CHAPTER S SUMMARY

This chapter is a summary of the ~~Draft~~ Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the JVR Energy Park Project (Proposed Project) prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). As required by CEQA, this EIR: (1) assesses the potentially significant direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental effects of the Proposed Project; (2) identifies potential feasible means of avoiding or substantially lessening significant adverse impacts; and (3) evaluates a range of reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Project, including the required No Project Alternative. The County of San Diego (County) is the lead agency for the Proposed Project and has the principal responsibility for preparing this EIR. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.), this EIR consists of an evaluation of the effects of the entire Proposed Project. This Project EIR will be used by the County to inform public agencies, the public, and decision makers of the significant environmental effects of the Proposed Project; identify ways to minimize significant effects; and describe reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Project.

The Draft Environmental Impact report (Draft EIR) for the Proposed Project was prepared and circulated for public review from October 8, 2020 to December 7, 2020. During that time, the County received comment letters from Tribes, Agencies, Organizations, and Individuals. As a result of the comments received regarding the Proposed Project, minor changes have been made to the Proposed Project design. These revisions include increased setbacks of the proposed solar facility from Old Highway 80 and Jacumba Community Park, which resulted in a reduction in the Major Use Permit area. These minor changes to the Proposed Project are summarized below in Section S.1.1 and described in Chapter 1 of the Final EIR.

Responses to each of the written comment letters on the Draft EIR have been prepared. The comment letters and responses are included in Volume II of the Final EIR. In some cases, comments prompted text changes to the Draft EIR. In addition, updated information is provided where appropriate. Changes to the text in the Final EIR chapters are shown in strikeout/underline and are summarized in the Errata Summary Table (Table S-5). Appendices to the Draft EIR were also revised based on comments received during public review and new appendices are included in the Final EIR, as summarized in Table S-6. New appendices are not shown as underlined text.

S.1 Project Synopsis

S.1.1 Project Description

The Proposed Project is a solar energy generation and storage facility which would produce a rated capacity of up to 90 megawatt (MW) of alternating current (AC) generating capacity. The power produced by the proposed solar facility would be delivered to an existing San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) 138 KV transmission line which transects the Project site. The solar facility would be

located on ~~643~~ 623 acres within the 1,356-acre privately-owned Project site, located adjacent to Jacumba Hot Springs in unincorporated southeastern San Diego County. In addition, an existing water main would be realigned resulting in 3 acres of disturbance. Thus, the total area of disturbance for the Proposed Project is 626 acres. The Project site is located within the County's Mountain Empire Subregional Plan area.

As a result of the comments received regarding the Proposed Project during public review of the Draft EIR, minor changes have been made to the Proposed Project design. These revisions include increased setbacks of the proposed solar facility from Old Highway 80 and Jacumba Community Park, which resulted in a reduction in the Major Use Permit (MUP) area. These minor changes to the Proposed Project are summarized below and are shown on Figure 1-2, Project Components, Figure 1-3, Enlarged Site Plan Index, and Figure 1-4, New Setbacks from Old Highway 80 and Jacumba Community Park in Chapter 1 of the Final EIR.

- **Revised Major Use Permit Boundary:** As a result of the increased setbacks described below, the size of the MUP area has been reduced from 643 acres to 623 acres.
- **Increased Setbacks from Old Highway 80**: Along Old Highway 80, the Proposed Project fence line on both sides of the roadway has been set back further to provide a larger buffer between the roadway and the Proposed Project. The fence line along the north side of Old Highway 80 will be 70 feet from the Project property line to the fence line (110 feet from the edge of the pavement on Old Highway 80 to the fence line), providing a buffer to the north that is 52 feet more than described in the Draft EIR. The fence line along the south side of Old Highway 80 will be 140 feet from the Project property line to the fence line (175 to 180 feet from the edge of pavement on Old Highway 80 to the fence line), providing a buffer to the south that is 122 feet more than described in the Draft EIR.
- **Increased Setback from Jacumba Community Park**: Adjacent to the Jacumba Community Park, the Proposed Project fence line has been set back further to provide a larger buffer between the park and the Proposed Project. The fence line adjacent to the park will be 300 feet from the Project property line to the fence line.
- **Water Main Realignment**: An existing water main that connects the existing Jacumba Valley Ranch Water Company well to commercial uses along Carrizo Gorge Road is proposed to be realigned. The existing water main is shown on Figure 1-1 and is owned and operated by the Jacumba Valley Ranch Water Company. The Proposed Project will realign the water main north from the Jacumba Valley Ranch Water Company well along the western edge of the Proposed Project, then east along the Proposed Project fence line south of the SDG&E easement, as shown in Figure 1-2 in Chapter 1 of the

Final EIR. The realigned water main will connect with the existing water main which crosses the SDG&E easement and continue north to connect with the existing commercial uses along Carrizo Gorge Road. No construction will occur within the SDG&E easement. The water main realignment will impact approximately 3 acres outside of the revised MUP boundary. However, less than 1 acre impacted by the water main realignment is located outside the original MUP boundary analyzed in the Draft EIR.

The Proposed Project would include the following primary components: approximately 300,000 photovoltaic (PV) modules mounted on support structures (single-axis solar trackers); a direct current (DC) underground collection system linking the modules to the inverters; 25 inverter/transformer platforms located throughout the solar facility; an underground collection system; an on-site collector substation; ~~a switchyard,~~ an overhead transmission line to connect the on-site collector substation to the switchyard; a switchyard and overhead transmission lines (tie-in) to loop the switchyard into the existing 138 kV transmission line (jointly, referred to as the "Switchyard Facilities" throughout the Final EIR); and a battery energy storage system of up to 90 MW (AC), ~~(~~or ~~180~~ 360 megawatt hours (MWh). The battery system would be comprised of battery storage containers located adjacent to the inverter/transformer ~~pads~~ platforms (up to 3 containers at each location for a total of 75 containers on site). The Proposed Project would also include a fiber optic line, a control system, five meteorological weather stations, internal access, site access driveways, perimeter fencing, ~~motion sensor~~ low level lighting, fuel modification zones, and six water tanks for fire protection. In addition, landscaping along some sections of the perimeter fencing would be installed as mitigation for visual impacts. The facility would not be staffed full-time. All Project components would be decommissioned after an operational life of approximately 35 years, except the ~~switchyard~~ Switchyard Facilities, which includes ~~and~~ the 138 kV connection line to the SDG&E transmission line, which would be owned and operated by SDG&E.

The Proposed Project would use bi-facial PV modules, which produce solar power from both sides of the module. The Proposed Project would also use modules with increased wattage (increased from 385 watts to approximately 540 watts per module). Due to these technological improvements in the PV modules, the estimated renewable electricity production of the Proposed Project has been increased to approximately 283,000 megawatt hours per year. These technological improvements make it possible to maintain the Proposed Project's 90 MW AC nameplate capacity (power delivered to the grid) even though the MUP footprint has been reduced by 20 acres (Appendix V to the Final EIR).

Project Approvals and Permits

The Proposed Project requires approval by the County. In addition, approvals or permits may be required by other state and federal agencies. In order to develop a solar facility on the Project site, discretionary actions from the County would be required, including a Major Use Permit (MUP). The Proposed Project, other than the Switchyard Facilities, is considered a Major Impact Service and Utility type. The Switchyard Facilities are considered a Minor Impact Utility type. Other County permits and approvals that would be required include a grading permit, building and demolition permits, County Right-of-Way Permit, and various ministerial permits. A demolition permit is required because the Proposed Project would demolish existing dairy and ranch structures located within the Project site.

S.1.2 Project Objectives

Specific objectives for the Proposed Project are as follows:

1. Develop a solar energy project with a rated capacity of up to 90 megawatts (MW) of alternating current (AC) and an energy storage facility that can supply electricity to indirectly reduce the need to emit greenhouse gases caused by the generation of similar quantities of electricity from either existing or future nonrenewable sources to meet existing and future electricity demands, including during on-peak power periods.
2. Develop a renewable solar energy project that can meet the criteria to achieve the maximum federal solar Investment Tax Credit, which is intended to decrease the cost of renewable energy generation and delivery, promote the diversity of energy supply, and decrease dependence of the United States on foreign energy supplies.
3. Assist in achieving the state's Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS), as mandated under the 100 Percent Clean Energy Act of 2018 (Senate Bill 100), by developing and constructing California RPS-qualified solar generation from eligible renewable energy resources by December 31, 2045.
4. Develop a utility-scale solar energy project that improves electrical reliability for the San Diego region by providing a source of local generation as near as possible to existing San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E) transmission infrastructure.
5. Provide a new source of energy storage that assists the state in achieving or exceeding its energy storage targets, consistent with the terms of Assembly Bill 2514, and its greenhouse gas reduction targets, consistent with Assembly Bill 32 and Senate Bill 32.
6. Site a solar energy project in an area within San Diego County that has excellent solar attributes, including but not limited to high direct normal irradiance, in order to maximize productivity.
7. Develop a utility-scale solar energy facility within San Diego County that supports the economy by investing in the region and creates construction jobs.

S.1.3 Project Location

The Proposed Project would be located on a privately owned 1,356-acre site in southeastern San Diego County. The Project site lies within the Jacumba Subregional Group Area within the Mountain Empire Subregion area of the unincorporated County. The Project site is located south of Interstate 8 (I-8), east of the unincorporated community of Jacumba Hot Springs, and immediately north of the U.S./Mexico border. Access to the Project site is provided by Old Highway 80 and Carrizo Gorge Road. The Project site consists of 24 parcels. The Project site includes right-of-way easements for Old Highway 80, SDG&E easements, and an easement for the San Diego and Arizona Eastern Railway.

S.1.4 Environmental Setting

The baseline for the Proposed Project is established by the physical condition that exists at the time the Notice if Preparation (NOP) for the EIR was published, which occurred on March 7, 2019. The environmental setting is summarized below and described in greater detail for each environmental issue at the beginning of each section in Chapter 2 and 3 of this EIR.

A portion of the Project site has historically been used for dairy and agricultural operations. The Project site is not currently under cultivation and has been fallow. The Project site contains ~~11~~ 12 vegetation communities and/or land covers, including ~~8~~ 9 sensitive vegetation communities. Across the 1,356-acre Project site, elevations range from approximately 2,745 feet above mean sea level (amsl) in the lower, northern portion of the site to 3,365 feet amsl at the top of Round Mountain in the northwestern portion of the Project site.

Surrounding land uses include public lands, the Jacumba Hot Springs community, Jacumba Airport, and railways. Public land in the surrounding area includes Anza-Borrego Desert State Park to and Bureau of Land Management Federal lands. The unincorporated community of Jacumba Hot Springs, which includes residential and commercial uses, is located to adjacent to southwestern boundary of the Project site. The Jacumba Airport is located to the east of the southern portion of the Project site, and the site is located within its Airport Influence Area. The Project site includes an easement for the San Diego and Arizona Eastern Railway, but the segment is not currently operational. Transmission lines transect the northern portion of the Project site, including a SDG&E 138kV transmission line, the Sunrise Powerlink, and the Southwest Powerlink.

S.2 Summary of Significant Effects and Mitigation Measures That Reduce or Avoid the Significant Effects

Table S-1, Summary of Significant Effects, presents the results of the environmental analysis completed for the Proposed Project. Mitigation measures have been identified to reduce environmental impacts associated with aesthetics (Section 2.1), air quality (Section 2.2), biological resources (Section 2.3), cultural resources (Section 2.4), geology, soils, and seismicity (Section 2.5), hazards and

hazardous materials (Section 2.6), hydrology and water quality (Section 2.7), noise (EIR Section 2.9), paleontological resources (EIR Section 2.10), tribal cultural resources (EIR Section 2.11) and wildfire (EIR Section 2.12). All impacts (Impact-) and mitigation measures (M-) in abbreviated form are identified in Table S-1. All mitigation measures in full form are identified in Table S-2. The mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant impacts to below a significant level, with the exception of impacts to aesthetics (**Impacts AE-1**, **AE-2**, **AE-3**, **AE-4**, **AE-5**, **AE-6**, **AE-7**, **AE-8, AE-9, AE-CU-1 and AE-CU-2**), which remain significant and unavoidable. Impacts to mineral resources (**Impact M-MR-1**), identified in Section 2.8, are also significant and unavoidable. There are no feasible mitigation measures for mineral resources. A detailed analysis of significant environmental effects and mitigation measures is presented in Chapter 2 of this EIR.

S.3 Areas of Controversy

CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b)(2) requires that an EIR identify areas of controversy, including issues raised by other agencies and the public. Areas of known controversy associated with the Proposed Project that are relevant to the EIR are as follows:

Aesthetics

- Aesthetic impacts related to scenic vistas and community character
- Light pollution.
- Glint or glare impacts to motorists on I-8

Agricultural Resources

- Impacts to potential farmland and impacts to soil that could be used for agriculture

Air Quality

- Air quality impacts, including diesel fuel combustion emissions and dust

Biological Resources

- Impacts to wetlands
- Compliance with applicable resource regulations, including the California Endangered Species Act and Fish and Game Code.
- Direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to biological and natural resources from all project components, including impacts from human intrusion, drainage, soil, air flow, dust, lighting, and temperature changes

Cultural Resources

- Disclosure of any historical resources
- Impacts to archaeological resources.
- Completion of tribal consultations and potential for significant tribal cultural resources
- Need for tribal cultural resource monitoring during ground disturbance

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- Fire hazards and need for a new fire station or firefighter personnel
- Exposure to electromagnetic fields

Hydrology and Water Quality

- Excessive water use
- Water quality impacts

Land Use and Planning

- Consistency with the Mountain Empire Subregional Plan and Jacumba's vision statement
- Location in proximity to the Jacumba Hot Springs community and the size of project
- Housing impacts, including removing land that could be developed with housing
- Potential abandonment of existing housing due to the project impacts

Noise

- Noise and vibration impacts to residents

Parks and Recreation

- Impacts to the Anza Borrego Desert State Park, Jacumba Community Park, and the underserved Jacumba Hot Spring residents
- Impacts to existing open space and trails

Other Areas of Controversy

- Environmental justice and socio-economic issues, including impacts to a low-income community
- Impacts to property values

- Tourism impacts
- Lack of benefits to the community.
- Changes to local temperature

S.4 Issues to be Resolved by the Decision-Making Body

The San Diego County Planning Commission serves as the decision-making body for Major Use~~r~~ Permits; however, the Proposed Project requires a Fire ~~Services~~ Protection and Mitigation Agreement, which must be approved by the County Board of Supervisors. Therefore, for the Proposed Project, the Board of Supervisors is the decision-making body for the Major Use Permit. The Planning Commission will make a recommendation on the Proposed Project to the Board of Supervisors.

Issues to be resolved by the Board of Supervisors include: (1) how to mitigate the significant effects of the Proposed Project; (2) whether to reject or approve one of the alternatives to the Proposed Project and other environmental findings; and (3) whether to reject or approve the Proposed Project. The Board of Supervisors must adopt detailed findings on the feasibility of mitigation measures that substantially lessen or avoid the significant effects of the Project on the environment.

In addition to mitigation measures, the Board of Supervisors will decide whether or not to adopt the Proposed Project or any of the Project alternatives that would feasibly attain most of the Project objectives while avoiding or substantially reducing any of the significant impacts of the Proposed Project.

Because this EIR has identified adverse environmental effects that are unavoidable, the Board of Supervisors must also determine whether the adverse environmental effects are considered acceptable with consideration given to economic, social, technological, and other relevant benefits of the Proposed Project pursuant to CEQA Section 15093. The Board of Supervisors would prepare a statement of overriding considerations as described in CEQA Section 15093 to reflect the ultimate balancing of competing project objectives if the Board of Supervisors decides to approve the Proposed Project, Proposed Project alternatives, or components of either, which have the potential to cause one or more significant effects on the environment.

S.5 Project Alternatives

Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Project or to the Proposed Project location that would feasibly attain most of the Proposed Project objectives but would avoid or lessen any significant environmental impacts. An EIR should evaluate the environmental impacts of the alternatives compared to the Proposed Project. According to the CEQA Guidelines, many factors may be taken into account

when addressing the feasibility of alternatives, such as environmental impacts, site suitability as it pertains to various land use designations, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, regulatory limitations, and jurisdictional boundaries (CEQA Guidelines, 15126.6(f)(1)).

Chapter 4 of this EIR describes and evaluates alternatives and is intended to implement the requirements set forth in the CEQA Guidelines. Three alternatives, as listed below, are fully analyzed in this EIR (see also Table S-~~3~~ 4). For each of these alternatives, the analysis includes a description of the alternative and a comparison of the environmental effects relative to the Proposed Project. These Project alternatives include:

- Alternative 1: No Project Alternative (No Development and Buildout Scenarios)
- Alternative 2: Community Buffer Alternative
- Alternative 3: Reduced Project Alternative

Subsequent to public review of the Draft EIR, the Community Buffer Alternative and the Reduced Project Alternative were revised to include increased setbacks adjacent to Jacumba Community Park and along both sides of Old Highway 80, like the Proposed Project in the Final EIR.

In addition, Chapter 4 discusses considered and rejected alternatives which include Energy Efficiency Ordinance, Distributed Generation and Storage Policy (rooftop solar panels), Wind Energy, Alternative Locations, Community Buffer with Southwest Expansion, and East County Substation Connection alternatives. These alternatives were considered but rejected because they either did not meet the basic project objectives, were infeasible, or would not reduce a significant impact of the Project.

S.5.1 Proposed Project Alternatives

S.5.1.2 No Project Alternative

CEQA requires an evaluation of the No Project Alternative so that decision makers can compare the impacts of approving the Proposed Project with the impacts of not approving the Proposed Project. According to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(e), the No Project Alternative must include the assumption that conditions at the time of the Notice of Preparation (i.e., baseline environmental conditions) would not be changed because the Proposed Project would not be installed. The No Project Alternative must also describe the events or actions that would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Proposed Project were not approved. The existing County General Plan land use designation for the majority of the Proposed Project development footprint is Specific Plan; therefore, it is reasonable to assume that if the Project was not approved that the Specific Plan are portion of the Project site would be developed. Therefore,

the No Project Alternative analysis includes two scenarios: No Development and Buildout, as discussed below.

No Development No Project Alternative

The No Development No Project Alternative scenario assumes that the Proposed Project would not be developed and the existing conditions would remain. No reasonably expected actions or changes to the Project site would be anticipated if the Proposed Project is not approved. Under this scenario, the No Project Alternative would avoid all Proposed Project impacts, including aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology, soils, and seismicity, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, noise, paleontological resources, tribal cultural resources and wildfire. This alternative would not meet the project objectives.

Buildout No Project Alternative

For purposes of this Buildout No Project Alternative analysis, the previously proposed Ketchum Ranch Specific Plans for the Project site were considered as to what could potentially be developed within the Project site. The Ketchum Ranch Specific Plan was a multi-use concept; a residential community with recreational and visitor oriented commercial uses on approximately 1,250 acres. The conceptual land use plan included 1,110 dwelling units, active/passive open space for recreational uses such as an 18-hole golf course, a wastewater reclamation facility, and other supporting uses.

In general, this alternative would reduce several of the significant and unavoidable aesthetic impacts of the Project considering a community would be more visually compatible with the area than the Proposed Project (**Impacts AE-1 to -3, and AE-6 to -9**). Nonetheless, the Buildout No Project Alterative would continue to result in a significant visual contrast with the existing visual character and quality of the area considering the significant change from an open undeveloped site to a developed multi-use community. From closer viewpoints, the buildings that would be constructed would have similar or increased view blockage impacts (**Impacts AE-4** and **AE-5)**. This alternative would also likely increase the significant and unavoidable impact on mineral resources (**Impact MR-1**) since the development on the Project site would be permanent and it is likely that more on-site biological open space easements would be required for this alternative, both of which would further increase the loss of availability of any underlying mineral resources. Due to the increase in construction and operational activities relative to the Project, the Buildout No Project Alternative development scenario would also increase impacts associated with air quality, biological resources, geology, soils and seismicity, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, paleontological resources, tribal cultural resources and wildfire would be increased relative to the Project (see Table S-3). In addition, other impacts determined to be less than significant for the

Project, would be increased to potentially significant levels under the Buildout No Project Alternative. This includes potentially significant operational mobile-source air quality and odor from wastewater treatment, operational mobile noise, and operational transportation impacts. This alternative would not meet the project objectives.

S.5.1.2 Community Buffer Alternative

The Community Buffer Alternative would include a 300-foot buffer from the adjacent Jacumba Hot Springs community, north of Old Highway 80. This buffer would include landscaping however ~~N~~no construction or activities would occur within the ~~15.4~~ 18.9-acre buffer included in this alternative, and that area would remain in its current undeveloped condition. The Community Buffer Alternative includes increased setbacks along Old Highway 80 and adjacent to Jacumba Community Park, like the Proposed Project. Thus, the Major Use Permit area for this alternative would be reduced to approximately 604 acres. This alternative also includes realignment of an existing water main.

The Community Buffer Alternative assumes the use of bifacial PV modules and increased module wattage (from 385 watts to approximately 540 watts) like the Proposed Project in the Final EIR. The use of bifacial PV modules with increased wattage would allow the Community Buffer Alternative to generate an estimated 267,000 megawatt hours per year. Thus, although the solar facility development footprint of this alternative would be reduced by approximately 3% relative to the 623-acre Proposed Project, these technological improvements enable the Community Buffer Alternative to maintain a 90 MW AC nameplate capacity (see Appendix V in the Final EIR). ~~The Community Buffer Alternative would include 282,504 PV modules instead of the Proposed Project's 300,000 PV modules, which would reduce the energy generated from 90 MW to 82.3 MW.~~ The battery energy storage system, ~~switchyard~~ Switchyard Facilities, substation and other project components would be the same as the Proposed Project. The length of construction may be slightly reduced under this alternative, but the daily construction would remain the same as the Proposed Project, as would site access and number of employees.

