer. This potential is called the “heat island effect.” In response, please refer to Global Response GR-2 in the Final EIR which discusses heat island effects and solar facilities.
- I96-9** The commenter states that “Then there’s noise. Humming 24 hours a day along with panel motor noise.” The commenter also states “I can only imagine how our dogs are going to react to that. God help us then!” In response, Section 2.9 Noise of the Draft EIR analyzes the Proposed Project’s noise impacts, including noise from stationary equipment. The Draft EIR determined that the equipment and layout as proposed would be compliant with County noise requirements; however, if the equipment was to change or layout was different than what was evaluated in the EIR operational noise levels have the potential to exceed the County’s Noise Ordinance (**Impact NOI-1**). Implementation of mitigation measure **M-NOI-1** would reduce this potential impact to less than significant. In addition, noise impacts from panel washing (**Impact NOI-2**) were also identified as potential significant. Implementation of mitigation measure **M-NOI-2** would reduce the potential impact to less than significant.
- I96-10** The commenter states “There is so much wrong with this event being thrown on our laps. It seems like Jacumba is the dumping off site of unsightly things -- Organic farms have caused so many gnats they actually stopped the farming. Then they sent every sexual pervs to Jacumba to live.” In response, the comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within Draft EIR; therefore, no further response is required.
- I96-11** The commenter states “we can’t seem to realize our dreams of having our dreams of having a really great town.” The commenter asks that this project please be stopped and “let us build.” 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.