This alternative would ~~reduce~~ substantially lessen impacts to aesthetics **(Impacts AE-1, AE-2, AE-CU-1 and AE- CU-2**), and reduce impacts to air quality (**Impact AQ-1**), biological resources (**Impacts BI-V-2,** and **BI-W-2**), ~~hydrology and water quality (**Impact HDY-1**),~~ mineral resources (**Impact MR-1**) and noise (**Impacts NOI-1, NOI-2 and NOI-3**) as discussed in detail in Section 4.4 of Chapter 4. Although these impacts would be lessened, they would remain potentially significant under the Community Buffer Alternative. As with the Proposed Project, all impacts of the Community Buffer Alternative could be reduced to less than significant with the exception of significant impacts related to aesthetics and mineral resources that would remain significant and unavoidable. As with the Proposed Project, ~~A~~all ~~of the~~ impacts of the Community Buffer Alternative ~~listed above~~, except for **Impacts AE-1**, **AE-2, AE-CU-1, AE-CU-2** and **MR-1**, could

be reduced to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. **Impacts AE-1**, **AE-2, AE- CU-1, AE-CU-2** and **MR-1** would remain significant and unavoidable, similar to the Proposed Project. The provision of a 300-foot buffer adjacent to Jacumba Hot Springs, north of Old Highway 80, would not have a substantial effect to the remaining significant impacts of the Proposed Project, including cultural resources, geology, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, paleontological resources, and tribal cultural resources. Similar to the Proposed Project, with implementation of mitigation measures these impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

The Community Buffer Alternative would generally meet all project objectives~~, although not to the degree that the Proposed Project would~~. Technological improvements (bifacial modules and increased module wattage) would enable the Community Buffer Alternative to maintain a 90 VW AC nameplate capacity (Appendix V in the Final EIR). ~~This alternative would generate 7.7 MW less than the Project, and therefore, it would not achieve Project objectives 1, 2 or 3, 5 or 7 to the extent of the Proposed Project.~~

S.5.1.3 Reduced Project Alternative

The Reduced Project Alternative would reduce the development footprint relative to the Proposed Project. This alternative would not develop the portion of the Project site to the north of the existing transmission lines that transect the Project site, reducing the development footprint by 142 acres compared to the Proposed Project. The existing water main would only be realigned south of the SDG&E easement, not to the north of the easement. This ~~501~~ 481-acre solar facility would reduce the development footprint by approximately 23%, which ~~number of PV modules to 250,428. This reduction in PV modules~~ would reduce energy generated ~~by approximately 22 MW D/C~~ relative to the Proposed Project. With this reduction, the Reduced Project Alternative would generate ~~68~~ 70 MW compared to the Proposed Project's generation of 90 MW. The ~~switchyard~~ Switchyard Facilities, substation and other project components to the south of the transmission lines would be the same as the Proposed Project. The length of construction would be reduced under this Alternative, but the daily construction would remain the same as the Proposed Project, as would site access and number of employees.

The reduction of the development footprint by 142 acres would reduce impacts to aesthetics **(Impacts AE-1, AE-2, AE-3,** ~~and~~ **AE-6 through AE-9, AE-CU-1** and **AE-CU-2**), air quality (**Impact AQ-1**), biological resources (**BI-V-2, BI-W-2, BI-SP-2, BI-W-1, BI-W-2, BI-W-5, BI-W-6, BI-V-1, BI-V-3, BI- V-4, BI-JAR-1, BI-JAR-2, BI-JAR-3, BI-WLC-1 BI-WLC-2**, and **BI-WLC-3**), cultural resources (**Impacts CR-1** and **CR-2**), geology (**GEO-1** and **GEO-2**), ~~hazards and hazardous materials (**Impacts HAZ-1** and **HAZ-2**), hydrology and water quality (**Impact HYD-1**)~~, mineral resources (**Impact MR-1**), paleontological resources (**Impact PR-1**), and tribal cultural resources (**Impact TCR-1**), and wildfire (**Impacts WF-1, WF-2 and WF-3**).

As with the Proposed Project, all impacts of the Reduced Project Alternative could be mitigated to less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures, with the exception of significant impacts related to aesthetics (**Impacts AE-1 to AE-9, AE-CU-1, AE-CU-2**) and mineral resources (**Impact MR-1**) which would remain significant and unavoidable. The avoidance of the area north of the SDG&E transmission corridor would not have a substantial effect to the remaining significant impacts of the Proposed Project. ~~These impacts could be reduced to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures, except Impacts **AE- 4, AE-5,** and **MR-1** which would remain significant and unavoidable.~~

This alternative would generally meet all project objectives, although not to the degree that the Proposed Project would. The Reduced Project Alternative would result in approximately ~~22~~ 23% less renewable energy generation and, therefore, it would not achieve Project objectives 1, 2 or 3, 5 or 7 to the extent of the Proposed Project.

S.5.2 Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(b), indicates that a list of reasonable alternatives must be developed and considered by the lead agency. Elimination of potential environmental impacts of the Proposed Project should be considered when developing potential alternatives. As evaluated in Chapter 2 of this EIR, the significant impacts of the Proposed Project include: aesthetics; air quality; biological resources; cultural resources; geology, soils, and seismicity; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; mineral resources; noise; paleontological resources; tribal cultural resources; and wildfire.

As shown in Table S-3, the No Development No Project Alternative would be environmentally superior to the Proposed Project, based on avoidance of all of the Proposed Project's significant environmental impacts. However, the No Development No Project Alternative would not meet any of the project objectives. Additionally, CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(c)) requires that, if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. The Environmentally Superior Alternative is the Reduced Project Alternative. The Reduced Project Alternative, which reduces the development footprint by 142 acres and avoids the area to the north of the SDG&E transmission corridor, would substantially reduce the severity of significant and unavoidable aesthetic impacts (**Impacts AE-1, AE-2, AE-3, ~~and~~ AE-6 to AE-9, AE-CU-1** and **AE-CU-2**), and mineral resource impacts (**Impact MR-1**) ~~air quality (**Impact AQ-1**)~~, as well as potentially significant mitigable air quality, biological, cultural, geologic, hydrology and water quality, ~~mineral resources,~~ paleontological, and tribal cultural resource impacts.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
Significant and Unavoidable Impacts		
2.1 Aesthetics		
Impact AE-1: Impact to Jacumba existing visual character and/or quality	**M-AE-1** (inverter enclosures shall be a non-reflective color), **M-AE-2** (battery energy storage containers shall be a non-reflective color), **M-AE-3** (Transmission line conductors shall be non-reflective in design), **M-AE-4** (setback of 75 feet from residential property lines), **M-AE-5** (landscaping buffers), **M-AE-6** (tan-colored slats or screening on perimeter fence)	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact AE-2: Impact to visual character of Jacumba Hot Springs	**M-AE-1** (inverter enclosures shall be a non-reflective color), **M-AE-2** (battery energy storage containers shall be a non-reflective color), **M-AE-3** (Transmission line conductors shall be non-reflective in design), **M-AE-4** (setback of 75 feet from residential property lines), **M-AE-5** (landscaping buffers), **M-AE-6** (tan-colored slats or screening on perimeter fence)	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact AE-3: I-8 – Long distance view changes to this eligible state scenic highway viewpoint due to proposed project	**M-AE-1** (inverter enclosures shall be a non-reflective color), **M-AE-2** (battery energy storage containers shall be a non-reflective color), **M-AE-3** (Transmission line conductors shall be non-reflective in design), **M-AE-4** (setback of 75 feet from residential property lines), **M-AE-5** (landscaping buffers), **M-AE-6** (tan-colored slats or screening on perimeter fence)	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact AE-4: Old Highway 80 – Long distance view blockage and character change from this County scenic highway system viewpoint due to proposed project	**M-AE-1** (inverter enclosures shall be a non-reflective color), **M-AE-2** (battery energy storage containers shall be a non-reflective color), **M-AE-3** (Transmission line conductors shall be non-reflective in design), **M-AE-4** (setback of 75 feet from residential property lines), **M-AE-5** (landscaping buffers), **M-AE-6** (tan-colored slats or screening on perimeter fence)	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact AE-5: Jacumba Community Park – Long distance view blockage and character change from this County Park due to proposed project	**M-AE-1** (inverter enclosures shall be a non-reflective color), **M-AE-2** (battery energy storage containers shall be a non-reflective color), **M-AE-3** (Transmission line conductors shall be non-reflective in design), **M-AE-4** (setback of 75 feet from residential property lines), **M-AE-5** (landscaping buffers), **M-AE-6** (tan-colored slats or screening on perimeter fence	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact AE-6: Anza-Borrego Desert State Park Lands and Carrizo Gorge Wilderness - Long distance view changes from State Parks lands due to proposed project	**M-AE-1** (inverter enclosures shall be a non-reflective color), **M-AE-2** (battery energy storage containers shall be a non-reflective color), **M-AE-3** (Transmission line conductors shall be non-reflective in design), **M-AE-4** (setback of 75 feet from residential property lines), **M-AE-5** (landscaping buffers), **M-AE-6** (tan-colored slats or screening on perimeter fence	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact AE-7: Round Mountain – Character change and view interruption from this recreational	**M-AE-1** (inverter enclosures shall be a non-reflective color), **M-AE-2** (battery energy storage containers shall be a non-reflective color), **M-AE-3** (Transmission line conductors shall be non-reflective in design), **M-AE-4** (setback of 75 feet from residential property lines), **M-AE-5**	Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
resource viewpoint due to proposed project	(landscaping buffers), **M-AE-6** (tan-colored slats or screening on perimeter fence)	
Impact AE-8: Airport Mesa - Long distance view changes at this recreational resource viewpoint due to proposed project	**M-AE-1** (inverter enclosures shall be a non-reflective color), **M-AE-2** (battery energy storage containers shall be a non-reflective color), **M-AE-3** (Transmission line conductors shall be non-reflective in design), **M-AE-4** (setback of 75 feet from residential property lines), **M-AE-5** (landscaping buffers), **M-AE-6** (tan-colored slats or screening on perimeter fence	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact AE-9: Table Mountain area – Long distance view changes at this recreational resource viewpoint due to proposed project	**M-AE-1** (inverter enclosures shall be a non-reflective color), **M-AE-2** (battery energy storage containers shall be a non-reflective color), **M-AE-3** (Transmission line conductors shall be non-reflective in design), **M-AE-4** (setback of 75 feet from residential property lines), **M-AE-5** (landscaping buffers), **M-AE-6** (tan-colored slats or screening on perimeter fence)	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact AE-CU-1 Cumulative Impact on valued visual character or image of neighborhoods, communities, or localized areas.	**M-AE-1** (inverter enclosures shall be a non-reflective color), **M-AE-2** (battery energy storage containers shall be a non-reflective color), **M-AE-3** (Transmission line conductors shall be non-reflective in design)	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact AE-CU-2 Cumulative impacts to panoramic vista available from I-8, and elevated vantage points in the Airport Mesa and Table Mountain Recreational Management Zones.	**M-AE-1** (inverter enclosures shall be a non-reflective color), **M-AE-2** (battery energy storage containers shall be a non-reflective color), **M-AE-3** (Transmission line conductors shall be non-reflective in design)	Significant and Unavoidable
2.8 Mineral Resources		
Impact MR-1 A portion of the biological open space easements (188 acres), required as mitigation for the Proposed Project's biological resource impacts, and the ~~3.2-acre switchyard~~ Switchyard Facilities together would result in a permanent loss of the availability of mineral resources exceeding the County's threshold value of $12,500,000.	No feasible mitigation measures have been identified.	Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
Significant Impacts Mitigated to a Level of Less than Significant		
2.1 Aesthetics		
Impact AE-10: Glare impacts to roadways from proposed project	M-AE-1 (inverter enclosures shall be a non-reflective color), M-AE-2 (battery energy storage containers shall be a non-reflective color), M-AE-3 (Transmission line conductors shall be non-reflective in design)	Less Than Significant
2.2 Air Quality		
Impact AQ-1: Construction-related cancer risk from diesel exhaust	**M-AQ-1** (measures to minimize diesel particulate matter emissions)	Less than Significant
Impact AQ-CUM-1: Construction-related emissions of Nox, PM10 and PM2.5	**M-AQ-1** (measures to minimize diesel particulate matter emissions), **M-AQ-2** (Fugitive Dust Control Plan)	Less than Significant
2.3 Biological Resources		
Impact BI-SP-1: Temporary direct impact to special-status plants	**M-BI-1** (monitoring)**, M-BI-2** (temporary construction fencing)	Less than Significant
Impact BI-SP-2: Permanent direct impact to special-status plants	**M-BI-3 (**habitat preservation)**, M-BI-4** (resource management plan)	Less than Significant
Impact BI-SP-3: Construction-related temporary indirect impacts to special-status plants	**M-BI-1** (monitoring), **M-BI-2** (temporary construction fencing), **M-BI-7 (**biological monitoring of the stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP)**), , M-BI-8 (**prevention of ~~chehmical~~ chemical pollutants), **M-AQ-2 (**fugitive dust control plan**)**	Less than Significant
Impact BI-SP-4: Operational permanent indirect impacts to special-status plants	**M-BI-3** (habitat preservation), **M-BI-4** (resource management plan)**, M-BI-8** (prevention of chemical pollutants), **M-BI-9** (prevention of invasive plant species)**, M-BI-10** (O&M signage), **M-WF-1** (fire protection plan (FPP))	Less than Significant
Impact BI-W-1: Temporary direct impact to special-status wildlife	**M-BI-1** (monitoring), **M-BI-2**,(temporary construction fencing)	Less than Significant
Impact BI-W-2: Permanent direct impact to special-status wildlife (including tricolored blackbird, burrowing owl and raptor foraging habitat)	**M-BI-3** (habitat preservation**), M-BI-4** (resource management plan)**, M-BI-5** (nesting bird surveys)	Less than Significant
Impact BI-W-3: Permanent direct impact to special-status wildlife (sensitive bird nesting)	**M-BI-1** (monitoring), **M-BI-5** (nesting bird surveys)	Less than Significant
Impact BI-W-4: Permanent direct impact to	**M-BI-6** (bat surveys and roost avoidance or exclusion)	Less than Significant

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
Special-status wildlife (bats)		
Impact BI-W-5: Construction-related temporary indirect impacts to special-status wildlife (including sensitive bird nesting)	**M-BI-1** (monitoring), **M-BI-2** (temporary construction fencing), **M-BI-5** (nesting bird surveys), **M-BI-7** (biological monitoring of the SWPPP**),** and **M-BI-10 (**O&M signage), **M-BI-11** (noise reduction); **M-AQ-2** (fugitive dust control plan)	Less than Significant
Impact BI-W-6: Operational permanent indirect impacts to special-status wildlife	**M-BI-3** (habitat preservation), **M-BI-4 (**resource management plan), and **M-BI-8 (**prevention of chemical pollutants**), M-BI-9 (**prevention of invasive species**), M-BI- 10** (O&M signage**); M-WF-1** (FPP)	Less than Significant
Impact BI-WLC-1: Temporary direct impact to wildlife movement	**M-BI-1** (monitoring), **M-BI-2** (temporary construction fencing)	Less than Significant
Impact BI-WLC-2: Permanent direct impact to wildlife movement (Core wildlife area)	**M-BI-3** (habitat preservation), **M-BI-4** (resources management plan)	Less than Significant
Impact BI-WLC-3: Temporary indirect impact to wildlife movement	**M-BI-**1 (monitoring), **M-BI-2** (temporary construction fencing), **M-BI-5** (nesting bird surveys)**, M-BI-7** (biological monitoring of the SWPP)**,** and **M-BI-11** (noise reduction)	Less than Significant
Impact BI-V-1: Temporary direct riparian habitat or sensitive vegetation communities	**M-BI-1** (monitoring), **M-BI-2** (temporary construction fencing)	Less than Significant
Impact BI-V-2: Permanent direct riparian habitat or sensitive vegetation communities	**M-BI-3** (habitat preservation), **M-BI-4** (resource management plan)	Less than Significant
Impact BI-V-3: Temporary indirect riparian habitat or sensitive vegetation communities	**M-BI-1** (monitoring), **M-BI-2** (temporary construction fencing)**, M-BI-7** (biological monitoring of the SWPPP), to **M-BI-8** (prevention of chemical pollutants), **M-AQ-2** (fugitive dust control plan)	Less than Significant
Impact BI-V-4: Permanent indirect riparian habitat or sensitive vegetation communities	**M-BI-3** (habitat preservation), **M-BI-4** (resource management plan), **M-BI-7** (biological monitoring of the SWPPP), **M-BI-8** (prevention of chemical pollutants)**, M-BI-9** (prevention of invasive plant species), **M-WF-1** (FPP)	Less than Significant
Impact BI-JAR-1: Temporary direct Jurisdictional resources	**M-BI-1** (monitoring)**, M-BI-2 (**temporary construction fencing)	Less than Significant
Impact BI-JAR-2: Temporary indirect Jurisdictional resources	**M-BI-1** (monitoring)**, M-BI-2** (temporary construction fencing); **M-BI-7** (biological monitoring of the SWPPP), **M-BI-8** (prevention of chemical pollutants), **M-AQ-2 (**fugitive dust control plan)	Less than Significant

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
Impact BI-JAR-3: Permanent indirect Jurisdictional resources	**M-BI-3** (habitat preservation), **M-BI-4** (resource management plan), M-BI-7 (biological monitoring of SWPPP), **M-BI-8** (prevention of chemical pollutants; **M-BI-9** (prevention of invasive plant species); **M-WF-1** (FPP)	Less than Significant
2.4 Cultural Resources		
Impact CR-1: Construction and Decommissioning-related impacts to undiscovered cultural resources on-site or known cultural resources within 50 feet of the Project ADI	**M-CR-1 (**temporary fencing), **M-CR-2** (archaeological monitoring), **M-CR-3** (cultural resources treatment agreement and preservation plan), **M-CR-4** (long- term preservation of resources)	Less than Significant
Impact ~~CUL~~CR-2 Construction-related impacts to undiscovered human remains	**M-CR-2** (archaeological monitoring), **M-CR-3** (cultural resources treatment agreement and preservation plan)	
2.5 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity		
Impact GEO-1: Ground failure due to liquefaction, seismically induced settlements, and/or lateral ground spread that could result in the collapse of a structure	**M-GEO-1** (detailed, site-specific subsurface report or preliminary geotechnical investigation)	Less than Significant
Impact GEO-2: Expansive soils have potential to impact development	**M-GEO-1** (detailed, site-specific subsurface report or preliminary geotechnical investigation)	Less than Significant
2.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
Impact HAZ-1: Operational-related impacts that could exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires	**M-WF-1** (FPP), **M-WF-3** (Fire Protection and Mitigation Agreement)	Less than Significant
Impact HAZ-2: Construction-related impacts exposing project occupants to potential risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires	**M-WF-2**.(construction fire protection plan (CFPP))	Less than Significant
Impact HAZ-CU-1 Cumulative impacts to	**M-WF-1** (FPP), **M-WF-2** (CFPP), **M-WF-3** (Fire Protection and Mitigation Agreement)	Less than Significant

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
interference with emergency response		
Impact HAZ-CU-2 Cumulative impacts to Wildland Fire Hazards	**M-WF-1** (FPP), **M-WF-2** (CFPP), **M-WF-3** (Fire Protection and Mitigation Agreement)	Less Significant
2.7 Hydrology and Water Quality		
Impact HYD-1: Impacts resulting from implementation of the Proposed Project associated with potential alteration of drainage patterns and flood hazards due to the perimeter fence, during construction and operation	**M-HYD-1** (perimeter fencing plan)	Less than Significant
2.9 Noise		
Impact NOI-1: Operational stationary equipment noise	**M-NOI-1** (revised acoustical assessment report and site plan)	Less than Significant
Impact NOI-2: Operational Mobile Equipment noise	**M-NOI-2** (PV panel washing protocol)	Less than Significant
Impact NOI-3: Construction-related noise	**M-NOI-3** (construction noise management plan**)**	Less than Significant
2.10 Paleontological Resources		
Impact PR-1: Construction-related impact to paleontological resources	**M-PR-1** (paleontological resources monitoring program)	Less than Significant
2.11 Tribal Cultural Resources		
Impact TCR-1: Construction and Decommissioning related impacts to tribal cultural resources and human remains	**M-TCR-**1 (temporary fencing), **M-TCR-2** (archaeological and tribal monitoring), **M- TCR-3** (long-term preservation of resources)	Less than Significant
2.12 Wildfire		
Impact WF-1 Operational-related impacts to wildfire risk	**M-WF-1** (FPP)	Less than Significant
Impact WF-2 Construction-related impacts to wildfire risk	**M-WF-2** (CFPP)	Less than Significant

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
Impact WF-3 Infrastructure contribution to increased wildfire risk	**M-WF-3** (Fire Protection and Mitigation Agreement)	Less than Significant
Impact WF-CU-1 Cumulative Impact to Emergency Response ~~and emergency evacuation plan~~	**M-WF-1** (FPP), **M-WF-2** (CFPP), **M-WF-3** (Fire Protection and Mitigation Agreement)	Less than Significant
Impact WF-CU-2 Cumulative Impact to wildfire risk	**M-WF-1** (FPP), **M-WF-2** (CFPP), **M-WF-3** (Fire Protection and Mitigation Agreement)	Less than Significant
Impact WF-CU-3 Cumulative Infrastructure Contribution to Increased Wildfire Risk	**M-WF-1** (FPP), **M-WF-2** (CFPP), **M-WF-3** (Fire Protection and Mitigation Agreement)	Less than Significant

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

Aesthetics Mitigation Measures	
M-AE-1	Inverter enclosures shall be a non-reflective color. If the enclosures are not manufactured as non-reflective, the enclosures shall be painted a non-reflective color.
M-AE-2	Energy storage containers shall be a non-reflective color. If the containers are not manufactured as non-reflective, the containers shall be painted a non-reflective color.
M-AE-3	All new transmission line conductors shall be non-reflective in design to reduce conductor visibility and visual contrast.
M-AE-4	A minimum set-back of 75 feet from residential property lines to solar panels shall be provided along the western Project boundary. This setback shall be provided where the western Project boundary parallels residential property lines in Jacumba Hot Springs. Setbacks shall be provided pursuant to Section 4800, Setback Regulations, of the County's Zoning Ordinance and shown on Project Plot Plans.
M-AE-5	Landscaping shall be installed to provide visual screening of the solar facility. The proposed rows of landscaping will be approximately 15 feet wide and will include drought tolerant trees (approximately 18 feet tall 10 years after planting) with native and/or drought tolerant shrubs and ground covers incorporated in between the fence line and the existing road and utility easements. As identified on the Project Conceptual Landscape Plan, landscaping shall be installed and shall run parallel to segments of the Project perimeter fence in the following specified sections: along the north and south sides of Old Highway 80 for entire length of the solar facility; along the east side of Carrizo Gorge Road; and along the southwestern portion of the solar facility adjacent to the community of Jacumba Hot Springs. The applicant shall prepare the Landscape Plans using the Landscape Documentation Package and pay all applicable review fees. Prior to approval of any plan, issuance of any permit, and prior to use of the premises in reliance of this permit, the Landscape Documentation Package shall be prepared and approved. Prior to any occupancy, final grading release, or use of the premises in reliance of this permit, the landscaping shall be installed. The applicant shall submit to the [PDS LA, PCC], a Landscape Certificate of Completion from the project California licensed Landscape Architect, Architect, or Civil Engineer, that all landscaping has been installed as shown on the approved Landscape Documentation Package. The applicant shall prepare the Landscape Certificate of Completion using the Landscape Certificate of Completion Checklist. Prior to project construction, the project applicant shall submit a conceptual landscape plan detailing the planting materials and sizes and location of landscaping shall be prepared and provided to the County for review and approval. Landscaping shall be planted and maintained accordingly to ensure continued screening of proposed solar panels by the Applicant and/or Project operator over the operational life of the Project.
M-AE-6	As identified on the Project Plot Plans, ~~tan-colored slats~~ visual screening shall be installed along specific segments of the Project perimeter fence in the following specified sections: along the north and south sides of Old Highway 80 for the entire length of the solar facility; east side of Carrizo Gorge Road; and along the southwestern portion of the solar facilities adjacent to the community of Jacumba Hot Springs. Tan-colored slats shall be installed on fencing adjacent to residential properties north of Old Highway 80 and Jacumba Community Park, as determined feasible based on flood flow heights. Where slats are not feasible in areas of higher flood flows, screening material shall be installed. Screening material (such as vinyl or other acceptable material) shall be installed on the perimeter fence along both sides of Old Highway 80. The screening material shall be tan-colored, or other neutral color compatible with natural background setting. PDS shall approve the screening material and color. Screening material shall be installed securely to accommodate wind conditions. Slats and screening material shall be maintained accordingly over the operational life of the Project. Slats and screening material shall be replaced as needed to ensure a unified and orderly appearance and to provide continued visual screening of Project components. In areas where flood depths are less than approximately one foot in height and the Project is subject to **M-HYD-1** (flood fencing), slats or screening shall not be required on the bottom two feet of the Project fence (one foot of flood depths and one foot of freeboard); provided that the Project applicant submits evidence to PDS that establishes the bottom two feet of the fence is entirely screened from public views by the landscaping required

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

	by mitigation measure **M-AE-5** and any required flood fencing complies with the **M-HYD-1** and **PDF-HYD-4**. If PDS determines that the landscaping is not sufficient to screen this portion of the Project fence from public views, the Project applicant shall propose additional landscaping sufficient to meet this standard. PDS shall review and approve the additional landscaping in accordance with the requirements of **M-AE-5**.
Air Quality Mitigation Measures	
M-AQ-1	Prior to the County of San Diego's (County's) approval of any construction or decommissioning-related permits, the Proposed Project applicant or its designee shall place the following requirements on all plans, which shall be implemented during each construction phase to minimize diesel particulate matter emissions: a. Heavy-duty diesel-powered construction equipment shall be equipped with Tier 4 Final or better diesel engines for engines 75 horsepower or greater. The County shall verify and approve all pieces within the construction fleet that would not meet Tier 4 Final standards. b. Vehicles in loading and unloading queues shall not idle for more than 5 minutes and shall turn their engines off when not in use to reduce vehicle emissions. c. All construction equipment shall be properly tuned and maintained in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. When construction equipment units that are less than 50 horsepower are employed, that equipment shall be electrical or natural gas-powered, where available.
M-AQ-2	Prior to the County of San Diego's (County's) approval of any grading permits and during Proposed Project construction and decommissioning, a Fugitive Dust Control Plan shall be prepared demonstrating compliance with San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) Rule 55 and County Code Section 87.428 (Grading Ordinance), to the satisfaction of the County. The Project applicant or its designee shall require implementation of the following fugitive dust measures to minimize PM_{10} emissions as part of the Fugitive Dust Control Plan. All measures shall be designated on Grading and Improvement Plans. a. Prior to construction activities, the Project applicant shall employ a construction relations officer who shall address community concerns regarding on-site construction activity. The Project applicant shall provide public notification in the form of a visible sign containing the contact information of the construction relations officer who shall document complaints and concerns regarding on-site construction activity. The sign shall be placed in easily accessible locations and noted on Grading and Improvement Plans. b. Grading areas shall be watered, or another SDAPCD-approved dust control non-toxic agent shall be used, at least three times daily, to minimize fugitive dust only where chemical stabilizers are not used. c. All permanent roads and the paved access roadway improvements shall be constructed and paved as early as possible in the construction process to reduce construction vehicle travel on unpaved roads. Foundations shall be finalized as soon as possible following site preparation and grading activities to reduce fugitive dust from earth-moving operations. d. Grading areas shall be stabilized as quickly as possible to minimize fugitive dust. e. Wheel washers, grates, rock, or road washers shall be installed adjacent to the site access points for tire inspection and washing prior to vehicle entry on public roads. f. Visible track-out into traveled public streets shall be removed with the use of sweepers, water trucks, or similar method within 30 minutes of occurrence. g. Haul trucks shall be covered or at least 2 feet of freeboard shall be maintained to reduce blow-off during hauling. h. A 15-mile-per-hour speed limit on unpaved surfaces shall be enforced. Haul truck staging areas shall be provided for loading and unloading of soil and materials and shall be located away from sensitive receptors at the farthest feasible distance.

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

Biological Resources Mitigation Measures	
M-BI-1	**Biological Monitoring.** (a) In order to prevent inadvertent disturbance to sensitive resource areas outside the approved area of impact, a County of San Diego (County)-approved biologist (Project Biologist) shall be contracted to perform biological monitoring during all grading, clearing, grubbing, trenching, and construction activities. 1. The Project Biologist shall perform the monitoring duties before, during, and after construction pursuant to the most current version of the County *Biological Report Format and Requirement Guidelines*. The contract provided to the County shall include an agreement that this will be completed, and a memorandum of understanding between the biological consulting company and the County shall be executed. The contract shall include a cost estimate for the monitoring work and reporting. In addition to performing monitoring duties pursuant to the most current version of the County *Biological Report Format and Requirement Guidelines*, the Project Biologist shall also perform the following duties: a. Attend the pre-construction meeting with the contractor and other key construction personnel prior to clearing, grubbing, or grading to reduce conflict between the timing and location of construction activities with other mitigation requirements (e.g., seasonal surveys for nesting birds). b. Conduct meetings with the contractor and other key construction personnel describing the importance of restricting work to designated areas prior to clearing, grubbing, or grading and clarifying that the Project Biologist has the authority to halt work that could harm or harass a protected species. c. Review ~~and/or designate~~ the construction area in the field with the contractor in accordance with the final grading plan prior to clearing, grubbing, or grading. d. Discuss procedures and provide Worker Environmental Aware Program/training for minimizing harm to or harassment of wildlife encountered during construction with the contractor and other key construction personnel prior to clearing, grubbing, or grading. e. Conduct a field review of the staking to be set by the surveyor, designating the limits of all construction activity prior to clearing, grubbing, or grading. f. Supervise and monitor vegetation clearing, grubbing, and grading to ensure against direct and indirect impacts on biological resources that are intended to be protected and preserved. g. Flush special-status species (i.e., avian or other mobile species) from occupied habitat areas immediately prior to brush-clearing and earthmoving activities. If brush-clearing and earth-moving activities take place within the bird breeding season, flushing shall not occur in an area identified as having an active nest and thus resulting in a potential take of a species. h. Verify that grading plans include a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) (if required pursuant to provisions of the State Water Resources Control Board 2009-0009-DWQ Construction General Permit, or equivalent applying the standards set forth in the County of San Diego Stormwater Standards Manual) to address hydrology impacts; see **M-BI-7**. i. Periodically monitor the construction site to see that dust is minimized according to the fugitive dust control plan and that temporarily impacted areas are revegetated as soon as possible. j. Periodically monitor the construction site to verify that artificial security light fixtures are directed away from open space and are shielded. k. Oversee the construction site so that cover and/or escape routes for wildlife from excavated areas are provided on a daily basis during vegetation clearing, grubbing and grading. All steep trenches, holes, and excavations during construction shall be covered at night with backfill, plywood, metal plates, or other means, and the edges covered with soils and plastic sheeting such that small wildlife cannot access them. Soil piles shall be covered at night to prevent wildlife from burrowing in. The edges of the sheeting shall be weighted down with sandbags. These areas may also be fenced to prevent wildlife from gaining access. Exposed trenches, holes, and excavations shall be inspected twice daily (i.e.,

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

	each morning and prior to sealing the exposed area at the end of the day) by a qualified biologist to monitor for wildlife entrapment. Excavations shall provide an earthen ramp to allow for a wildlife escape route. l. Except as stated otherwise herein, biological monitoring is daily during vegetation clearing, grubbing and grading. Once the PV field construction commences, the monitoring shall be weekly. 2. The cost of the monitoring shall be added to the grading bonds or bonded separately with the County Planning & Development Services (PDS). **Documentation**: The Applicant shall provide a copy of the biological monitoring contract, cost estimate, and MOU to the PDS. Additionally, the cost amount of the monitoring work shall be added to the grading bond cost estimate. **Timing**: Prior to approval of any grading and or improvement plans and issuance of any grading or construction permits. **Monitoring**: The PDS shall review the contract, MOU, and cost estimate or separate bonds for compliance with this condition. The cost estimate should be forwarded to the Project manager, for inclusion in the grading bond cost estimate, and grading bonds. The DPW/PDS shall add the cost of the monitoring to the grading bond costs. (b) In order to ensure that the biological monitoring occurred during the grading phase of the Project, a final biological monitoring report shall be prepared. The Project Biologist shall prepare the final biological monitoring report. The report shall substantiate the supervision of the grading activities, and confirm that grading or construction activities did not impact any additional areas or any other sensitive biological resources. The report shall conform to the County *Report Format Guidelines for Biological Resources*, and include the following items: a. Photos of the fencing or temporary flagging that was installed during the trenching, grading, or clearing activities b. Monitoring logs showing the date and time that the monitor was on site c. Photos of the site after the grading and clearing activities. **Documentation:** The Project Biologist shall prepare the final report and submit it to the PDS for review and approval. **Timing:** Prior to any occupancy, final grading release, or use of the premises in reliance of this permit, the final report shall be approved. **Monitoring:** The PDS shall review the final report for compliance with this condition and the report format guidelines. Upon approval of the report, PDS shall inform DPW that the requirement is complete and the bond amount can be relinquished. If the monitoring was bonded separately, then PDS shall inform the applicant to release the bond back to the Applicant. (c) Compliance with this measure shall be required during decommissioning activities
M-BI-2	**Temporary Construction Fencing.** Prior to issuance of permits, including clearing, grubbing, grading, and/or construction permits, the project applicant or its designee shall install fencing wherever the limits of grading are adjacent to sensitive vegetation communities or other biological resources, as identified by the Project Biologist. Fencing shall remain in place during all construction activities. All temporary fencing shall be shown on plans. Prior to release of grading and/or improvement bonds, a qualified biologist shall provide evidence to the satisfaction of the Director of the San Diego County Department of Planning and Development Services (or his/her designee) that work was conducted as authorized under the approved permits and associated plans.
M-BI-3	**Habitat Preservation.** In order to mitigate for impacts to loss of sensitive vegetation communities, plant and wildlife species habitat, special status plant species, burrowing owl occupied habitat, and wildlife movement, the applicant shall provide an on- site biological open space easement. (a) In order to protect sensitive biological resources, pursuant to the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) and California Environmental Quality Act, a biological open space easement will be granted over up to 435.00 acres of sensitive vegetation communities, special-status plant species, and habitat for special-

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

status species. The project is estimated to impact sensitive vegetation communities that require mitigation as summarized in the following table.

Community/Land Cover	Ratio	Permanent Direct Impacts (Acres)	Required Mitigation (Acres)	Biological Open Space Vegetation Easement (Acres)
*Desert saltbush scrub	2:1	50.39	100.78	4.69
*Desert sink scrub	3:1	—	—	12.43
*Disturbed freshwater marsh	3:1	—	—	0.08
*Mesquite bosque	3:1	2.64	7.92	126.12
*Sonoran mixed woody scrub	1:1	—	—	139.33
*Sonoran mixed woody and	1:1			
succulent scrub	72.85	72.85	132.05	
*Tamarisk scrub	3:1	1.11	3.33	—
*Non-wetland waters of the United	1:1	—	—	0.78
States/state				
Fallow agriculture1	0.5:1	467.63	233.82	9.35
Disturbed habitat	N/A	27.27	—	10.17
Urban/developed	N/A	21.24	—	<0.01
Total	**—**	**643.13**	**418.70**	**435.00**

Note: An asterisk (*) marks land cover types for which the County of San Diego (2010a) requires mitigation.
1 The fallow agriculture is considered raptor foraging habitat mitigated at a 0.5:1 mitigation ratio.

This biological open space easement shall mitigate for project impacts to sensitive vegetation communities and habitat for wildlife species as shown in the table above, thereby preserving compensatory habitat that provides equal or greater benefit to plant and wildlife species. The Proposed Project Major Use Permit area was reduced in the Final EIR; however, the applicant shall provide a total of 435 acres of biological open space easement as descried in the Draft and Final EIR. This biological open space easement will be granted to the County of San Diego (County). Granting of this open space authorizes the County and its agents to periodically access the land to perform management and monitoring activities for the purposes of species and habitat conservation. This easement is for the protection of biological resources and prohibits all of the following on any portion of the land subject to said easement: grading; excavation; placement of soil, sand, rock, gravel, or other material; clearing of vegetation; construction, erection, or placement of any building or structure; vehicular activities; trash dumping; or use for any purpose other than as open space. Granting of this open space authorizes the County and its agents to periodically access the land to perform management and monitoring activities for the purposes of species and habitat conservation. The only exceptions to this prohibition are (1) vegetation clearing by hand, by written order of the fire ~~authority~~ protection district for reduction of an identified fire hazard; (2) activities conducted pursuant to an approved revegetation or resource management plan; (3) vector control by written order of the County; and (4) construction, use, and maintenance of approved multi-use, non-motorized trails. No trails have been approved as part of this Project and would require subsequent environmental review and approval by PDS. Permanent signage indicating the area is a biological open space will be required and will be installed by the developer.

Documentation: The applicant shall prepare the draft plats and legal descriptions of the easements, then submit them for preparation and recordation with the DGS, and concurrence with PDS, and pay all applicable fees associated with preparation of the documents.

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

	Timing: Prior to approval of any plan or issuance of any permit, and prior to use of the premises in reliance of this permit the easements shall be recorded. **Monitoring:** The DGS shall prepare and approve the easement documents and send them to PDS for pre-approval. The PDS shall pre-approve the language and estimated location of the easements before they are released to the applicant for signature and subsequent recordation. Upon Recordation of the easements, DGS shall forward a copy of the recorded documents to PDS for satisfaction of the condition. (b) **Special-Status Plants.** Mitigation shall be provided for one pygmy lotus (County List A) and 21 sticky geraea individuals (County List B). County List A plant species will be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio, and County List B species will be mitigated at a 1:1 mitigation ratio. Mitigation for these plants shall be achieved through a combination of (1) salvaging the plants located in proposed impact areas and replanting in suitable mitigation lands, and (2) establishment of additional plants to meet the mitigation requirements. The Resource Management Plan (RMP) for the biological open space easement shall include the required measures to ensure viability of the transplanted and established individuals. The RMP (see M-BI-4) ~~will~~ include<u>s</u> the location~~s~~ of the plant restoration. The RMP will be the basis for monitoring and mitigation activities for the entire biological open space, including locations of plant mitigation. **Documentation:** The applicant shall prepare an RMP and submit it to PDS and pay all applicable review fees. **Timing:** Prior to approval of any plan or issuance of any permit, and prior to use of the premises in reliance of this permit the easements shall be recorded. **Monitoring:** A RMP Annual Report will be submitted to the County along with the submittal fee to cover County staff review time. (c) **Burrowing owl occupied habitat**. Based on mitigation ratios provided in Table 1 of the Strategy for Mitigating Impacts to Burrowing Owls in the Unincorporated County (Attachment A, County of San Diego 2010b), the project is required to provide 1:1 mitigation ratio for impacts to occupied burrowing owl habitat. Impacts to burrowing owl habitat will be mitigated by dedicating 22 acres of suitable burrowing owl habitat as an on-site biological open space easement. This acreage is included in the overall up to 435-acre biological open space easement. This area is comprised of open, relatively flat habitat which contains similar vegetation communities as the impacted habitat. This biological open space easement shall mitigate for project impacts to occupied burrowing owl habitat. Refer to M-BI-3(a) which describes the biological open space easement requirements. (d) **Wildlife Corridor Access.** The project shall provide a 50 to 100 foot opening in the perimeter fence north of the SDG&E easement to allow for wildlife moving within the easement corridor or north of the easement to move in and out of the easement. The opening in the fence will allow wildlife traveling along the fence line to find a break in the fencing leading them into the larger wildlife corridor. This opening in the fence shall be provided and maintained for the life of the project. **Documentation:** The fencing on the construction plans shall show an opening in the perimeter fencing as described above. The applicant shall install the project fencing or walls as indicated above and provide site photos and a statement from a California Registered Engineer, or licensed surveyor that the fencing has been installed to provide the required opening. **Timing:** Prior to approval of any plan or issuance of any permit, and prior to use of the premises in reliance of this permit the easements shall be recorded. **Monitoring:** The *[PDS, PCC]* shall review the photos and statement for compliance with this condition.
M-BI-4	Resource Management Plan (RMP). In order to provide for the long-term management of the proposed on-site biological open space, an RMP will be prepared and implemented. The final RMP cannot be approved until the following has been completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning & Development Services as follows: 1. The plan will be prepared and approved pursuant to the most current version of the County of San Diego (County) Biological Report Format and Content Requirements. 2. The habitat land to be managed will be owned by a land conservancy or equivalent.

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

	3. Open space easements will be dedicated to the County in perpetuity, unless conveyed to another public agency subject to approval by the Director of PDS. 4. A resource manager will be selected and approved, with evidence provided demonstrating acceptance of this responsibility. 5. The RMP funding mechanism to fund annual costs for basic stewardship shall be identified and approved by the County. The RMP funding mechanism will be identified and adequate to fund annual costs for implementation; typically determined by a Property Analysis Record as a non-wasting endowment. 6. A contract between the applicant and County will be executed for the implementation of the RMP. 7. The Final RMP shall have Project-specific requirements for the following mitigation implementation and monitoring measures: a. Special status plant species mitigation b. Bat house monitoring (if required under M-BI-6) c. Tricolored blackbird monitoring d. Camera traps for wildlife movement 8. Goals: The Final RMP will accomplish the following: a. Preserve and manage lands to the benefit of the flora, fauna, and native ecosystem functions reflected in the natural communities occurring within the on-site biological open space. b. Provide 3:1 replacement of pygmy lotus and 1:1 replacement of sticky geraea. If 1 pygmy lotus and 21 sticky geraea are transplanted, then success of this Mitigation Program will be achieved when at least 3 pygmy lotus plants and 21 sticky geraea plant are documented within the reception site during one or more years during the 3-year monitoring period. Documentation: The applicant shall prepare an RMP and submit it to PDS and pay all applicable review fees. Timing: Prior to approval of any plan or issuance of any permit, and prior to use of the premises in reliance on this permit, the RMP shall be approved. Monitoring: The PDS shall review the RMP for compliance with the content guidelines, the conceptual RMP, and this condition.
M-BI-5	This mitigation measure serves to avoid take of birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code during the nesting season (MBI-5(a)), ~~and~~ take avoidance for burrowing owls during the breeding and nonbreeding season (M-BI-5(b)), and trampling or crushing special-status reptiles, San Diego desert woodrat, or American badger. (a) **Nesting Bird Survey.** To avoid any direct impacts on raptors and/or any migratory birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code, removal of habitat that supports active nests on the proposed area of disturbance shall occur outside the nesting season for these species (which is January 15 through August 31, annually). If construction work must occur during the avian breeding season (January 15 to August 31, annually), the applicant shall: 1. Work with the County, CDFW and the USFWS to prepare a Nesting Bird Management, Monitoring, and Reporting Plan (NBMMRP) to address avoidance of impacts to nesting birds. a. The applicant(s) will submit to the agencies the NBMMRP (see following for details) for review and approval prior to commencement of the project during the breeding season. The BMMRP should include the following: b. Nest survey protocols describing the nest survey methodologies c. A management plan describing the methods to be used to avoid nesting birds and their nests, eggs, and chicks d. A monitoring and reporting plan detailing the information to be collected for incorporation into a regular Nest Monitoring Log (NML)with sufficient details to enable USFSW and CDFW to monitor the applicant's compliance with Fish and Game Code Sections 3503, 3503.5, 3511, and 3513 e. A schedule for the submittal (usually weekly) of the NML

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

	f. Standard buffer widths deemed adequate to avoid or minimize significant project-related edge effects (disturbance) on nesting birds and their nests, eggs, and chicks g. A detailed explanation of how the buffer widths were determined. h. All measures the applicant will implement to preclude birds from utilizing project-related structures (i.e., construction equipment, facilities, or materials) for nesting. 2. Conduct preconstruction nesting bird surveys within 72 hours of construction-related activities; conduct preconstruction survey sweeps immediately prior to ground-disturbing activities; and implement appropriate avoidance measures for identified nesting birds in the NBMMRP. Resurvey, if construction activities are halted for ten consecutive days. 3. To determine presence of nesting birds that the project activities may affect, surveys shall be conducted beyond the project area—300 feet for passerine birds and 500 feet for raptors. The survey protocols shall include a detailed description of methodologies utilized by CDFW-approved avian biologists to search for nests and describe avian behaviors that indicate active nests. The protocols shall include but are not limited to the size of the project area being surveyed, method of search, and behavior that indicates active nests. 4. Each nest identified in the project area shall be included in the NML. The NMLs should be updated daily and submitted to the CDFW weekly. Since the purpose of the NMLs is to allow the CDFW to track compliance, the NMLs shall include information necessary to allow comparison between nests protected by standard buffer widths recommended for the project (300 feet for passerine birds, 500 feet for raptors) and nests whose standard buffer width was reduced by encroachment of project-related activities. The NMLs shall provide a summary of each nest identified, including the species, status of the nest, buffer information, and fledge or failure data. The NMLs shall allow for tracking the success and failure of the buffers and would provide data on the adequacy of the buffers for certain species. 5. The applicant(s) will rely on its avian biologists to determine the appropriate standard buffer widths for nests within the project corridor/footprint to employ based on the sensitivity levels of specific species or guilds of avian species. The determination of the standard buffer widths shall be site- and species-/guild-specific and data-driven and not based on generalized assumptions regarding all nesting birds. The determination of the buffer widths shall consider the following factors: a. Nesting chronologies b. Geographic location c. Existing ambient conditions (human activity within line of sight—cars, bikes, pedestrians, dogs, noise) d. Type and extent of disturbance (e.g., noise levels and quality—punctuated, continual, ground vibrations—blasting-related vibrations proximate to tern colonies are known to make the ground-nesting birds flush the nests) e. Visibility of disturbance f. Duration and timing of disturbance g. Influence of other environmental factors h. Species' site-specific level of habituation to the disturbance. 6. Application of the standard buffer widths shall avoid the potential for project-related nest abandonment and failure of fledging and minimize any disturbance to the nesting behavior. If project activities cause or contribute to a bird being flushed from a nest, the buffer must be widened. This measure does not apply to nests that are started on construction equipment or panels or supporting structures. **Documentation:** The Project Biologist shall prepare the final report and submit it to the PDS for review and approval.

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

	Timing: Surveys shall be conducted prior to any clearing, grubbing, trenching, grading, or any land disturbances. Prior to any occupancy, final grading release, or use of the premises in reliance of this permit, the final report shall be approved. **Monitoring:** The PDS shall review the final report for compliance with this condition and the report format guidelines. Upon approval of the report, PDS shall inform the applicant that the requirement is complete and the bond amount can be relinquished. If the monitoring was bonded separately, then the PDS shall inform DPW to release the bond back to the applicant. **(b) Burrowing Owl ~~Take Avoidance~~ Preconstruction Surveys.** ~~Take avoidance~~ Preconstruction surveys are intended to detect the presence of burrowing owls on a project site at a fixed period in time and inform necessary take avoidance actions. ~~Take avoidance~~ Preconstruction surveys may detect changes in owl presence such as colonizing owls that have recently moved onto the site, migrating owls, resident burrowing owls changing burrow use, or young of the year that are still present and have not dispersed (CDFG 2012). Surveys must be completed no less than 14 days prior to the initiating ground disturbance activities. 1. If burrowing owls are detected during the breeding season (February 1 through August 1) surveys, a Burrowing Owl Management Plan will need to be written and approved by the County and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife before construction continues. The Plan shall include, at a minimum: 1) measures to protect burrowing owls during grading; 2) description of passive or active burrowing relocation during the nonbreeding season; and 3) description of BMPs to implement during construction (e.g., ensure that the ends of all pipes and culverts are covered when they are not being worked on, and covering rubble piles, dirt piles, ditches, and berms). Table 6-2, Recommended Restricted Activity Dates and Setback Distances by Level of Disturbance for Burrowing Owls, provides the CDFW- recommended restricted activity dates and setback distances around occupied burrowing owl nests for varying levels of disturbance (CDFG 2012). 2. If construction activities occur during the non-breeding season for burrowing owl (1 September – 31 January), a biologist shall conduct a take avoidance preconstruction survey, following the methods described in the Burrowing Owl Staff Report (CDFG 2012). The ~~take avoidance~~ preconstruction survey(s) can be conducted between 14 days and 24 hours prior to initiating ground disturbance activities; however, time lapses2.3 Biological Resources between project activities may require subsequent surveys within 24 hours prior to ground disturbance. If any burrowing owls are found during these surveys, avoidance and minimization measures must be implemented. The following avoidance and minimization measures shall be implemented: a. Avoid working within 50 meters (160 feet) from the occupied burrow during the non-breeding season; b. Avoid direct destruction of occupied burrows during the non-breeding season until the burrowing owl has vacated the burrow (determined through monitoring of the burrow); If these measures cannot be implemented, the applicant shall obtain written approval of an accepted plan (written or verbal) from the County and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife before construction continues. The plan shall include 1) identification of artificial burrow sites, 2) passive relocation methods, 3) monitoring and management of the artificial burrow site, and 4) reporting. **Documentation:** The Project Biologist shall prepare the final survey report and/or Burrowing Owl Management Plan and submit it to the PDS for review and approval. **Timing:** Surveys shall be conducted prior to any clearing, grubbing, trenching, grading, or any land disturbances. Prior to final grading release, or use of the premises in reliance of this permit, the final survey report and/or Burrowing Owl Management Plan shall be approved. **Monitoring:** The PDS shall review the final survey report and/or Burrowing Owl Management Plan for compliance with this condition and the report format guidelines. Upon approval of the report, PDS shall inform the applicant that the requirement is complete and the bond amount can be relinquished. (**c**) **Special-Status Species Preconstruction Surveys and Relocation Plan.** Prior to construction, the applicant shall develop a relocation plan for special-status terrestrial reptiles (i.e., California legless lizard,

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

	California glossy snake, San Diegan tiger whiptail, and Blainville's horned lizard), American badger and San Diego desert woodrat with the potential to occur on site. The plan shall at minimum include: the timing and locations where surveys should be conducted; the habitat and conditions in the proposed relocation site(s); the methods that would be used for trapping and relocating the individual species; and the method for documentation/recordation of the species and number of animals relocated. The Plan shall be submitted to the County by a qualified biologist prior to any ground disturbing activities within potentially occupied habitat. *Pre-Construction Surveys*. No more than 7 days prior to construction, a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey within areas of suitable habitat for special-status species wildlife (i.e., California legless lizard, California glossy snake, San Diegan tiger whiptail, Blainville's horned lizard, San Diego desert woodrat, and/or American badger). The biologist shall look for special-status species that may be located within or immediately adjacent to the project work areas, as permitted by access. If determined by the qualified biologist that based on the construction activities, time of year and special status wildlife species and location of the special-status wildlife species relocation is necessary to occur; relocation will occur to nearby undisturbed areas within suitable habitat in the on-site open space easement as specified in the Plan and a California scientific collecting permit (SCP) (if applicable), but as close to their origin as possible (consistent with the approved Plan). If an American badger maternity den(s) is identified within the Project's disturbance limits, then the den will be avoided until the young have left the den. Once the young have left the den, the American badger will be relocated in accordance with this measure. The biologist relocating the species shall possess a California SCP to handle these species if required by applicable CDFW regulations. A qualified biologist shall be present during initial ground-disturbing activities (i.e. vegetation removal) immediately adjacent to or within the vegetation communities and/or disturbed habitats that could support populations of special-status wildlife species to monitor vegetation removal and topsoil salvaging and stockpiling, where applicable. If special-status species reptiles or woodrats are detected in the work area during biological monitoring, the individual(s) will be documented and relocated as per the approved Plan and in accordance with the SCP conditions as applicable. **Documentation:** The Project Biologist shall prepare the final survey report and relocation plan and submit it to the PDS for review and approval. **Timing:** Surveys shall be conducted prior to any clearing, grubbing, trenching, grading, or any land disturbances. Prior to final grading release, or use of the premises in reliance of this permit, the final survey report and Relocation Plan shall be approved. **Monitoring:** The PDS shall review the final survey report and Relocation Plan for compliance with this condition and the report format guidelines. Upon approval of the report, PDS shall inform the applicant that the requirement is complete and the bond amount can be relinquished. ~~(c)~~(d) In order to avoid impacts to nesting birds, and burrowing owls, American badger, San Diego desert woodrat, and special status reptile species during decommissioning the Project operator shall be required to implement the measures outlined in subsections (a), (b) and (~~b~~c) prior to undertaking decommissioning activities.
M-BI-6	**Bat Surveys and Roost Avoidance or Exclusion.** To determine whether there is an active maternity roost within the buildings and other structures to be demolished, a bat biologist shall conduct surveys within the maternity roosting season prior to demolition of the buildings or any other areas that provide suitable roosting habitat for bats. If a potential maternity roost is present, ~~the following measures shall be implemented to reduce the potential impact on special-status bat species to a less than significant level:~~ a. ~~**Maternity Roosting Season Avoidance.**~~ Aall demolition activities, or bat roost exclusion, shall occur outside the general bat maternity roosting season of March through August to reduce any potentially significant impact to maternity roosting bats. ~~If the maternity roosting season cannot be avoided, then roost exclusion can occur outside the maternity roosting season (September through February) to exclude~~

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

	~~bats from the demolition area prior to the start of demolition during the maternity roosting season. Items b and c below will be required to ensure no impacts occur to roosting bats during the exclusion process.~~ b. **Replacement Roost Installation.** Although no special status bat species are expected to roost within the structures on the Project site, ~~If~~ if there is a potential or known day ~~maternity~~ roost (i.e., non-maternity roost) of a special-status bat within a structure to be demolished, ~~a~~ replacement roost installation shall ~~occur~~ be installed, ~~outside of the maternity roosting season~~ within the biological open space easement. The land east of the structures shall be added to the open space easement if replacement roosts are required. The size of land to be added shall be determined by a bat biologist. At least one month prior to the exclusion of bats from the ~~roost(s)~~structure, the ~~project applicant~~ bat biologist will procure and install at least two bat ~~boxes~~ houses built specifically for the species that occur on site, or purchased from a reputable vendor if suitable for species that occur on site, ~~such as Bat Conservation and Management,~~ to allow bats sufficient time to acclimate to a new potential roost location. The bat ~~boxes~~houses shall be installed in an area that is close to suitable foraging habitat as determined by a biologist who specializes in bats in consultation with County staff. Additionally, the bat ~~boxes~~houses will be oriented to the south or southwest, and the area chosen for the bat ~~boxes~~ houses must receive sufficient sunlight (at least 6 hours daily) to allow the bat boxes to reach an optimum internal temperature (approximately 90°F) to mimic the existing bat roost. The bat ~~boxes~~houses will be suitable to house crevice-roosting bat species, and large enough to contain a minimum of 50 bats ~~(e.g., Four Chamber Premium Bat House or Bat Bunker Plus)~~. The bat ~~boxes~~houses shall be installed on a 20-foot-tall steel pole with a concrete base. ~~Should the bat boxes be required, m~~Maintenance of the ~~boxes~~houses will be included in the RMP to ensure long-term use/functionality. Quarterly monitoring shall be required after installation until it can be established that the bat house is being used by bats and which bat species are using the houses. A report shall be submitted to the County after 1 year of monitoring documenting if bat houses are being used and by what species. The report will include any necessary repairs or maintenance to the bat houses, if needed. c. **Roost Exclusion.** ~~Roost exclusion must only occur September through February to increase the potential to exclude all bats from roosts and minimize the potential for a significant impact to occur by avoiding the maternity roosting season~~. A minimum of one month after bat houses ~~boxes~~ have been installed, exclusion of the existing roost within the buildings will occur. The primary exit points for roosting bats will be identified, and all secondary ingress/ egress locations ~~on the buildings~~ will be covered with a tarp or wood planks to prevent bats from leaving from other locations. The primary exit point will remain uncovered to allow exclusion devices to be installed. Exclusion devices will consist of ~~a screen~~ plastic sheeting, or similar material (e.g., poly netting, window screen, or fiberglass screening) with mesh 1/6 of an inch or smaller, installed at the top of the roost location and sealed and passing 2 feet below the bottom of the primary exit point. The exclusion devices will be installed at night to increase the potential that bats will have already left the roost and are less likely to return. Exclusion devices will be left in place for one week to ensure that any remaining bats in the roost(s) are excluded. A passive acoustic monitoring detector will also be deployed during the exclusion period in order to verify excluded species and monitor whether bat activity has decreased during the exclusion period. Periodic monitoring should also be conducted during the exclusion period to observe whether any bats are still emerging from additional areas within the impact footprint, and an active monitoring survey should be conducted on the final night of exclusion to ensure that no bats are emerging from the ~~buildings~~ excluded roost and determine whether exclusion has been successful. Any continued presence of roosting bats will require an adjustment to the exclusion devices and schedule. The exclusion devices may remain in place until the start of demolition activities. If any bats are found roosting in any proposed demolition areas prior to demolition, additional exclusion will be required and follow the same methodology described in this mitigation measure. This will occur until all bats are excluded. ~~d.~~ **Survey Report**. Following completion of the survey the bat biologist will complete a survey report which records the findings. ~~If active roosts are observed, and the maternity roosting season cannot be avoided,~~

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

	~~and bats must be removed, the report will also document the replacement roost installation and roost exclusion.~~ **Documentation:** The Project Biologist shall prepare the final report and submit it to the PDS for review and approval. The final report shall document the replacement roost installation, including mapped locations and photographs, species using the bat houses, and roost exclusion. **Timing:** If the bat houses are occupied, ~~Prior~~ prior to final grading release, or use of the premises in reliance of this permit, the final report shall be approved by the County. If the bat houses are not being used prior to final grading release, or use of premises in reliance of this permit, the annual monitoring report will document the condition and vacancy of the bat houses. **Monitoring:** The PDS shall review the final report for compliance with this condition and the report format guidelines. Upon approval of the report, PDS shall inform the applicant that the requirement is complete and the bond amount can be relinquished.
M-BI-7	**Biological Monitoring of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) Implementation.** During construction monitoring, the Project Biologist shall verify the following are implemented: a. No planting or seeding of invasive plant species on the most recent version of the California Invasive Plant Council's California Invasive Plant Inventory for the project region. b. Dust-control fencing is in place and intact if fencing is required. c. Construction activity is located outside of jurisdictional waters of the United States/state except as authorized by applicable law and permit(s), including permits and authorizations approved by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and Regional Water Quality Control Board. d. Silt-settling basins installed during the construction process are located away from areas of ponded or flowing water to prevent discolored, silt-bearing water from reaching areas of ponded or flowing water during normal flow regimes. Design of drainage facilities shall incorporate long-term control of pollutants and stormwater flow to minimize pollution and hydrologic changes. e. Temporary structures, staging, and storage areas for construction equipment and/or materials are located outside of jurisdictional waters, including wetlands and riparian areas. f. No material stockpiles, debris, bark, slash sawdust, rubbish, cement, concrete or washing thereof, oil, or petroleum products are stored where they may be washed by rainfall or runoff into jurisdictional waters of the United States/state. g. When construction operations are completed, excess materials or debris have been removed from the work area. h. No equipment maintenance is performed within or near jurisdictional waters of the United States/state where petroleum products or other pollutants from the equipment may enter these areas. i. Fully covered trash receptacles that are animal-proof and weather-proof are installed and used by the operator to contain all food, food scraps, food wrappers, beverage containers, and other miscellaneous trash. Littering is prohibited and removal of trash from construction areas daily is required. All food-related trash and garbage are removed from construction sites on a daily basis. j. There are no pets on or adjacent to construction sites. k. Speed limits in and around all construction areas are enforced so that vehicles do not exceed 15 miles per hour on unpaved roads and the right-of-way accessing the construction site, or 10 miles per hour during the night.
M-BI-8	**Prevention of Chemical Pollutants**. Weed control treatments shall include all legally permitted chemical, manual, and mechanical methods applied with the authorization of the County of San Diego (County) agriculture commissioner. The application of herbicides shall be in compliance with all federal and state laws and regulations under the prescription of a licensed Pest Control Adviser with at least 2-years' experience and

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

	implemented by a licensed applicator. Where manual and/or mechanical methods are used, disposal of the plant debris shall follow the regulations set by the County agriculture commissioner. The timing of the weed control treatment shall be determined for each plant species in consultation with the Pest Control Adviser, the County agriculture commissioner, and the California Invasive Plant Council, with the goal of controlling populations before they start producing seeds. During project operation, all areas that use chemicals that are potentially toxic or impactive to sensitive habitats or plants shall incorporate best management practices (e.g., avoid applications during or before rain events and avoid placing materials close to sensitive habitats) on site to reduce impacts caused by the application and/or drainage of such materials within the development footprint. In addition, use of rodenticides and pesticides shall not be allowed. Weed treatment shall occur at least once per year throughout the life of the project.
M-BI-9	**Prevention of Invasive Plant Species.** A County of San Diego-approved plant list shall be used for areas immediately adjacent to open space. A hydroseed mix that incorporates native species, is appropriate to the area, and is free from invasive species shall be used for landscaped areas adjacent to the biological open space. The San Diego County Planning & Development Services landscape architect shall require that all final landscape plans comply with the following: no invasive plant species, as included on the most recent version of the California Invasive Plant Council's California Invasive Plant Inventory for the project region shall be included, and the plant palette shall be composed of native species that do not require high irrigation rates. The Project Biologist shall periodically check landscape products for compliance with these requirements.
M-BI-10	**Operations and Maintenance Signage**. Signage shall be posted at all entrances to the facility stating that operations and maintenance personnel shall be prohibited from the following: • Harming, harassing, or feeding wildlife and/or collecting special-status plant or wildlife species • Smoking • Traveling (either on foot or in a vehicle) outside of the solar facility undisturbed portions of the Project site • No pets • No Littering • No persons not conducing operations and maintenance activities shall remain at the facility after daylight hours or exceed normal nighttime operational noise or lighting
M-BI-11	**Noise Reduction.** Construction-related activities that are excessively noisy (e.g., clearing, grading, or grubbing) adjacent to breeding/nesting areas shall incorporate noise-reduction measures (described below) or be curtailed during the breeding/nesting season of sensitive bird species. • Trucks and other engine-powered equipment shall be equipped with noise reduction features, such as mufflers and engine shrouds, which are no less effective than those originally installed by the manufacturer. • Trucks and other engine-powered equipment shall be operated in accordance with posted speed limits and limited engine idling requirements. • Usage of truck engine exhaust compression braking systems shall be limited to emergencies. • Back-up beepers for all construction equipment and vehicles shall be adjusted to the lowest noise levels possible, provided that Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and Cal OSHA's safety requirements are not violated. These settings shall be retained for the duration of construction activities. • Vehicle horns shall be used only when absolutely necessary, as specified in the contractor's specifications. • Radios and other noise-generating "personal equipment" shall be prohibited. If construction-related activities that are excessively noisy (e.g., clearing, grading, grubbing, or blasting) occur during the period of January 15 through August 31, a County of San Diego-approved biologist shall conduct preconstruction surveys in suitable nesting habitat adjacent to the construction area to determine the location of any active nests in the area (see **M-BI-5**).

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

Cultural Resources Mitigation Measures	
M-CR-1	**Temporary Fencing.** To prevent inadvertent disturbance of archaeological sites within the avoidance areas and to the unimpacted portions of the site outside of the ADI, temporary fencing shall be installed where resources are located within 50 feet of the Project ADI. The temporary fencing shall include the following requirements: 1. Prior to the commencement of any grading and/or clearing in association with the grading and/or improvement plan, temporary construction fencing shall be placed to protect from inadvertent disturbance archaeological sites or portions of sites (CA-SDI-4457/H, CA-SDI-6741, CA-SDI-7054, CA-SDI-7056/H, CA-SDI-8430, CA-SDI- 11676, CA-SDI-11686, and CA-SDI-19910) adjacent to the Project ADI during earth-disturbing activities. Temporary fencing shall be installed prior to the pre-construction meeting and any clearing, grubbing, trenching, grading, or land disturbances and shall remain for the duration of earth-disturbing activities o Temporary fencing is required in all locations of the Project where proposed grading or clearing is within 50 feet of any archaeological site outside of the Project ADI (CA-SDI-11682, and CA-SDI-20985). o The placement of such fencing shall be approved by the County. Upon approval, the fencing shall remain in place until the conclusion of grading activities, after which the fencing shall be removed. o Installation of temporary fencing shall require the presence of monitor(s) (Archaeological & Native American) pursuant to M-CR-2. o A signed and stamped statement from a California Registered Engineer, or licensed surveyor shall be submitted to Planning & Development Services for approval. The statement shall identify that temporary fencing has been installed in all required locations where grading or clearing is within 50 feet of an archaeological site outside of the Project ADI.
M-CR-2	**Archaeological Monitoring.** To mitigate for potential impacts to undiscovered, buried archaeological resources within the Project ADI and to mitigate the additional impacts to known archaeological resources, an archaeological monitoring program and potential data recovery program shall be implemented pursuant to the County of San Diego's (County's) Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Requirements for Cultural Resources and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and shall include the following requirements: • Pre-Construction o The applicant shall contract with a County-approved archaeologist to perform archaeological monitoring. The project archaeologist shall contract with a Kumeyaay monitor to conduct Native American monitoring for the Proposed Project. o Pre-construction meeting to be attended by the Project Archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor(s) to explain the monitoring requirements. • Construction o Temporary Fencing. Temporary orange construction fencing shall be installed around unimpacted portions of CA-SDI-4457/H, CA-SDI-6741, CA-SDI-7054, CA-SDI-7056/H, CA-SDI-8430, CA-SDI-11676, CA-SDI- 11686, and CA-SDI-19910 and along the MUP boundaries where cultural resources (CA-SDI-11682, and CA-SDI-20985, and CA-SDI-21757) are within 50 feet of the Project ADI. An archaeological monitor and Kumeyaay Native American monitor shall be present to assure proper placement of construction fencing and to prevent impacts to cultural resources. o Monitoring. Both the archaeological and Kumeyaay Native American monitor(s) are to be on site during earth disturbing activities. The frequency and location of monitoring of native soils will be determined by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Kumeyaay Native American monitor(s). Both the archaeological and Kumeyaay Native American monitor(s) shall evaluate fill soils to ensure that they are negative for cultural resources

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

	○ If cultural resources are identified: ▪ Both the archaeological and Kumeyaay Native American monitor(s) have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of the discovery. ▪ The archaeological monitor shall contact the Project Archaeologist. ▪ The Project Archaeologist shall contact the County Archaeologist. ▪ The Project Archaeologist in consultation with the County Archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor(s) shall determine the significance of discovered resources. ▪ The Project Archeologist shall notify the Campo Band of Mission Indians, Manzanita Band of the Kumeyaay Nation and Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians of the unanticipated discovery. ▪ Should a potential TCR be identified, the Project Archaeologist shall consult with consulting tribes for a final determination. ▪ Construction activities will be allowed to resume after the County Archaeologist has concurred with the significance evaluation. ▪ Isolates and non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field. Should the isolates and non-significant deposits not be collected by the archaeological monitor, the Kumeyaay Native American monitor(s) may collect the cultural material for transfer to a Tribal curation facility or repatriation program. ▪ If cultural resources are determined to be significant, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program shall be prepared by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Kumeyaay Native American monitor(s) and approved by the County Archaeologist. The program shall include reasonable efforts to preserve (avoid) unique cultural resources of Sacred Sites; the capping of identified Sacred Sites or unique cultural resources and placement of development over the cap if avoidance is infeasible; and data recovery for non-unique cultural resources. The preferred option is preservation (avoidance). ○ Human Remains. ▪ The Property Owner or their representative shall contact the County Coroner and the County Planning & Development Services (PDS) Staff Archaeologist. ▪ Upon identification of human remains, no further disturbance shall occur in the area of the find until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Should the human remains need to be taken offsite for evaluation, they shall be accompanied by a Kumeyaay Native American monitor. ▪ If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), shall be contacted by the Property Owner or their representative in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains. ▪ The Project Archeologist shall notify the Campo Band of Mission Indians, Manzanita Band of Kumeyaay Nation, and Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians of the identification of human remains. ▪ The immediate vicinity where the Native American human remains are located is not to be damaged or disturbed by further development activity until consultation with the MLD regarding their recommendations as required by Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 has been conducted. ▪ Public Resources Code §5097.98, CEQA §15064.5 and Health & Safety Code §7050.5 shall be followed in the event that human remains are discovered. • Rough Grading ○ Upon completion of Rough Grading, a monitoring report shall be prepared identifying whether resources were encountered. A copy of the monitoring report shall be provided to any culturally affiliated tribe who requests a copy.

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

	• Final Grading o A final report shall be prepared substantiating that earth-disturbing activities are completed and whether cultural resources were encountered. A copy of the final report shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center, and any culturally affiliated tribe who requests a copy. o Cultural Material Conveyance ▪ The final report shall include evidence that all prehistoric materials have been curated at a San Diego County, Imperial County, or culturally affiliated Tribal curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, or alternatively have been repatriated to a culturally affiliated tribe. ▪ The final report shall include evidence that all historic materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79.
M-CR-3	**Cultural Resources Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan** Prior to the approval of any plan or issuance of any permit, and prior to use of the premises in reliance on this permit, the Cultural Resources Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan shall be submitted to County of San Diego Director of Planning & Development Services for review and approval. The Plan shall be prepared by the Project archaeologist in coordination with consulting tribes and Kumeyaay Native American monitor(s) and shall include but not be limited to the following: • Parties entering into the agreement and contact information. • Responsibilities of the Property Owner or their representative, Principal Investigator, archaeological monitors, Kumeyaay Native American monitors, and the Tribe. • Requirements of the Archaeological Monitoring Program including unanticipated discoveries. The requirements shall address grading and grubbing requirements including controlled grading and controlled vegetation removal in areas of cultural sensitivity, analysis of identified cultural materials (both in the field and lab settings), and onsite storage of cultural materials, as necessary and if required. • Treatment of identified Native American cultural materials. • Treatment of Native American human remains and associated grave goods. • Requirements for Temporary Fencing for 10 sites that partially intersect or are within 50 feet of the Project ADI (CA-SDI-4457/H, CA-SDI-6741, CA-SDI-7054, CA-SDI-7056/H, CA-SDI-8430, CA-SDI-11676, CA-SDI-11682, CA-SDI-11686, and CA-SDI-19910, and CA-SDI-20985). • Confidentiality of cultural information including location and data. • Negotiation of disagreements should they arise during the implementation of the Agreement and Preservation Plan. • Regulations that apply to cultural resources that have been identified or may be identified during project construction.
M-CR-4	**Long-Term Preservation of Resources** All O&M and decommissioning activities will be performed within the Project ADI – no ground-disturbing activities shall occur outside the Project ADI. Employees and contractors performing O&M and decommissioning activities will receive training or instructions regarding the archaeological and cultural sensitivity of the Project Area to ensure no inadvertent impacts occur to the 10 potentially significant sites (or portions thereof) that are adjacent to the Project ADI. These include the eight sites that were fully or partially tested because they intersect the Project ADI and the three sites that were not evaluated because they are outside of the Project ADI but require protection because they are within 50 feet of the Project ADI. Temporary fencing shall be installed during decommissioning activities to delineate the ADI. Temporary fencing requirements are provided in **M-CR-1.**

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

Geology, Soils and Seismicity Mitigation Measures	
M-GEO-1	Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Project applicant shall retain a California Certified Engineering Geologist or Civil engineer specializing in geotechnical engineering to perform a detailed site-specific subsurface report or preliminary geotechnical investigation, consistent with the California Building Code. The California Building Code (which incorporates the International Building Code) is contained in the California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 2, which is a portion of the California Building Standards Code, and includes design and construction requirements related to life safety and structural safety. The geotechnical study shall include subsurface investigation, laboratory testing, and additional deep explorations using borings ~~of 60 feet or more~~ and/or cone penetrometer tests ~~across the alluviated portions~~ in the vicinity of the substation and Switchyard Facilities ~~of the Proposed Project site~~ to sufficient, as determined by the California Certified Engineering Geologist or Civil Engineer specializing in geotechnical engineering in accordance with applicable regulations, to further define the alluvium profile and ~~quantitatively~~ qualitatively address the potential for soil liquefaction and lateral spreading ~~across the site~~. The subsurface geotechnical study shall also include recommendations for the proposed construction and grading such as remedial grading, ground improvement techniques, special foundation design, and other recommendations to ensure that construction of the project does not pose risk to human life in a seismic event as the result of ~~in~~ substantial liquefaction, subsidence, or seismic-related ground failure due to lateral spread. In addition, the Proposed Project shall implement any necessary measures required to comply with existing building codes and regulations.
Hydrology and Water Quality Mitigation Measures	
M-HYD-1	Prior to approval of final design plans, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the County DPW Flood Control through hydrologic and hydraulic analyses, acceptable to DPW Flood Control and performed by a California licensed engineer in accordance with standard engineering practice, that the design features for the perimeter fencing avoids the blockage and/or redirection of storm flows resulting from the accumulation of debris and/or detritus at wash crossings. This can be accomplished through a number of means such as a) use of breakaway fencing perpendicular to flood flows, b) use of fencing that spans washes (without posts) above the anticipated peak flow depth, c) or an alternative design measure that would avoid accumulations of detritus at perimeter fence wash crossings, subject to County approval. **Documentation:** The applicant shall show the proposed fencing design or alternative design measure on the Final Grading Plans. The associated Drainage Study shall contain hydrologic and hydraulic analyses, acceptable to DPW Flood Control and performed by a California licensed engineer in accordance with standard engineering practice, that model the proposed fencing and/or design measures and demonstrate that the fencing will not cause alteration of drainage patterns and/or flood hazards from pre-project conditions. The Drainage Study shall be in compliance with the County Hydrology Manual and the County Hydraulic Design Manual. **Timing:** Prior to the approval of any grading and/or improvement plans and issuance of Grading or Construction Permits, the Drainage Study and Plans shall be approved. **Monitoring:** The County DPW Flood Control shall review and approve the hydrologic and hydraulic analyses contained in the Drainage Study and the final fencing design and layout to ensure the flood flow is fully mitigated to pre-project conditions.
Noise Mitigation Measures	
M-NOI-1	The Proposed Project would comply with the County's Noise Ordinance §36.404 based upon the current proposed layout of the Proposed Project and the anticipated major noise producing operating stationary equipment (Equipment) deployed for the Proposed Project. The Equipment modeled in the Acoustical Analysis Report (AAR) prepared for the EIR was selected as representative technology at the time the 2020 AAR was prepared. The Project applicant may propose to use different Equipment than what was used to perform the noise modeling in the AAR or propose a change in the Equipment layout. If different Equipment is selected and/or the layout of Equipment is changed subsequent to Project approval, the applicant will be required to submit a revised AAR, and a revised site plan if needed, as follows:

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

	a. The Project applicant shall retain a County Approved CEQA Noise Consultant to prepare a new predictive operations noise analysis in accordance with the County's Noise Report Format and Content requirement b. Any proposed Equipment selections, equipment duty cycles, Project layout alterations, and/or the addition, modification, reduction of the preceding equipment noise limits and measures may be approved, if they are demonstrated to comply with applicable outdoor hourly Leq noise limits per Section 36.404(a) of the County's Noise Ordinance at the property line. c. The above identified measures shall take place prior to approval of any building plans for the Proposed Project. Any alterations or modifications proposed and approved pursuant to this procedure shall be included in the proposed Project design plans.
M-NOI-2	**PV Panel Washing Protocol**: To ensure noise from mobile operating equipment associated with regular cleansing of Project PV panel surfaces complies with daytime County noise standards, the following shall be implemented: a. As part of the Project operations and maintenance program, the Applicant shall prepare a PV Panel Washing Plan (PVPWP) that addresses the usage of self-propelled or towed washing systems during the expected quarterly (or other frequency as reasonably anticipated annually) PV panel washing. The PVPWP shall demonstrate compliance with the County Noise Ordinance for avoiding potential impacts caused by operating PV panel washing equipment and vehicle noise sufficiently proximate to the property on which the noise is produced or at any location on a property that is receiving the noise. The PVPWP shall be submitted to County Planning & Development Services (PDS) a minimum of 30 days prior to the first PV panel washing. The County shall review the PVPWP to ensure compliance with the County Noise Ordinance prior to any panel washing. A subsequent plan shall be submitted to County PDS if there are any anticipated changes to the panel washing in the future. The subsequent Plan shall be submitted to the County 30 days prior to any new PV panel washing procedures occur. Components of the PVPWP shall include the following: • Affected property owners shall be notified in writing two weeks prior to PV panel washing activity within 500 feet of their property boundaries. ~~• Noise emission from a self-propelled PV panel washer (Mazaka, MultiOne, or comparable) must not exceed 83 dBA Leq at 16 feet over a full hour; and its operation must be restricted to daytime operation at the specified distance between it and a position along the property line that adjoins S80, RR or similar County- classified Noise Zone 1 property:~~ ~~within 150 feet – not permitted;~~ ~~150 to 250 feet – up to five minutes within any hour;~~ ~~250 to 300 feet – up to fifteen minutes within any hour;~~ ~~300 to 450 feet – up to thirty minutes within any hour; and,~~ ~~beyond 450 feet – no restriction.~~ ~~• Noise emission from a self-propelled PV panel washer (Mazaka, MultiOne, or comparable) must not exceed 83 dBA Leq at 16 feet over a full hour; and its operation must be restricted to daytime operation at the specified distance between it and a position along the property line that adjoins C44 or similar County- classified Noise Zone 3 property:~~ ~~within 100 feet – not permitted;~~ ~~100 to 150 feet – up to five minutes within any hour;~~ ~~150 to 200 feet – up to fifteen minutes within any hour;~~ ~~200 to 250 feet – up to thirty minutes within any hour; and,~~ ~~beyond 250 feet – no restriction~~ • Noise emission from a pick-up truck (or ATV) and its towed IPC Eagle wash station (or comparable equipment) must not exceed 74 dBA Leq at 9 feet over a full hour; and, its operation must be restricted

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

	to daytime operation at the specified distance between it and a position along the property line that adjoins S80, RR or similar County-classified Noise Zone 1 property: within 50 feet – not permitted; 50 to 75 feet – up to five minutes within any hour; 75 to 100 feet – up to fifteen minutes within any hour; 100 to 125 feet – up to forty-five minutes within any hour; and, beyond 125 feet – no restriction. • Noise emission from a pick-up truck (or ATV) and its towed IPC Eagle wash station (or comparable equipment) must not exceed 74 dBA Leq at 9 feet over a full hour; and, its operation must be restricted to daytime operation at the specified distance between it and a position along the property line that adjoins C44 or similar County-classified Noise Zone 3 property: within 25 feet – not permitted; 25 to 40 feet – up to five minutes within any hour; 40 to 60 feet – up to fifteen minutes within any hour; 60 to 75 feet – up to thirty minutes within any hour; and, beyond 75 feet – no restriction. • Visual guides (flags, reflectors, or other markers) shall clearly delineate distances or zones of operation allowed for either of the afore-mentioned PV panel washing systems (self-propelled or towed). b. Operators of the PV panel washing equipment shall be informed of the PVPWP as part of customary on-site Project training and awareness of County noise standard compliance to avoid potential noise impacts to the Jacumba Hot Springs community
N-NOI-3	**Construction Noise Management Plan**: Prior to construction and decommissioning, the Applicant shall prepare a construction noise management plan (CNMP) which establishes construction activity restrictions in order to reliably achieve compliance with the County's 8-hour 75 dBA Leq standard at the Project property lines adjoining existing occupied properties (defined by Section 36.402.m as "property on which there is a building for which a certificate of occupancy has been issued"). The CNMP shall demonstrate compliance with the County Noise Ordinance for avoiding potential impacts caused by operating construction equipment and vehicle noise sufficiently proximate to these property lines of occupied properties. The CNMP shall be submitted to County Planning & Development Services (PDS) thirty (30) days prior to any land disturbance. Components of the CNMP shall include the following: a. Affected property owners shall be notified in writing two weeks prior to construction activity within 500 feet of their property boundaries. b. In order to comply with the County Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409 – Construction Equipment), the acoustical usage factors (AUF) of heavy construction equipment used on the Project site shall be comparable to those listed on Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM) User's Guide Table 1, reference Lmax values at 50 feet shall be the lower of either the "Spec. 721.560" or "Actual Measured" values from the same RCNM User's Guide Table 1, and duration of heavy equipment operating for construction shall comply with the following limitations by activity, for the specified distance between the indicated heavy equipment operations and a position along the property line of an occupied parcel: • Perimeter fence installation – up to two flatbed trucks and a front end loader: within 15 feet – not permitted; 15 to 25 feet – no more than twenty minutes per 8-hour period; 25 to 50 feet – no more than one hour per 8-hour period; 50 to 75 feet – no more than 4 hours per 8-hour period; and, beyond 75 feet – no restriction.

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

	• Site preparation (clearing) – water truck and tractor (mowing attachment): within 20 feet – not permitted; 20 to 25 feet – no more than twenty minutes per 8-hour period; 25 to 50 feet – no more than thirty minutes per 8-hour period; 50 to 75 feet – no more than 2 hours per 8-hour period; 75 to 100 feet – no more than 4 hours per 8-hour period; and, beyond 100 feet – no restriction. • Site preparation (earth-moving) – bulldozer, water truck, and scraper: within 25 feet – not permitted; 25 to 50 feet – no more than twenty minutes per 8-hour period; 50 to 75 feet – no more than one hour per 8-hour period; 75 to 100 feet – no more than three hours per 8-hour period; 100 to 125 feet – no more than six hours per 8-hour period; and, beyond 125 feet – no restriction. • Site preparation (grading) – flatbed truck, grader, water truck, and sheepsfoot roller: within 25 feet – not permitted; 25 to 50 feet – no more than twenty minutes per 8-hour period; 50 to 75 feet – no more than one hour per 8-hour period; 75 to 100 feet – no more than three hours per 8-hour period; 100 to 125 feet – no more than six hours per 8-hour period; and, beyond 125 feet – no restriction. • Underground work (trenching) – excavator, sheepsfoot roller, water truck, 5kW generator, and gradall (4x4 forklift): within 25 feet – not permitted; 25 to 50 feet – no more than twenty minutes per 8-hour period; 50 to 75 feet – no more than 1.5 hours per 8-hour period; 75 to 100 feet – no more than 3 hours per 8-hour period; and, beyond 100 feet – no restriction. • Underground work (back-filling) – Aussie padder, sheepsfoot roller, water truck, 5kW generator, and gradall (4x4 forklift): within 25 feet – not permitted; 25 to 50 feet – no more than twenty minutes per 8-hour period; 50 to 75 feet – no more than 1.5 hours per 8-hour period; 75 to 100 feet – no more than 3 hours per 8-hour period; and, beyond 100 feet – no restriction. • System installation – gradall (4x4 forklift), crane, ATV, vibratory pile driver (RGT Model RG21T or comparable), pick-up truck, and 5kW generator: within 25 feet – not permitted; 25 to 50 feet – no more than twenty minutes per 8-hour period; 50 to 75 feet – no more than 1.5 hours per 8-hour period; 75 to 100 feet – no more than 4 hours per 8-hour period; and, beyond 100 feet – no restriction. All construction equipment operations shall incorporate all recommended noise reducing measures such as, but not limited to, limiting construction equipment operations, installation of temporary noise barriers, and

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

	implementation of the recommendations within the CNMP to demonstrate compliance with the County Code Noise Ordinance, Sections 36.408 and 36.409. Concurrent construction activities may occur so long as next closest construction activity to the same studied property line position is at least four times its "no restriction" distance away. By way of example, if earth-moving was occurring near a fixed point on the potentially affected property line, the next-closest set of earth-moving equipment performing like work, or perhaps an overlapping and comparable scheduled activity (e.g., grading), would be permitted if no closer than 500 feet (= 4 x 125') from the same receptor point. c. If distance buffers or duration limits cannot be maintained, then the Project Applicant or its contractor will implement on-site temporary sound abatement measures, such as a field-erected noise barrier (e.g., sound blankets) of sufficient height and horizontal extent, or the placement of storage containers and other similarly solid sound-occluding structures, to ensure construction activity noise at the Project property line complies with County standards. d. The CNMP will also include direction for the Project applicant or its contractor(s) to implement the following: • Trucks and other engine-powered equipment shall be equipped with noise reduction features, such as mufflers and engine shrouds, which are no less effective than those originally installed by the manufacturer; • Trucks and other engine-powered equipment shall be operated in accordance with posted speed limits and limited engine idling requirements; • Usage of truck engine exhaust compression braking systems shall be limited to emergencies; • Back-up beepers for all construction equipment and vehicles shall be adjusted to the lowest noise levels possible, provided that Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and Cal OSHA's safety requirements are not violated; • Vehicle horns shall be used only when necessary, as specified in the contractor's specifications; and, • Radios and other noise-generating "personal equipment" shall be prohibited
Paleontological Mitigation Measures	
M-PR-1	Prior to commencement of any grading activity on-site, the applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist, subject to the review and approval of the County. The paleontologist shall prepare a Paleontological Resources Monitoring Program (PRMP) for the project. The PRMP shall be consistent with the guidelines of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (2010). The qualified paleontologist shall attend the preconstruction meeting and the paleontological monitor shall be on-site during rough grading and other significant ground-disturbing activities in previously undisturbed geological units with moderate to high paleontological resource sensitivity. In the event that paleontological resources (e.g., fossils) are unearthed during grading, the paleontological monitor shall temporarily halt and/or divert grading activity to allow recovery of paleontological resources. The area of discovery shall be contained with temporary orange construction fencing and shall include a 50-foot radius buffer. Once documentation and collection of the find is completed, the paleontological monitor shall remove the temporary orange construction fencing and grading will be allowed to recommence in the area of the find. Upon completion of the paleontological monitoring program, the qualified paleontologist shall prepare a final monitoring report documenting the results of the monitoring program. This report shall include a description of the methods used, stratigraphic section(s) exposed, fossils collected, and significance of recovered fossils.
Tribal Cultural Resources Mitigation Measures	
M-TCR-1	**Temporary Fencing.** To prevent inadvertent disturbance of tribal cultural resources (TCRs) within the avoidance areas (land outside of the Project ADI), temporary fencing shall be installed where resources are located within 50 feet of the Project ADI. The temporary fencing shall include the following requirements: • Prior to the commencement of any grading and/or clearing in association with the grading and/or improvement plan, temporary construction fencing shall be placed to protect archaeological sites or portions

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

	of sites adjacent to the Project ADI during earth-disturbing activities. Temporary fencing shall be installed prior to the pre- construction meeting and any clearing, grubbing, trenching, grading, or land disturbances; remain for the duration of earth-disturbing activities; and include the following: o Temporary fencing is required in all locations of the Project where proposed grading or clearing is within 50 feet of any archaeological site outside of the Project ADI. o The placement of such fencing shall be approved by the County. Upon approval, the fencing shall remain in place until the conclusion of grading activities, after which the fencing shall be removed. o Installation of temporary fencing shall require the presence of monitor(s) (Archaeological & Native American) pursuant to M-CR-2.
M-TCR-2	**Archaeological and Tribal Monitoring.** To mitigate for potential impacts to undiscovered, buried tribal cultural resources (TCRs) within the Project ADI, an archaeological and tribal monitoring program and potential data recovery program shall be implemented pursuant to the County of San Diego's (County's) Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Requirements for Cultural Resources and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and shall include the following requirements: a. Pre-Construction • The project developer shall contract with a County-approved archaeologist to perform archaeological monitoring. The Project archaeologist shall contract with a Kumeyaay Native American monitor(s) to conduct Native American monitoring for the Project. • The pre-construction meeting shall be attended by the Project archaeologist and the Kumeyaay Native American monitor(s) to explain the monitoring requirements. b. Construction • Monitoring o Both the Project archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor(s) are to be on site during all earth-disturbing activities. The frequency and location of monitoring of native soils shall be determined by the Project archaeologist and the Kumeyaay Native American monitor. Both the Project Archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor(s) will evaluate fill soils to ensure that they are negative for cultural resources • Inadvertent Discoveries o Both the Project archaeologist and the Kumeyaay Native American monitor have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of the discovery. o The Project archaeologist shall contact the County archaeologist. o The Project archaeologist, in consultation with the County archaeologist and the Kumeyaay Native American monitor, shall determine the significance of discovered resources and whether they constitute a TCR. o <u>The Project Archaeologist shall notify the Campo Band of Mission Indians, Manzanita Band of Kumeyaay Nation, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians of the unanticipated discovery.</u> o <u>Should a potential TCR be identified, the Project archaeologist shall consult with consulting tribes for a final determination.</u> o Construction activities shall be allowed to resume after the County archaeologist has agreed with the significance evaluation. o Isolates and non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field. If the isolates and non- significant deposits are not collected by the Project archaeologist, the Kumeyaay Native American monitor may collect the cultural material for transfer to a tribal curation facility or repatriation program.

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

	○ If cultural resources are determined to be significant, a research design and data recovery program shall be prepared by the Project archaeologist in consultation with the Kumeyaay Native American monitor and approved by the County archaeologist. The program shall include reasonable efforts to preserve (avoid) unique cultural resources or sacred sites, to cap identified sacred sites or unique cultural resources and to place development over the cap if avoidance is infeasible; and to perform data recovery for non-unique cultural resources. The preferred option is preservation (avoidance). c. Human Remains • The property owner or their representative shall contact the County coroner and the County Planning & Development Services staff archaeologist. • Upon identification of human remains, no further disturbance shall occur in the area of the find until the County coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Should the human remains need to be taken offsite for evaluation, they shall be accompanied by a Kumeyaay Native American monitor. • If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the most likely descendant (MLD), as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), shall be contacted by the property owner or their representative to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains. • The Project Archaeologist shall notify the Campo Band of Mission Indians, Manzanita Band of the Kumeyaay Nation, and Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians of the identification of human remains. • The immediate vicinity where the Native American human remains are located is not to be damaged or disturbed by further development activity until consultation with the MLD regarding their recommendations as required by California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98, has been conducted. • California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98; CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5; and California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5, shall be followed in the event that human remains are discovered. d. Rough Grading • Upon completion of rough grading, a monitoring report identifying whether resources were encountered shall be prepared. A copy of the monitoring report shall be provided to any culturally affiliated tribe that requests a copy. e. Final Grading • A final report substantiating that native soil-disturbing activities are completed and whether cultural resources were encountered shall be prepared. A copy of the final report shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) and any culturally affiliated tribe that requests a copy. f. Cultural Material Conveyance The final report shall include the following: • Evidence that all prehistoric materials have been curated at a San Diego County, Imperial County, or culturally affiliated Tribal curation facility or tribal curation facility that meets federal standards according to Title 36, Part 79, of the Code of Federal Regulations or alternatively have been repatriated to a culturally affiliated tribe. • Evidence that historic materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility that meets federal standards according to Title 36, Part 79, of the Code of Federal Regulations.
M-TCR-3	**Long-Term Preservation of Resources.** All O&M and decommissioning activities will be performed within the Project ADI – no ground-disturbing activities shall occur outside the Project ADI. Employees and contractors performing O&M and decommissioning activities will receive training or instructions regarding the archaeological and cultural sensitivity of the Project Area to ensure no inadvertent impacts occur to the 11 potentially significant cultural sites (or portions thereof) that are located within 50 feet of the Project ADI,

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

	including the eight sites that were fully or partially tested and the three that were not evaluated). Temporary fencing will be installed during decommissioning activities to delineate the ADI.
Wildfire Mitigation Measures	
M-WF-1	**Fire Protection Plan** Fire Protection Measures The Project's Fire Protection Plan (FPP) provides customized measures that address the identified potential fire hazards on the site. The measures are independently established but will work together to result in reduced fire threat and heightened fire protection. The following measures identified in Section 7 of the FPP will be implemented: • Fuel Modification throughout the solar facility site from boundaries inward, including beneath PV modules, around the collector substation and adjacent switchyard, with restrictions on plant species, heights, densities, and locations (Required measure). • Provide a technical report indicating special precautions for firefighting response (included as Appendix G of the FPP) (Code-exceeding measure). • Minimum 20-foot interior on-site inverter fore access driveways and a minimum improved 24-foot wide perimeter on-site driveways would be constructed (Required measure). • Participation in a County Fire Protection and Mitigation Agreement, for funding firefighting and emergency medical resources of which the details will be determined in the Project Fire Protection and Mitigation Agreement (Required measure). • Project funded annual fuel modification inspections to ensure compliance with this FPP (Code-exceeding requirement). • ~~Motion sensor~~ illuminated (and/or reflective) signage at main entrance with inverter and contact information for a 24-hour remote operations center for the Project ~~electrical grid disconnect and isolation information and identification~~ (Required measure). • Training program for local fire agencies on the deenergizing process that is controlled by the California Independent System Operator (CAISO), as described in Section 5.2.3 of the FPP. (Required measure). • Training program for local fire agencies including preparation of a technical training video with County input and customized for this facility that can be easily viewed by new firefighters who rotate through the local fire stations (Code-exceeding measure). • Preparation of a construction fire prevention plan (CFPP) for this project to be implemented by all contractors working on this project (CFPP included as Appendix A of the FPP) (Code-exceeding measure). • Portable carbon dioxide (CO2) fire extinguishers mounted at the inverters and medium voltage transformer units. • Six (6) 10,000-gallon water tanks dedicated for firefighting purposes; one tank will be provided at each driveway entrance to the solar panel areas as defined by geographic isolation from other sections and one tank will be provided near the substation (Required measure). • System contact information with local fire agencies/stations to assist responding firefighters during an emergency (Required measure). • Committed on-going maintenance of all facility components for the life of the project (Required measure). • Maintenance logs to be kept and made available upon request to SDCFPD ~~SDCFA~~/CAL FIRE (Required measure). • Consistent placarding and labeling of all components for fire safety/response (Required measure).

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

	Defensible Space and Fuel Modification The Project would provide defensible space by setting back all PV modules a minimum 30-feet from the solar facility's perimeter fence and modifying the fuels on-site by removing and grading them to a height of 6 inches, or, in the case of perimeter areas, drivable surfaces and vegetation free areas. The perimeter Fuel Modification Zone (FMZ) buffer will include at least 30 feet of modified fuels and will include the 30-foot wide perimeter fire access road, and cleared, contiguous modified fuel areas from the perimeter fence to the outermost panel racks. This area seamlessly meets the modified fuel areas that occur throughout the site where fuels are maintained at a 6-inch height. Defensible space around all electrical equipment would be provided by an FMZ buffer of 100 feet surrounding the project collector substation pad area and 100 feet surrounding the adjacent switchyard. The entire solar facility site would include modified fuels with fire access roadways and service roads compartmentalizing the low-growing (less than 6-inch) maintained areas beneath all PV modules, surrounding the collector substation pad area, and surrounding the adjacent switchyard. Fuel modification requirements are detailed in the Project FPP.
M-WF-2	**Construction Fire Protection Plan** Risk Reduction Measures Risk Reduction Measures as identified in the Project Construction Fire Protection Plan (included as Appendix A to the Fire Protection Plan) will be implemented, as appropriate, during the construction phase of the Project to reduce the risk of ignitions. These measures will be enforced through the Site Safety Officer (SSO) and ongoing worker safety training: • Fire rules shall be posted on the Project bulletin board at the contractor's field office and areas visible to employees. This shall include all contractors and subcontractors if more than one. • All internal combustion engines used at the Project site shall be equipped with spark arrestors that are in good working order. • Once initial two-track roads have been cut and initial fencing completed, light trucks and cars shall be used only on roads where the roadway is cleared of vegetation. Mufflers on all cars and light trucks shall be maintained in good working order. • The Project will be equipped with at least ~~one and up to two~~ water trucks each of 4,000- gallon capacity. Each truck will be equipped with 50 feet of 0.25-inch fast response hose with fog nozzles. Any hose size greater than 1.5 inches shall use National Hose (NH) couplings. ~~• During construction, the project site will have at a minimum two pick-up trucks outfitted with Type-6 Skid-Mounted Units, including fire pump, hose, and nozzle, that are staffed with personnel properly trained to use the equipment.~~ • A cache of shovels, McLeods, and Pulaskis shall be available at staging sites. The amount of equipment will be determined by consultation between SSO and SDCFPD ~~SDCFA~~/CAL FIRE. Additionally, on-site pickup trucks will be equipped with first aid kits, fire extinguishers, and shovels. Contractor vehicles will be required to include the same basic equipment. • Equipment parking areas and small stationary engine sites shall be cleared of all extraneous flammable materials and provided with a gravel surface. • A fire watch (i.e., person responsible for monitoring for ignitions) shall be provided during hot work and shall occur for up to one hour following completion of the hot work activities. • Smoking will not be permitted on the site. • Each Project construction site, if construction occurs simultaneously at various locations on the site, shall be equipped with fire extinguishers and firefighting equipment sufficient to extinguish small fires.

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

	• The on-site contractor or Project staff shall coordinate with SDCFPD ~~SDCFA~~/CAL FIRE to create a training component for emergency first responders to prepare for specialized emergency incidents that may occur at the Project site. • All on-site employees shall participate in fire prevention and response training exercises with the SDCFPD ~~SDCFA~~/CAL FIRE. • The Project shall implement ongoing fire patrols during the fire season as defined by local and state agencies. The SSO will be assigned as fire patrol to monitor work activities when an activity risk exists for fire compliance. The SSO shall verify proper tools and equipment are on site, assess any fire agency work restrictions, and serve as a lookout for fire starts, including staying behind (e.g., a fire watch) to make certain no residual fire exists. Fire watch may be performed by any site personnel. A SSO shall perform routine patrols of the Project site during the fire season equipped with a portable fire extinguisher and communications equipment. The Project staff shall notify SDCFPD ~~SDCFA~~/CAL FIRE of the name and contact information of the current SSO in the event of any change. • Fires ignited on site shall be immediately reported via SDCFPD ~~SDCFA~~ and CAL FIRE. • The engineering, procurement, and construction contracts for the Project shall clearly state the fire safety requirements that are the responsibility of any person who enters the site, as described in this CFPP. Daily Fire Prevention Measures To limit the risk of fires, all site staff, employees, and contractors shall take the following precautions during Project construction: • Fire safety shall be a component of daily tailgate meetings. Foremen will remind employees of fire safety, prevention, and emergency protocols on a daily basis. • Smoking will not be permitted in the project site. Combustible materials shall be stored in areas away from native vegetation. Whenever combustibles are being stored in the open air, the SSO shall be informed of the situation. • Evacuation routes shall be maintained and free of obstructions. Unavoidable evacuation route blockages shall be coordinated such that a secondary route is identified and available. • Disposal of combustible waste in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations shall be required. • Use and storage of flammable materials in areas away from ignition sources shall be required. • Proper storage of chemicals such that incompatible (i.e., chemically reactive) substances would be separated appropriately shall be required. • Performance of hot work (i.e., welding or working with an open flame or other ignition sources) in controlled areas under the supervision of a fire watch shall be required. Fire watch may be any site personnel who would watch for accidental ignitions. Hot work permits are required and shall be reviewed and granted by the SSO for all hot work. • Equipment shall be kept in good working order by inspecting electrical wiring and appliances regularly and maintaining motors and tools free of excessive dust and grease. • Ensuring that heating units are safeguarded shall be required. • Immediate reporting of fuel or petroleum leaks. The site mechanic shall ensure that leaks are repaired immediately upon notification. • Immediate repair and cleanup of flammable liquid leaks shall be required. • Construction work areas shall be kept free of combustible materials. • Extension cords shall not be relied on if wiring improvements are needed, and overloading of circuits with multiple pieces of equipment shall be prohibited. • Turning off and unplugging electrical equipment when not in use.

Table S-2
Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

	Red Flag Warning Protocol Red Flag Warnings are issued by the National Weather Service and indicate that conditions are such (low humidity, high winds) that wildfire ignitions and spread may be facilitated. To ensure compliance with Red Flag Warnings restrictions, the National Weather Service website shall be monitored at the site (http://www.srh.noaa.gov/ridge2/fire/briefing.php). During Red Flag Warnings, construction activities shall be limited and precautions may be taken onsite during periods of a Red Flag Warning, when conditions such as low humidity and high winds are present. Upon announcement of a Red Flag Warning, red flags shall be prominently displayed at the entrance gate and main office, indicating to employees and contractors that restrictions are in place. Additionally, any hot work, grading, or other work that could result in heat, flame, sparks, or may cause an ignition to vegetation shall be limited to low fire hazard, non-hot work, unless within an ignition resistant structure until the Red Flag Warning has been lifted. Areas may be evacuated where personnel may be exposed to higher risks. If vehicles are required to be used during Red Flag Warning conditions, vehicles shall remain only on designated access roads on the site.
M-WF-3	**Fire Protection and Mitigation Agreement:** As a condition to providing service and pursuant to the Safety Element of the General Plan, the applicant shall enter into a Fire Protection and Mitigation Agreement with the San Diego County Fire ~~Authority~~ Protection District prior to approval of a Major Use Permit to make a fair share contribution toward local emergency response capabilities. The funding shall be used by the SDCFPD ~~SDCFA~~ to mitigate risks of wildfires and to enhance fire suppression and emergency services capabilities for the Proposed Project and the southeast portion of CSA 135.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table S-3
Project Design Features for the Proposed Project

2.1 Biological Resources Project Design Features	
PDF-BIO-1	**APLIC Standards**. The Proposed Project shall incorporate Avian Power Line Interaction Committee (APLIC) standards with respect to line spacing for energized and grounded parts of the 138 kV transmission structures. The proposed insulators for the transmission structures will include an insulated polymer section that is at least 69 inches long, and the separation for transmission conductors operating at 138 kV will have 76 inches horizontal and 56 inches vertical minimum spacing.
2.6 Hazards and Hazards Materials Project Design Features	
PDF-HAZ-1	**PV Panel Tracking.** The PV panels for the Project shall incorporate the following operational features: (1) all PV panels south of Old Highway 80 will utilize a minimum 20 degree east facing wake angle; and (2) all PV panels north of Old Highway 80 and south of the SDG&E Transmission Corridor shall have afternoon backtracking disabled. Instead, the PV panels will stay at their maximum 52 degree west facing rotational limit until after the sun has set.
2.7 Hydrology and Water Quality Project Design Features	
PDF-HYD-1	Prior to approval of final design plans, the County DPW shall verify that all components located within the 100-year floodplain shall comply with the County of San Diego Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance, County Hydrology Manual, and County Hydraulic Design Manual, which includes elevating all solar panels at maximum tilt, inverter/transformer platforms, battery storage containers, and all electrical components one (1) foot above base flood elevation.
PDF-HYD-2	**Groundwater Monitoring and Mitigation Plan**. During groundwater extraction for the Proposed Project's construction and operation, the applicant shall implement the groundwater production and groundwater-level monitoring, groundwater mitigation criteria and, if necessary, the groundwater-habitat monitoring procedures outlined in the Groundwater Monitoring and Mitigation Plan that has been prepared for the Proposed Project.
PDF-HYD-3	**Vegetative Cover On-Site During Operation.** In order to provide dust control and minimize erosion during Project operation, at least 70% vegetation cover shall be maintained during Project operation on the portions of the solar facility development footprint within the perimeter fencing not overlain by vehicle access driveways and internal access, inverter/transformer platforms, battery storage containers, the substation, and the Switchyard Facilities. These areas shall be reseeded with a native hydroseed mix that shall be approved by the County Landscape Architect prior to reseeding. A biologist shall also review the native hydroseed mix prior to reseeding for compatibility with native habitats in the Project area. The Project owner shall ensure that at least 70% of the hydroseeded area is covered with vegetation within one year of occupancy. If this coverage threshold is not met, additional native hydroseed applications must be conducted in order to meet the 70% threshold. The Project owner shall submit a written report with photographic evidence of the vegetative cover to the County Landscape Architect one year after occupancy. This report shall also include documentation of the date of hydroseeding and the type of native hydroseed mix. Subsequently a report with photographic evidence shall be submitted to the County Landscape Architect bi-annually (every other year) during Project operation.
PDF-HYD-4	**Flood Fencing Types.** Flood fencing shall be either breakaway fencing or flow through fencing, as described below: • Where flood fencing is provided along Old Highway 80, breakaway type fencing should be used where feasible. Flow-through fencing may be used along Old Highway 80 if drainage conditions warrant its use. However, if flood depths exceed 12 inches, breakaway type fencing (not flow through) must be used along Old Highway 80. • Where flood fencing is provided elsewhere (not along Old Highway 80), either flow-through or breakaway fencing may be used.

Table S-3
Project Design Features for the Proposed Project

2.9 Noise Project Design Features	
PDF-NOI-1	The Applicant commits to restricting usage of a self-propelled PV panel washing apparatus, having an estimated hourly Leq noise level of 83 dBA at 16 feet, within 450 feet of a County-classified Noise Zone 1 property or within 250 feet of a County-classified Noise Zone 3 property. Within these distances, and respecting additional temporal and distance conditions per relevant portions of the Photo-Voltaic Panel Washing Plan (PVPWP) prepared and implemented per **M-NOI-2**, the Applicant commits to using PV panel washing methodology, such as a pick-up truck towed and enclosed IPC Eagle wash station, or other means, that exhibits hourly Leq no greater than 74 dBA at 9 feet.
3.1.7 Transportation Project Design Features	
PDF-TR-1	**Traffic Control Plan**. Prior to obtaining a grading permit from the County of San Diego, the applicant shall implement a construction Traffic Control Plan (TCP) that includes the following measures: • Temporary traffic control devices in accordance with the California Department of Transportation's (Caltrans) California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Device to identify locations/sections where construction is ongoing. This may include slow-moving-vehicle warning signs, signage to warn of merging trucks, barriers for separating construction and non-construction traffic, use of traffic control flaggers, and any additional measures required for the sole convenience of safely passing non-construction traffic (including transit, bicyclists and pedestrians) through and around construction areas. • Coordination with Caltrans to secure the necessary encroachment and trip permits necessary for specialized haul trucks. Also, any excessive height/length vehicles should use pilot car services to provide safe over-the-road operations and overhead height warnings, if necessary. Notification of the California Highway Patrol, if necessary, to facilitate slowing freeway traffic to ensure safe access for motorists. • Coordination with Caltrans, California Highway Patrol, and County officials, including the Sheriff's department. For the State Highway System, Caltrans requires a TCP to be submitted to District 11's Transportation Permits Issuance Branch at least 30 days prior to the start of any construction. • Employment of a contract transport company that would be responsible for surveying the route to determine how turns on existing roads would be accomplished and ensuring that is reflected in the TCP. • Establishment of procedures for coordinating with local emergency response agencies to ensure dissemination of information regarding emergency response vehicle routes affected by construction activities.
PDF-TR-2	**Preparation of Construction Notification Plan.** Forty-five days prior to construction, the project applicant would prepare and submit a construction notification plan to the appropriate land use jurisdiction agency for approval. The construction notification plan would identify the procedures that would be used to inform property owners of the location and duration of construction, identify approvals that would be needed prior to posting or publication of construction notices, and include text of proposed public notices and advertisements. The construction notification plan would address at a minimum two of the following components **Public notice mailer** A public notice mailer would be prepared and mailed no fewer than 15 days prior to construction. The notice would identify construction activities that would restrict, block, remove parking, or require a detour to access existing residential properties. The notice would state the type of construction activities that would be conducted and the location and duration of construction, including all helicopter activities. The project applicant or construction contractor would mail the notice to all residents or property owners within 1,000 feet of project components. If construction delays of more than 7 days occur, an additional notice would be prepared and distributed.

Table S-3
Project Design Features for the Proposed Project

	Public liaison person and toll-free information hotline The project applicant would identify and provide a public liaison person before and during construction to respond to concerns of neighboring property owners about noise, dust, and other construction disturbance. Procedures for reaching the public liaison officer via telephone or in person would be included in notices distributed to the public. The project applicants would also establish a toll-free telephone number for receiving questions or complaints during construction and shall develop procedures for responding to callers. Procedures for handling and responding to calls would be addressed in the construction notification plan.
PDF-TR-3	**Notify property owners and provide access.** To facilitate access to properties that might be obstructed by construction activities, the project applicant would notify property owners and tenants at least 24 hours in advance of construction activities and would provide alternative access if required.
PDF-TR-4	**Traffic Demand Management Program.** The Project applicant shall implement a voluntary construction period Transportation Demand Management program to encourage construction workers to carpool or use alternative transportation modes. The program shall include the following: (1) encouragement of carpooling among workers to reduce worker commuter trips entering and exiting the Project Area; (2) a transportation package would be provided to workers, prior to commencing work on the Project, with information about how to access the Project by alternative transportation and the benefits of doing so; and, (3) the applicant shall evaluate the feasibility of a vanpool or shuttle service to facilitate worker commute trips if feasible.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table S-~~3~~ 4
Summary of Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Issue Areas	Proposed Project	Alternatives			
		No Project			
		No Development	*Buildout*	*Community Buffer*	*Reduced Project*
Impact AE-1: Impact to Jacumba existing visual character and/or quality	SU	▼	=	▼	▼
Impact AE-2: Impact to visual character of Jacumba Hot Springs	SU	▼	▼	▼	▼
Impact AE-3: I-8 Long distance view changes to this eligible state scenic highway viewpoint due to proposed project	SU	▼	▼	=	▼
Impact AE-4: Old Highway 80 – Long distance view blockage and character change from this County scenic highway system viewpoint due to proposed solar and fencing	SU	▼	▲	=	=
Impact AE-5: Jacumba Community Park – Long distance view blockage and character change from this County Park due to proposed solar and fencing	SU	▼	▲	=	=
Impact AE-6: Anza-Borrego Desert State Park Lands and Carrizo Gorge Wilderness - Long distance view changes from State Parks lands due to proposed solar	SU	▼	▼	=	▼
Impact AE-7: Round Mountain – Character change and view interruption from this recreational resource viewpoint due to proposed solar	SU	▼	▼	=	▼
Impact AE-8: Airport Mesa - Long distance view changes at this recreational resource viewpoint due to proposed solar	SU	▼	▼	=	▼
Impact AE-9: Table Mountain area – Long distance view changes at this recreational resource viewpoint due to proposed solar	SU	▼	▼	=	▼
Impact AE-10: Glare impact to roadways from proposed project	LS	▼	▲	=	▼
Impact AE-CU-1 Cumulative Impact on valued visual character or image of neighborhoods, communities, or localized areas.	SU	▼	=	▼	▼

Table S-~~3~~ 4
Summary of Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Issue Areas	Proposed Project	Alternatives			
		No Project			
		No Development	*Buildout*	*Community Buffer*	*Reduced Project*
Impact AE-CU-2 Cumulative impacts to panoramic vista available from elevated vantage point in the Airport Mesa and Table Mountain Recreational Management Zones.	SU	▼	▼	~~=~~ ▼	▼
Impact AQ-1: Construction-related cancer risk from diesel exhaust	SM	▼	▲	▼	▼
Impact AQ-CUM-1: Construction-related emissions of Nox, PM10 and PM2.5	SM	▼	▲	=	=
Impact BI-SP-1: Temporary direct impact to special-status plants	SM	▼	▲	=	~~▼~~ =
Impact BI-SP-2: Permanent direct impact to special-status plants	SM	▼	▲	=	▼
Impact BI-SP-3: Construction- related temporary indirect impacts to special-status plants	SM	▼	▲	=	~~▼~~ =
Impact BI-SP-4: Operational permanent indirect impacts to special-status plants	SM	▼	▲	=	~~▼~~ =
Impact BI-W-1: Temporary direct impact to special-status wildlife	SM	▼	▲	=	▼
Impact BI-W-2: Permanent direct impact to special-status wildlife (including tricolored blackbird, burrowing owl and raptor foraging habitat)	SM	▼	▲	▼	▼
Impact BI-W-3: Permanent direct impact to special-status wildlife (sensitive bird nesting)	SM	▼	▲	=	=
Impact BI-W-4: Permanent direct impact to Special-status wildlife (bats)	SM	▼	▲	=	=
Impact BI-W-5: Construction-related temporary indirect impacts to special-status wildlife (including sensitive bird nesting)	SM	▼	▲	=	▼
Impact BI-W-6: Operational permanent indirect impacts to special-status wildlife	SM	▼	▲	=	▼
Impact BI-WLC-1: Temporary direct impact to wildlife movement	SM	▼	▲	=	▼

Table S-~~3~~ 4
Summary of Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Issue Areas	Proposed Project	Alternatives			
		No Project			
		No Development	*Buildout*	*Community Buffer*	*Reduced Project*
Impact BI-WLC-2: Permanent direct impact to wildlife movement (Core wildlife area)	SM	▼	▲	=	▼
Impact BI-WLC-3: Temporary indirect impact to wildlife movement, including cougars	SM	▼	▲	=	▼
Impact BI-V-1: Temporary direct riparian habitat or sensitive vegetation communities	~~LS~~ SM	▼	▲	=	▼
Impact BI-V-2: Permanent direct riparian habitat or sensitive vegetation communities	SM	▼	▲	▼	▼
Impact BI-V-3: Temporary Indirect Impacts to Riparian Habitat or Sensitive Vegetation Communities	SM	▼	▲	=	▼
Impact BI-V-4: Permanent indirect riparian habitat or sensitive vegetation communities	SM	▼	▲	=	▼
Impact BI-JAR-1: Temporary direct Jurisdictional resources	SM	▼	▲	=	▼
Impact BI-JAR-2: Temporary indirect Jurisdictional resources	~~LS~~ SM	=	▲	=	▼
Impact BI-JAR-3: Temporary indirect impact to jurisdictional resources	L~~S~~ SM	▲	▲	~~▲~~ =	▼
Impact CR-1: Construction and Decommissioning-related impacts to undiscovered cultural resources on-site or known cultural resources within 50 feet of the Project ADI	SM	▼	▲	=	▼
Impact CUL-2 Construction-related impacts to undiscovered human remains	SM	▼	▲	=	▼
Impact GEO-1: Ground failure due to liquefaction, seismically induced settlements, and/or lateral ground spread that could result in the collapse of a structure	SM	▼	▲	=	▼
Impact GEO-2: Expansive soils have potential to impact development	SM	▼	▲	=	▼
Impact HAZ-1: Operational-related impacts that could exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project	SM	▼	▲	=	~~▼~~ =

Table S-~~3~~ 4
Summary of Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Issue Areas	Proposed Project	Alternatives			
		No Project		*Community Buffer*	*Reduced Project*
		No Development	*Buildout*		
occupants to risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires					
Impact HAZ-2: Construction-related impacts exposing project occupants to potential risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires	SM	▼	▲	=	~~▼~~ =
Impact HAZ-CU-1 Cumulative impacts to interference with emergency response	SM	▼	▲	=	~~▼~~ =
Impact HAZ-CU-2 Cumulative impacts to Wildland Fire Hazards	SM	▼	▲	=	~~▼~~ =
Impact HYD-1: Impacts resulting from implementation of the Proposed Project associated with potential alteration of drainage patterns and flood hazards due to the perimeter fence, during construction and operation	SM	▼	▲	=	=
Impact MR-1 The Proposed Project is an interim use and would not result in the permanent loss of availability of a known mineral resource that is minable, processable, and marketable under the technologic and economic conditions that exist at present or which can be estimated to exist in the next 50 years and is valued at more than $12,500,000. However, MM BI-3, Habitat Preservation, a mitigation measure implemented to reduce the Proposed Project's impacts to biological resources, will cause a potentially significant impact with respect to the permanent loss of availability of a known mineral resource that is minable, processable, and marketable under the technologic and economic conditions that exist at present or which can be estimated to exist in the next 50 years and is valued at more than $12,500,000.	SU	▼	▲	▼	▼
Impact NOI-1: Operational stationary equipment noise	SM	▼	▲	▼	=

Table S-~~3~~ 4
Summary of Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Issue Areas	Proposed Project	Alternatives			
		No Project			
		No Development	*Buildout*	*Community Buffer*	*Reduced Project*
Impact NOI-2: Operational Mobile Equipment noise	SM	▼	▲	▼	=
Impact NOI-3: Construction-related noise	~~LS~~ SM	▼	▲	▼	=
Impact PR-1: Construction-related impact to paleontological resources	SM	▼	▲	=	▼
Impact TCR-1: Construction-related impacts to tribal cultural resources	SM	▼	▲	=	▼
Impact WF-1 Operational-related impacts to wildfire risk	SM	▼	▲	=	~~▼~~ =
Impact WF-2 Construction-related impacts to wildfire risk	SM	▼	▲	=	~~▼~~ =
Impact WF-3 Infrastructure contribution to increased wildfire risk	SM	▼	▲	=	~~▼~~ =
Impact WF-CU-1 Cumulative Impact to Emergency Response and emergency evacuation plan	SM	▼	▲	=	~~▼~~ =
Impact WF-CU-2 Cumulative Impact to wildfire risk	SM	▼	▲	=	~~▼~~ =
Impact WF-CU-3 Cumulative Infrastructure Contribution to Increased Wildfire Risk	SM	▼	▲	=	~~▼~~ =

▲ Alternative is likely to result in greater impacts to issue when compared to Proposed Project.
= Alternative is likely to result in similar impacts to issue when compared to Proposed Project.
▼ Alternative is likely to result in reduced impacts to issue when compared to Proposed Project.
LS=lessthansignificantwithoutmitigation;SM=lessthansignificantwithmitigationmeasures;SU=potentiallysignificantandunavoidableimpact.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Throughout Final EIR		
Global Change	Throughout the Final EIR, the switchyard and the 138 kV Transmission Line Tie-in are referred as the "Switchyard Facilities." The Switchyard Facilities would be accessed through improvements to an existing SDG&E access road. In addition, throughout the Final EIR, the total area of Switchyard Facilities up to the existing SDG&E access road has been changed from approximately 3.2 acres to 8.18 acres. The size of the switchyard pad has not changed.	Revised based on comments from San Diego Gas & Electric on the Draft EIR
Global Change	The San Diego County Fire Authority (SDCFA) has been renamed to the San Diego County Fire Protection District (SDCFPD) throughout the Final EIR.	Change made because the Agency has been renamed
Global Change	The area of disturbance has been changed throughout the Final EIR from 643 acres to 626 acres as a result of minor changes to the Proposed Project. The area of disturbance includes approximately 623 acres within the Major Use Permit (MUP) boundary and approximately 3 acres of temporary disturbance outside of the MUP boundary for a water main realignment.	Clarification of the area of disturbance as a result of minor changes to the Proposed Project
Global Change	The amount of impervious surface acre has been corrected throughout the Final EIR from 1.9 acres to 6.65 acres.	Correction
Global Change	Motion sensor lighting has been changed to low level lighting throughout the Final EIR.	Revised based on comments from California Department of Fish and Wildlife on the Draft EIR
Global Change	The amount of grading has been revised throughout the Final EIR from 264,000 cubic yards to 280,000 cubic yards.	As explained in the new Revised Construction Water Demand Memorandum (Appendix F of the Groundwater Resources Investigation), the amount of grading required for the Proposed Project changed from 264,000 cubic yards to 280,000 cubic yards
Global Change	The construction water demand has been updated throughout the Final EIR from 140 acre-feet to 141.4 acre-feet.	As explained in the new Revised Construction Water Demand Memorandum (Appendix F of the Groundwater Resources Investigation), the amount of grading required for the Proposed Project changed from 264,000 cubic yards to 280,000 cubic yards which requires a slight increase in the amount of construction water required

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Summary		
Page S-1	Introductory text has been added to describe the Draft EIR public review period, the comment letters received throughout the public review period, and how responses to comments and changes to the Draft EIR resulting from responses to comments are addressed in the Final EIR.	Clarification regarding the Final EIR organization and content
Pages S-2 and S-3 Section S.1.1	In Section S.1.1, Project Description, text has been included explaining that as a result of the comments received regarding the Proposed Project during public review of the Draft EIR, minor changes have been made to the Proposed Project design. The minor changes include increased setbacks adjacent to Jacumba Community Park and along both sides of Old Highway 80. The Proposed Project also includes the realignment of an existing water main.	As a result of comments received regarding the Proposed Project during public review of the Draft EIR
Page S-9 Section S.5	In Section S.5, Project Alternatives, text has been inserted to explain how the Community Buffer alternative was revised to include increased setbacks adjacent to Jacumba Community Park and along both sides of Old Highway 80, and the realignment of an existing water main.	As a result of comments received regarding the Proposed Project during public review of the Draft EIR
Page S-11 and S-12 Section S.5.1.2	In Section S.5.1.2, Community Buffer Alternative, text has been updated to include minor revisions made to the Proposed Project, which include the increased setbacks and the existing water main realignment	As a result of comments received regarding the Proposed Project during public review of the Draft EIR
Page S-12 Section S.5.1.3	In Section S.5.1.3, Reduced Project Alternative, text has been updated to include realignment of an existing water main	As a result of comments received regarding the Proposed Project during public review of the Draft EIR
Page S-13, Section S.5.2	In Section S.5.2, Environmentally Superior Alternative, the summary has been updated to clarify the impacts in the Reduced Project Alternative.	Update
Page S-13 and S-20 Table S-1	Table S-1, Summary of Significant Effects, has been updated for any changes in the text of mitigation measures	Revised to reflect text changes to mitigation measures
Page S-21 and S-22 Table S-2	In Table S-2, Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project, **M-AE-6** has been updated with additional language regarding the tan-colored slats and visual screening material where flood flow heights do not allow slats.	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-AE-6** to address flood flow

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Page S-23 Table S-2	In Table S-2, Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project, text has been added to **M-BI-1** to include a Worker Environmental Awareness Program requirement.	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-BI-1**
Page S-25 Table S-2	In Table S-2, Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project, text has been added to **M-BI-3** in order to clarify that even with the reduced Major Use Permit area in the new Project design, the applicant shall provide a total of 435 acres of biological open space easement as described in the Draft and Final EIR.	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-BI-3**
Page S-27 Table S-2	In Table S-2, Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project, text has been added to **M-BI-4** to include Project specific requirements and Goals in the Final Resources Management Plan	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-BI-4**
Page S-27 Table S-2	In Table S-2, Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project, text has been added to **M-BI-5** to include language about avoiding trampling and crushing special-status reptiles, San Diego desert woodrat or American badger	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-BI-5**
Page S-29 Table S-2	In Table S-2, Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project, **M-BI-5** has been updated to remove the language take avoidance and replace it with preconstruction surveys.	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-BI-5**
Page S-30 Table S-2	In Table S-2, Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project, text has been added to **M-BI-5** to clarify how Special-Status Preconstruction Surveys and Relocation Plan shall be conducted, documented, timed and monitored.	Clarification in mitigation measure **M-BI-5**
Pages S-31 and S-32 Table S-2	In Table S-2, Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project, text has been revised and/or added to **M-BI-6** to clarify how Bat Surveys and Roost Avoidance or Exclusion activities shall be conducted, documented, timed and monitored.	Clarification in mitigation measure **M-BI-6**
Page S-35 Table S-2	In Table S-2, Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project, text has been added to **M-CR-**2 to clarify that the Campo Band of Mission Indians, Manzanita Band of the Kumeyaay Nation and Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians shall be notified of any unanticipated discovery and, should a potential TCR be identified, the Project Archaeologist shall consult with consulting tribes for a final determination.	Clarification in mitigation measure **M-CR-2** in response to comments on Draft EIR
Page S-36 Table S-2	In Table S-2, Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project, text has been added to **M-CR-2** to states that the Project Archaeologist shall notify the Campo	Clarification in mitigation measure **M-CR-2** in response to comments on the Draft EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
	Band of Mission Indians, Manzanita Band of Kumeyaay Nation, and Viejas Bank of Kumeyaay Indians of the identification of human remains.	
Page S-36 Table S-2	In Table S-2, Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project, text has been added to **M-CR-2** to state that the final cultural Material Conveyance report shall include evidence that all prehistoric materials have been curated at a San Diego County, Imperial County, or culturally affiliated Tribal curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79.	Clarification in mitigation measure **M-CR-2** in response to comments on the Draft EIR
Page S-36 Table S-2	In Table S-2, Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project, text has been added to **M-CR-3** to clarify that the Project archaeologist shall coordinate with consulting tribes and Kumeyaay Native American monitors	Clarification in mitigation measure **M-CR-3** in response to comments on the Draft EIR
Page S-37 Table S-2	In Table S-2, Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project, text has been added to **M-GEO-1** to clarify how the mitigation measure shall be carried out.	Clarification in **M-GEO-1** based on the new information in the Preliminary Geotechnical Report (Appendix F to EIR
Page S-39 Table S-2	In Table S-2, Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project, text in **M-NOI-2** regarding the noise emission from self-propelled PV panel wasters has been deleted because of the inclusion of a new project design feature in the Proposed Project (PDF-NOI-1) has been included.	Clarification in **M-NOI-2** based on updated analysis in Acoustical Analysis Assessment (Appendix M to EIR)
Page S-43 Table S-2	In Table S-2, Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project, text has been added to **M-TCR-2** to clarify that the Campo Band of Mission Indians, Manzanita Band of the Kumeyaay Nation and Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians shall be notified of any unanticipated discovery and, should a potential TCR be identified, the Project Archaeologist shall consult with consulting tribes for a final determination.	Clarification in mitigation measure **M-TCR-2** in response to comments on the Draft EIR
Page S-44 Table S-2	In Table S-2, Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project, text has been added to **M-TCR-2** to states that the Project Archaeologist shall notify the Campo Band of Mission Indians, Manzanita Band of Kumeyaay Nation, and Viejas Bank of Kumeyaay Indians of the identification of human remains.	Clarification in mitigation measure **M-TCR-2** in response to comments on the Draft EIR
Page S-44 Table S-2	In Table S-2, Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project, text has been added to **M-TCR-2** to state that the final cultural Material Conveyance report shall include evidence that all prehistoric materials have been curated at a	Clarification in mitigation measure **M-TCR-2** in response to comments on the Draft EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
	San Diego County, Imperial County, or culturally affiliated Tribal curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79.	
Page S-45 Table S-2	In Table S-2, Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project, text has been revised in **M-WF-1** to specify that signage with contact information for a 24-hour remote operations center will be provided.	Clarification in mitigation measure **M-WF-1** based on update to Fire Protection Plan (Appendix N to EIR)
Page S-46 Table S-2	In Table S-2, Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project, text has been deleted from **M-WF-2** as follows: The Project will be equipped with at least one and up to two water trucks each of 4,000- gallon capacity.	Clarification in mitigation measure **M-WF-2** based on update to Fire Protection Plan (Appendix N to EIR)
Page S-46 Table S-2	In Table S-2, Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project, the following language has been removed from **M-WF-2** ~~During construction, the project site will have at a minimum two pick-up trucks outfitted with Type-6 Skid- Mounted Units, including fire pump, hose, and nozzle, that are staffed with personnel properly trained to use the equipment.~~	Clarification in mitigation measure **M-WF-2** based on update to Fire Protection Plan (Appendix N to EIR)
Pages S-51 to S-53 Table S-3	Table S-3, Project Design Features for the Proposed Project, was added to clarify all Project Design Features that are part of the Proposed Project.	Provide summary table of all Project Design Features in Summary Chapter
Pages S-55 to S-59 Table S-4	Table S-4, Summary of Alternatives to the Proposed Project, was updated per edits in Chapter 4, Alternatives.	Updated per edits in Chapter 4, Alternatives
Pages S-61 to S-115 Table S-6	Table S-5, Errata Summary Table JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes was added to summarize all Errata changes made for the Final EIR.	Provide a summary of all Errata changes made for the Final EIR
Pages S-117 and S-118 Table S-5	Table S-6, Summary of Appendices, was added to provide a summary of revisions to appendices in Draft EIR and new appendices in Final EIR	Provide a summary table which includes overview of revisions to Draft EIR appendices and a list of new appendices added to Final EIR
Chapter 1 - Project Description		
Pages 1-2 and 1-3 Section 1.2	In Section 1.2, text added to describe how the Proposed Project's area of disturbance and Major Use Permit boundary was reduced as a result of minor changes to the Proposed Project. Added text to describe minor changes that have been made to the Proposed Project. Specifically, the changes include a	Provide description of minor revisions to the Proposed Project which were made in response to comments received regarding the Proposed Project in the Draft EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
	revised Major Use Permit boundary, increased setbacks from Old Highway 80 and Jacumba Community Park, and the realignment of an existing water main	
Pages 1-3 and 1-4 Section 1.2.1	Text in the list of primary components has been slightly revised to account updates in the Proposed Project.	Update to the Proposed Project components
Page 1-4 Section 1.2.1	Text has been added to Page 1-4 to clarify that the PV modules would be bifacial and capable of generating solar energy on both side s of the PV module.	Update to PV module description
Page 1-5 Section 1.2.1	Text has been added to the PV Module Support Structures discussion to clarify the height of the PV modules would vary depending on terrain and other factors but will maintain a maximum PV module height of 12 feet above grade or will not be installed within certain locations.	Clarification in the PV Modules Support Structures discussion
Page 1-6 Section 1.2.1	Text has been added to the Inverter/Transformer Platforms discussion has been revised to discuss that Project Design Feature PDF-HYD-1 would require the inverter/transformer platforms to be mounted above the 100-year flood elevation via a set of piles driven into the ground and covered by an earth or gravel mount that is built up to the top of the skid to provide a working clearance to all access points and how the height of the base of the inverter/transformer will range from 18 inches to approximately 4.5 feet above ground level depending on the flood depth at each location.	Clarification in the Inverter/Transformer Platforms discussion
Pages 1-8 and 1-9 Section 1.2.1	The text in Switchyard Facilities discussion has been updated to clarify which components area considered part of the Switchyard Facilities and would be transferred to SDG&E after project construction.	Text clarification in response to SDG & E comments on Draft EIR (Comment Letter O-2)
Page 1-10 Section 1.2.1	Text has been added to clarify the height of the battery storage containers would be increased above ground level due to the 100-year flood depths	Clarification in the Battery Energy Storage System discussion
Pages 1-16 and 1-17 Section 1.2.1	In Section 1.2.1.2, Water Main Realignment, has been added to describe the new realignment of an existing water main as part of the Proposed Project.	Addition of water main realignment to Proposed Project in response to comments on the Draft EIR
Page 1-21 Section 1.2.1.5	In Section 1.2.1.4, Decommissioning, to clarify all project components except the Switchyard Facilities and the realigned water main would be dismantled and removed upon decommissioning.	Clarification in the Decommissioning discussion

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Page 1-22 Section 1.2.1.5	Text has been updated in the Dismantling discussion to clarify that all underground and transmission components would be removed upon decommissioning.	Clarification in the Dismantling discussion
Page 1-23 – 1-24 Section 1.2.1.7	Section 1.2.1.7, Project Design Features, a new Project Design Feature PDF-BIO-1 APLIC Standards has been added	Addition of new Project Design Feature PDF-BIO-1 in response to comments on Draft EIR
Page 1-24 Section 1.2.1.7	In Section 1.2.1.7, Project Design Features, a new Project Design Feature PDF HAZ-1 PV Panel Tracking has been added	Addition of new Project Design Feature PDF-HAZ-1 in response to comments on Draft EIR regarding impacts to glider pilots from potential glare
Pages 1-24 and 1-25 Section 1.2.1.7	In Section 1.2.1.7, Project Design Features, a new Project Design Feature PDF-HYD-3 Vegetative Cover On-Site During Operation was added	Addition of new Project Design Feature PDF-HAZ-3 in response to comments on Draft EIR regarding potential erosion and dust control
Page 1-25 Section 1.2.1.7	In Section 1.2.1.7, Project Design Features, a new Project Design Feature PDF-HYD-4 Flood Fencing Types, was added to the Final EIR	Addition of new Project Design Feature PDF-HYD-4 clarifying flood fencing types
Page 1-25 Section 1.2.1.7	In Section 1.2.1.7, Project Design Features, a new Project Design Feature PDF-NOI-1 was added	Addition of new Project Design Feature PDF-NOI-1 based on updated analysis of panel washing noise impacts
Page 1-27 Section 1.2.1.7	In Section 1.2.1.7, Project Design Features, a new Project Design Feature PDF-TR-4, Traffic Demand Management Program was added	Addition of new Project Design Feature PDF-TR-4 in response to comments on the Draft EIR regarding potential construction traffic
Page 1-28 Section 1.2.2.1	In Section 1.2.2.1, Technical Considerations, text was revised to clarify that the PV panels would measure approximately 3.7 feet in width and 7.5 feet in length and would have a total heigh of up to 12 feet.	Clarification in the measurements of the PV panels
Pages 1-28 and 1-29 Section 1.2.3.3	In Section 1.2.3.3, Environmental Considerations, text has been added to the Aesthetics discussion	Additional discussion added in response to comments on Draft EIR regarding potential aesthetics impacts
Page 1-33 Section 1.5.1	In Section 1.5.1, text has been added to Project Approvals/Permits to clarify that other than the Switchyard Facilities, the Proposed Project is considered a Major Impact Service and Utility type, which may be conditionally permitted in any zone if it is determined that public interest supersedes the usual limitations placed on land use and transcends the usual restraints of zoning for reasons of necessary location and community wide interest.	Clarification in the Project Approval/Permits Section in response to comments on the Draft EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Pages 1-33 and 1-34 Section 1.5.1	In Section 1.5.1, Project Approvals/Permits, text has been added to clarify the Switchyard Facilities, including the switchyard and the transmission lines connecting the switchyard to the existing SDG&E transmission infrastructure, are considered a Minor Impact Utility. (County Zoning Ordinance Section 1355.) Pursuant to County Zoning Ordinance Section 2884, until a Specific Plan applicable to the property is adopted, Minor Impact Utilities are a permitted use in the area zoned as Specific Planning Area upon issuance of a Minor Use Permit. While the Major Use Permit will govern both the interim uses subject to County Zoning Ordinance Section 2888 and the Switchyard Facilities, the Switchyard Facilities will not be required to be decommissioned because it is only subject to County Zoning Ordinance Section 2884. Additionally, after the Switchyard Facilities are constructed, the facilities will be transferred to SDG&E and therefore only subject to California Public Utilities Commission jurisdiction.	Clarification in the project Approval/Permits Section in response to comments on the Draft EIR
Page 1-35 Figure 1-9	A callout to Figure 1-9, Cumulative Projects Map, has been added to Chapter 1	Figure 1-9 added to Chapter 1 in response to comments on Draft EIR regarding cumulative project locations
Page 1-40 Table 1-3	In Table, 1-3, Encroachment and trip permits for specialized haul trucks as necessary have been added to the California Department of Transportation Approvals/Permits	Clarification in response to comments on the Draft EIR from Caltrans
Page 1-43 to 1-44 Table 1-4	In Table 1-4, Cumulative – Reasonably Foreseeable, Approved, and Pending Project, the following project have been added: Jacumba Solar, Sunrise Powerlink, Southwest Powerlink and ECO Substation.	Revisions made in response to comments on the Draft EIR
Page 1-45 Figure 1-1	Figure 1-1, Project Location on Page 1-45 has been updated to reflect the revised MUP Boundary.	Revised Figure1-1 due to revision to MUP boundary in Proposed Project in the Final EIR
Page 1-47 Figure 1-2	Figure 1-2, Project Components on Page 1-47 has been updated to reflect the revised Project Components and the new MUP boundary.	Revised Figure 1-2 due to revised Proposed Project in the Final EIR
Pages 1-49 to 1-57 Figures 1-3 to 1-3D	The following figures have been updated to reflect the revised Proposed Project: • Figure 1-3, Enlarged Site Plan Index on Page 1-49 • Figure 1-3A, Enlarged Site Plan • Figure 1-3B, Enlarged Site Plan	Revised Figures in the Enlarged Site Plan Index due to the revised Proposed Project in the Final EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
	• Figure 1-3C, Enlarged Site Plan • Figure 1-3D, Enlarged Site Plan	
Page 1-61 Figure 1-5	Figure 1-4, Photovoltaic Module and Support Structure from the Draft EIR has been changed to Figure 1-5 and moved to page 1-61	Change in figure number
Pages 1-59 and 1-61 Figures 1-4	New Figure 1-4, New Setbacks from Old Highway 80 and Jacumba Community Park has been added to show the revised Proposed Project's increased setbacks	Addition of new Figure showing increased setbacks from Old Highway 80 and Jacumba Community Park
Page 1-63 Figure 1-6	Figure 1-5, Typical Battery Energy Storage Container has been changed to Figure 1-6 and moved to page 1-63.	Change in Figure number
Page 1-65 Figure 1-7	New Figure 1-7, Equipment Buildup Detail, has been added as Page1-65 of the Final EIR.	Addition of new Figure to show Equipment Buildup Detail
Page 1-6 Figure 1-8	New Figure 1-8, Perimeter Fence Types, has been added as Page 1-67 of the Final EIR.	Addition of new Figure to show the different perimeter fence types
Page 1-69 Figure 1-9	Figure 1-9, Cumulative Project List Map, has been added to Page 1-69 of the Final EIR.	Addition of a Cumulative Projects List Map in response to comments on the Draft EIR regarding other cumulative projects in the area
Section 2.1 – Aesthetics		
Page 2.1-1 Section 2.1	In Section 2.1, Aesthetics, the list of reports relied upon for the Aesthetics Section was updated to include the JVR Solar Project <u>2021</u> Glare Study (Appendix A of Visual Resources Technical Report) and the Proposed Project Revision Technical Memorandum (Appendix R).	Updated list of technical documents relied upon in the Final EIR
Page 2.1-1 Section 2.1	In Section 2.1, the following text was added to page 2.1-1 of the Final EIR as follows: <u>In addition, and subsequent to public review of the Draft EIR, a site visit was conducted in February 2021 to document views from Old Highway 80 where the highway parallels the Project site.</u>	Text added to disclose a site visit conducted in February 2021

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Page 2.1-1 Section 2.1	In Section 2.1, the introduction has been updated to include minor revisions to the Proposed Project including the increased setback from Jacumba Community Park, the increased setbacks from the north and south sides of Old Highway 80 and the water main realignment. These changes will not change any significance determinations in this section and this section has been revised to account for these changes.	Provide description of minor revisions to the Proposed Project which were made in response to comments received regarding the Proposed Project in the Draft EIR
Pages 2.1-2 and 2.1-3 Section 2.1.1.1	In Section 2.1.1.1, Project Site and Surrounding area text has been updated on Page 2.1-2 and 2.1-3.	Updated text regarding the Project site and surrounding area
Page 2.1-18 Section 2.1.3	In Section 2.1-18, the following text has been added and/or deleted on Page 2.1-18 under Section 2.1.3, Analysis of Project Effects and Determination as to Significance, as follows: In addition and subsequent to the release of the Draft EIR for public review, a site visit was conducted in February 2021 to obtain photographs documenting available views from west and eastbound Old Highway 80 where the highway parallels the Project site. Winds were mild, and local conditions were generally sunny and clear, except for the site visits conducted in February 2019 and February 2021 during which local conditions were mostly cloudy. Digital photographs of the Project site and surrounding area were taken with a location-services-enabled iPhone 6s to document the characteristics of the Project site, ~~and~~ surrounding area, and quality of existing views.	Text added to document an additional site visit and photographs taken of Old Highway 80
Page 2.1-19 Section 2.1.3	In Section 2.1.3, under Analysis of Project Effects and Determination as to Significance, the following text has been added as follows: In addition, a mobile vantage point was located on westbound Old Highway 80 to illustrate visual change associated with perimeter Proposed Project components (e.g., fencing, and solar panels) as highway parallels the Project site and motorists approach the Jacumba Hot Springs community. The locations of selected key views (including the three vantage points on westbound Old Highway 80 that function as a mobile vantage point intended to illustrate visual change to corridor views at fixed locations on the highway) are shown in Figure 2.1-8A, Key Views.	Text added to document the addition of a mobile vantage point on westbound Old Highway 80

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Pages 2.1-21 and 2.1-22 Section 2.1.3.1	In Section 2.1.3.1, Visual Character or Quality, the analysis under Theme and Style was updated on Pages 2.1-21 - 2.1-22 to address minor revisions in the Proposed Project.	Analysis added to address minor revisions to the Proposed Project
Pages 2.1-22 and 2.1-23 Section 2.1.3.1	In Section 2.1.3.2, Visual Character or Quality, the analysis under Size, Scale, and Massing was updated on page 2.1-22 to 2.1-23 to address minor revisions in the Proposed Project.	Analysis added to address minor revisions to the Proposed Project
Page 2.1-24 Section 2.1.3.1	In Section 2.1.3.1, Visual Character or Quality, the analysis under Color and Building Materials was updated on Page 2.1-24 to address minor revisions in the Proposed Project.	Analysis added to address minor revisions to the Proposed Project
Pages 2.1-25 and 2.1-26 Section 2.1.3.1	In Section 2.1.3.1, Visual Character or Quality, the analysis under Setbacks was updated on Pages 2.1-25 – 2.1-26 to address minor revisions in the Proposed Project.	Analysis added to address minor revisions to the Proposed Project
Pages 2.1-29 and 2.1-31 Section 2.1.3.2	In Section 2.1.3.2, Valued Visual Character or Image of Neighborhood or Community, text was added to the Proposed Project analysis on Page 2.1-29 to Page 2.1-31 to address minor revisions in the Proposed Project.	Analysis added to address minor revisions to the Proposed Project
Pages 2.1-32 and 2.1-33 Section 2.1.3.3	In Section 2.1.3.3, Focal or Panoramic Vistas, the Interstate 8 analysis has been updated to include PDF-HYD-3 on pages 2.1-32 and 2.1-33.	Analysis added to address the implementation of Project Design Feature PDF-HYD-3
Pages 2.1-33 and 2.1-35 Section 2.1.3.3	In Section 2.1.3.3, Focal or Panoramic Vistas, the Old Highway 80 analysis has been updated to include minor project revisions on pages 2.1-33 and 2.1-35.	Analysis added to address minor revisions to the Proposed Project
Pages 2.1-37 and 2.1-38 Section 2.1.3.3	In Section 2.1.3.3., Focal or Panoramic Vistas, the Jacumba Community Park analysis was updated for the minor revisions to the Proposed Project on Pages 2.1-37 – 2.1-38.	Analysis added to address minor revisions to the Proposed Project
Page 2.1-38 Section 2.1.3.3	In Section 2.1.3.3., Focal or Panoramic Vistas, the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park Lands analysis was updated for the minor revisions to the Proposed Project on Page 2.1-38.	Analysis added to address minor revisions to the Proposed Project and based on comments from California Department of Parks and Recreation on the Draft EIR
Pages 2.1-48 and 2.1-50 Section 2.1.3.5	In Section 2.1.3.5, Light and Glare, the operation analysis regarding light fixtures that do not conform to the lamp type and shielding requirements, light trespass that exceeds 0.2-foot candles and highly reflective building materials has been updated to account for minor revisions in the Proposed Project. Specifically, the analysis was updated to account for low-level light instead of	Analysis revised based on comments from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife on the Draft EIR and other comments on the Draft EIR regarding light and glare

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
	motion-sensored lights, PDF-HAZ-1 and the findings of the 2021 Glare Study on pages 2.1-48 – 2.1-50.	
Page 2.1-53 Section 2.1.3.5	In Section 2.1.3.5, Light and Glare, the Switchyard analysis regarding outdoor light fixtures has been updated to account for minor Proposed Project revisions on page 2.1-53.	Analysis revised to address minor revisions to the Proposed Project and to address comments on the Draft EIR regarding light and glare
Pages 2.1-59 and 2.1-60 Section 2.1.4	In Section 2.1.4, Cumulative Impact Analysis, additional analysis was added to the Focal or Panoramic Vistas on Page 2.1-59 – 2.1-60.	Analysis revised to address minor revisions to the Proposed Project and to address comments on the Draft EIR regarding cumulative impacts
Pages 2.1-61 and 2.1-62 Section 2.1.4	In Section 2.1.4, Cumulative Impact Analysis, additional analysis was added to Light and Glare discussion on Page 2.1-61 – 2.1-62. The new analysis includes information from the new 2021 Glare Study.	Analysis revised to address minor revisions to the Proposed Project and to address comments on the Draft EIR regarding light and glare and cumulative impacts
Pages 2.1-67 and 2.1-68 Section 2.1.5	In Section 2.1.5, Significance of Impacts Prior to Mitigation, under the conformance with applicable Federal, State or local statute or regulation related to dark skies or glare was updated to account for minor revisions in the Proposed Project. The discussion specifically revised to address, low-level lighting, the 2021 Glare Study and PDF-HAZ-1 on pages 2.1-67 -2.1-68.	Analysis revised to address minor revisions to the Proposed Project and to address comments on the Draft EIR regarding light and glare
Pages 2.1-69 and 2.1-70 Section 2.1.6	In Section 2.1.6, Mitigation Measures, has been updated to include revisions to Mitigation Measure **M-AE-6** on Pages 2.1-69 – 2.1-70 of the Final EIR.	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-AE-6** to address fence screening types based on flood flow
Page 2.1-93 Figure 2.1-8B	Figure 2.1-8B, Conceptual Landscape Plan, has been updated to reflect the revised site plan.	Figure added to provide new Conceptual Landscape Plan
Page 2.1-95 Figure 2.1-9	Figure 2.1-9, Key View 1 – Eastbound I-8, has been updated to show the existing view south from Eastbound I-8 at Carrizo Gorge Road Offramp, the Visual simulation of the Proposed Project in the Draft EIR and the Visual Simulation of the Project in the Final EIR.	Figure revised to show Visual Simulation of Key View 1 in the Final EIR
Page 2.1-97 Figure 2.1-10	Figure 2.1-10, Key View 2 – Northbound Carrizo Gorge Road, has been updated to show the existing view north from Carrizo Gorge Road, the Visual simulation of the Proposed Project in the Draft EIR and the Visual Simulation of the Project in the Final EIR.	Figure revised to show Visual Simulation of Key View 2 in the Final EIR
Page 2.1-99 Figure 2.1-11	Figure 2.1-11, Key View 3 – Eastbound Old Highway 80, has been updated to show the existing view southeast from Old Highway 80 at Laguna Street, the	Figure revised to show Visual Simulation of Key View 3 in the Final EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
	Visual simulation of the Proposed Project in the Draft EIR and the Visual Simulation of the Project in the Final EIR.	
Page 2.1-101 Figure 2.1-12	Figure 2.1-12, Key View 4 – Jacumba Community Park, has been updated to show the existing view existing view east from Jacumba Community Park, the Visual simulation of the Proposed Project in the Draft EIR and the Visual Simulation of the Project in the Final EIR.	Figure revised to show Visual Simulation of Key View 4 in the Final EIR
Page 2.1-103 Figure 2.1-13	Figure 2.1-13, Key View 5 – Westbound Old Highway 80, has been updated to show the existing view northwest from Old Highway 80, the Visual simulation of the Proposed Project in the Draft EIR and the Visual Simulation of the Project in the Final EIR.	Figure revised to show Visual Simulation of Key View 5 in the Final EIR
Page 2.1-105 Figure 2.1-13A	Figure 2.1-13A, Key View 5A – Westbound Old Highway 80: Mobile Vantage Point A, has been updated to show the existing view west from Old Highway 80 (approximately 0.6-mile from Laguna Street), the Visual simulation of the Proposed Project in the Draft EIR and the Visual Simulation of the Project in the Final EIR.	Figure revised to show Visual Simulation of Key View 5A in the Final EIR
Page 2.1-107 Figure 2.1-13B	Figure 2.1-13B, Key View 5B – Westbound Old Highway 80: Mobile Vantage Point B, has been updated to show the existing view existing view west from Old Highway 80 (approximately 0.25-mile from Laguna Street), the Visual simulation of the Proposed Project in the Draft EIR and the Visual Simulation of the Project in the Final EIR.	Figure revised to show Visual Simulation of Key View 5B in the Final EIR
Page 2.1-109 Figure 2.1-13C	Figure 2.1-13C, Key View 5C – Westbound Old Highway 80: Mobile Vantage Point C, has been updated to show the existing view west from Old Highway 80 (approximately 385 feet from Laguna Street), the Visual simulation of the Proposed Project in the Draft EIR and the Visual Simulation of the Project in the Final EIR.	Figure revised to show Visual Simulation of Key View 5C in the Final EIR
Page 2.1-111 Figure 2.1-14	Figure 2.1-14, Key View 6 – Undeveloped Brawley Avenue Property, has been updated to show the existing view east from the Undeveloped Brawley Avenue Property, the Visual simulation of the Proposed Project in the Draft EIR and the Visual Simulation of the Project in the Final EIR.	Figure revised to show Visual Simulation of Key View 6 in the Final EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Page 2.1-113 Figure 2.1-15	Figure 2.1-15, Key View 7 – State Park Lands, has been updated to show the existing view southeast from state parks lands Adjacent to the Project site, the Visual simulation of the Proposed Project in the Draft EIR and the Visual Simulation of the Project in the Final EIR.	Figure revised to show Visual Simulation of Key View 7 in the Final EIR
Page 2.1-115 Figure 2.1-16	Figure 2.1-16, Key View 8 – Airport Mesa, has been updated to show the existing view west from Airport Mesa, the Visual simulation of the Proposed Project in the Draft EIR and the Visual Simulation of the Project in the Final EIR.	Figure revised to show Visual Simulation of Key View 8 in the Final EIR
Page 2.1-117 Figure 2.1-17	Figure 2.1-17, Key View 9 – Mesa South of Table Mountain, has been updated to show the existing view southwest from mesa landform south of Table Mountain, the Visual simulation of the Proposed Project in the Draft EIR and the Visual Simulation of the Project in the Final EIR.	Figure revised to show Visual Simulation of Key View 9 in the Final EIR
Section 2.2 Air Quality		
Page 2.2-1 Section 2.2	In Section 2.2, the Proposed Project Revisions Technical Memorandum (Appendix R) memorandum has been added to the list of technical data relied upon for Section 2.2, Air Quality.	Updated list of technical documents relied upon in the Final EIR
Page 2.2-1 Section 2.2	In Section 2.2, the introduction has been updated to include minor revisions to the Proposed Project including the increased setback from Jacumba Community Park, the increased setbacks from the north and south sides of Old Highway 80 and the water main realignment. These changes will not change any significance determinations in this section and this section has been revised to account for these changes.	Provide description of minor revisions to the Proposed Project which were made in response to comments received regarding the Proposed Project in the Draft EIR
Page 2.2-3 Section 2.2.1.1	In Section 2.2.1.1, Climate and Topography, text regarding the average temperatures in the Site-Specific Conditions has been updated.	Correction in the average temperature in the site-specific conditions
Page 2.2-8 Section 2.2.1.3	In Section 2.2.1.3, Pollutants and Effects, the following text was added and/or deleted in the Valley Fever discussion of as follows: The Project site is wholly contained within the 91934 zip code. For the 91934 zip code, there were no cases of Coccidioidomycosis between 2008 and ~~2017~~ 2019 (Nelson 2018; Coccidioidomycosis Case Counts and Rates by Zip Code, 2010-2019, County Public Health Services, Epidemiology and Immunization Services	Updated information for coccidioidomycosis (Valley Fever) cases

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
	Branch, January 8, 2021). Statewide incidences in 2016 were 13.7 per 100,000 people (CDPH 2016).	
Pages 2.2-22 and 2.2-23 Section 2.2.3.1	In Section 2.2.3.1, Conformance to the Regional Air Quality Strategy, under the Switchyard Facilities discussion, the following text was added and/or deleted on page 2.2-22 of the Final EIR as follows: Operation of the ~~switchyard~~ Switchyard Facilities would result in a negligible increase in associated operational trips. As shown in Table 2.2-5, the ~~switchyard~~ Switchyard Facilities would comprise ~~5.14~~ 8.1 acres of parcel 661-010-30. As such, based on the existing zoning of S88 and density of 0.25 units per acre, the maximum buildout would be ~~1.3~~ 2.025 single-family residential units. Assuming ~~1~~ 2 single-family unit~~s was~~ were built, the buildout would result in an average daily trip rate of ~~10~~ 20 and ~~34,961~~ 69,922 VMT annually.	Clarification based on minor Proposed Project revisions
Page 2.2-27 Section 2.2.3.2	In Section 2.2.3.2, Impacts to Sensitive Receptors, under the Valley Fever Exposure discussion, the following text has been added on page 2.2-27 of the Final EIR as follows: In addition, the Proposed Project will implement Project Design Feature **PDF-HYD-3** to ensure that those portions of the Project site not overlain by roads, inverters, battery storage containers, Switchyard Facilities, and the substation will have at least 70% vegetative cover during Project operations. The areas shall be reseeded with a native hydroseed mix and the vegetation cover shall be maintained through the life of the Project. PDF-HYD-3 will provide dust control during Project operations.	Added text regarding new Project Design Feature PDF-HYD-3 to address dust control
Page 2.2-29 Section 2.2.3.2	In Section 2.2.3.2, Impacts to Sensitive Receptors, under the Health Impacts of Criteria Air Pollutants of the Switchyard Facilities discussion, text has been added on Page 2.2.-29 of the Final EIR to clarify impacts would be less than significant.	Clarification regarding health impacts as a result of comments during public review of the Draft EIR
Page 2.2-36 Section 2.2.4.1	In Section 2.2.4.1, Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of Criteria Pollutants (Construction and Decommissioning), text has been added to the analysis to explain that although the air quality analysis prepared in June 2021 assumed backup water would be imported during construction activities from the Jacumba	Clarification that the Jacumba Community Services District would not be relied upon for back water

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
	Community Services District, construction water would be provided through onsite wells only and the Jacumba Community Services District would not be relied upon for backup water.	
Page 2.2-37 Section 2.2.4.1	In Section 2.2.4.1, Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of Criteria Pollutants (Construction and Decommissioning), the Water Main Realignment Component has been added to Site Mobilization construction phase on Page 2.2.37 of the Final EIR.	Update to address minor revisions to the Proposed Project
Page 2.2-37 Section 2.2.4.1	In Section 2.2.4.1, Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of Criteria Pollutants (Construction and Decommissioning), the following text has been added to the analysis discussion as follows: As described in Section 1.2 Project Description in the Final EIR, the Proposed Project's setbacks would result in a net reduction of 17 acres in the Proposed Project's area of disturbance. However, the reduction would not result in a material decrease in construction activity as analyzed herein. The realignment of the existing water main would result in a marginal increase in construction equipment resulting in additional construction activity. The worker, vendor, and haul trips would not change based on the realignment of the existing water main.	Updated the cumulative analysis to address minor revisions to the Proposed Project
Page 2.2-38 Section 2.2.4.1	In Section 2.2.4.1, Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of Criteria Pollutants (Construction and Decommissioning), the following text has been added and/or deleted to the analysis as follows: Table 1-4 in Chapter 1 provides a list of ~~18~~ 21 reasonably foreseeable, approved, and pending projects within 18 miles of the Project site. Of those projects, ~~seven~~ ten have been completed, three are approved but not constructed, and six are under review.	Clarification of information in the Cumulative Impacts Analysis
Page 2.2-55 Table 2.2-6	Table 2.2-6, Construction Activity Health Risk Assessment Results – Unmitigated, was updated on Page 2.2-55 of the Final EIR.	Updated Table data for minor revisions to the Proposed Project
Page 2.2-55 Table 2.2-7	Table 2.2-7, Estimated Maximum Daily Construction Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions – Unmitigated, was updated on Page 2.2-55 of the Final EIR.	Updated Table data for minor revisions to the Proposed Project

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Page 2.2-58 Table 2.2-13	Table 2.2-13, Estimated Maximum Daily Construction Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions – Mitigated, was updated on Page 2.2-58 of the Final EIR	Updated Table Data for minor revisions to the Proposed Project
	Section 2.3 Biological Resources	
Global Change	Throughout Section 2.3, Biological Resources, all references to Appendix D have now been changed to Appendix E and all references to Appendix E have been changed to Appendix F.	Global change due the addition of two new appendices to the Biological Resources Technical Report (Appendix D to the EIR)
Page 2.3-1 Section 2.3	In Section 2.3, Biological Resources, the following technical documents were added to the list of technical data relied upon: • Bat Survey Results for the JVR Energy Park Project (Appendix B of Biological Resources Technical Report) • Draft Resource Management Plan for the JVR Energy Park Project (Appendix I of the Biological Resources Technical Report) • Proposed Project Revisions Technical Memorandum (Appendix R) • U.S./Mexico Border Wildlife Corridor and Crossings - JVR Energy Park Project (Appendix S)	Updated list of technical documents relied upon in the Final EIR
Page 2.3-1 Section 2.3	In Section 2.3, the introduction has been updated to include minor revisions to the Proposed Project including the increased setback from Jacumba Community Park, the increased setbacks from the north and south sides of Old Highway 80 and the water main realignment. These changes result in biological resources impacts that are slightly less than those presented in the Draft EIR and do not change any significance determinations in this section and this section has not been updated to account for this changed Project area and conservatively reports impact associated with the 643-acre Project as analyzed in the Draft EIR.	Provide description of minor revisions to the Proposed Project which were made in response to comments received regarding the Proposed Project in the Draft EIR
Page 2.3-7 Section 2.3.1.3	In Section 2.3.1.3, Flora, the following text was added or deleted from Page 2.3-7 as follows: total of 255 vascular plant species, consisting of 187 native species (83%), and 38 non-native species (17%), were recorded within the Project site during initial	Update to the Appendix designation in the Biological Technical Resources Report (Appendix D to the EIR)

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
	surveys (Appendix ~~B~~ C, List of Plant Species Observed,of Appendix D in the Final EIR~~, List of Plant Species Observed~~).	
Page 2.3-8 Section 2.3.1.4	In Section 2.3.1.4, Fauna text has been updated updated.	Update to the Fauna discussion
Page 2.3-9 Section 2.3.1.4	In Section 2.3.1.4, Fauna, the Mammals discussion has been updated to include information from the Bat Survey conducted in February 2021.	Update to the Mammal discussion
Page 2.3-19 Section 2.3.1.6	In Section 2.3.1.6, Special-Status Animal Species, the Golden Eagle (Aquila chrysaetos; BCC/FP, WL/County Group 1) discussion has been updated to include a review of USGS data from 2015 to 2017 for golden eagle.	Updated based on comments from California Department of Fish and Wildlife on the Draft EIR
Page 2.3-23 Section 2.3.1.6	In Section 2.3.1.6, Special-Status Animal Species, the Pallid Bat discussion has been updated with the results from the February 2021 bat survey.	Update to the Special-Status Animal Species Pallid Bat discussion based on February 2021 bat survey
Page 2.3-29 Section 2.3.1.6	In Section 2.3.1.6, Special-Status Animal Species, the Yuma Myotis (Myotis yumanensis, County Group 2) discussion has been updated.	Update to the Special-Status Animal Species Yuma Myotis discussion
2.3-29-30 Section 2.3.1.6	In Section 2.3.1.6, Special Status Animal Species, the Cougar (Puma concolor; County Group 2, Specially Protected Mammal) discussion has been inserted into Page 2.9-30 of the Final EIR.	Revised based on comments from California Department of Fish and Wildlife on the Draft EIR
Page 2.3-37 Section 2.3.1.8	In Section 2.3.1.8, Habitat Connectivity and Wildlife Corridors, the Special Habitat Management Areas discussion has been updated for the Planning Agreement for the North and East County Multiple Species Conservation Program.	Update to the Habitat Connectivity and Wildlife Corridors discussion based on updated information on the Planning Agreement for the MSCP Program
Pages 2.3-41 to 2.3-43 Section 2.3.2.3	In Section 2.3.2.3, Local Regulations, the discussion of the East County Multiple Species Conservation Program has been updated to discuss the Amended Planning Agreement for the North and East County Multiple Species Conservation Plan with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the United States Wildlife Service.	Update to the discussion of the East County Multiple Species Conservation Program discussion
Pages 2.3-49 and 2.3-50 Section 2.3.3.2	In Section 2.3.3.2, Candidate, Sensitive, or Special-Status Species, Impacts BI-WLC-1, BI-WLC-2, and BI-WLC-3: Impacts to Cougar have been updated and a footnote inserted at the bottom of Page 2.3-49.	Revised based on comments from California Department of Fish and Wildlife on the Draft EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Pages 2.3-50 and 2.3-52 Section 2.3.3.2	In Section 2.3.3.2, Candidate, Sensitive, or Special-Status Species, Impacts BI-W2, Impacts to Tricolored Blackbird have been updated and a footnote inserted at the bottom of Page 2.3-50.	Revised based on comments from California Department of Fish and Wildlife on the Draft EIR
Page 2.3-54 Section 2.3.3.2	In Section 2.3.3.2, Candidate, Sensitive, or Special-Status Species, the Golden Eagle discussion on Page 2.3-54 has been updated to include the implementation of Project Design Feature PDF-BIO-1.	Revised based on comments from California Department of Fish and Wildlife on the Draft EIR
Page 2.3-55 Section 2.3.3.2	In Section 2.3.3.2, Candidate, Sensitive, or Special-Status Species, the Impact BI-W-4; Permanent Direct Impacts on Maternity Bat Roosts discussion has been updated to discuss the February 2021 Bat Surveys.	Revised based on comments received during public review of the Draft EIR
Page 2.3-57 Section 2.3.3.2	In Section 2.3.3.2, Candidate, Sensitive, or Special-Status Species, the Impact BI-W-4; Permanent Direct Impacts on Maternity Bat Roosts discussion has been updated to discuss the February 2021 Bat Surveys.	Revised based on comments received during public review of the Draft EIR
Page 2.3-61 Section 2.3.3.2	In Section 2.3.3.2, Candidate, Sensitive, or Special-Status Species, the Project Effects Relevant to Guideline A Switchyard Facilities discussion has been updated to discuss Cougars.	Revised based on comments from California Department of Fish and Wildlife on the Draft EIR
Page 2.3-69 Section 2.3.3.3	In Section 2.3.3.3, Riparian Habitat or Sensitive Natural Community, the Impact BI-V-3: Temporary Indirect Impacts to Riparian Habitat or Sensitive Vegetation Communities has been updated to address edge effects on adjacent undeveloped lands or other natural habitat areas.	Revised based on comments from California Department of Fish and Wildlife on the Draft EIR
Page 2.3-70 Section 2.3.3.3	In Section 2.3.3.3, Riparian Habitat or Sensitive Natural Community, the Impact BI-V-4: Permanent Indirect Impacts to Riparian Habitat or Sensitive Vegetation Communities has been updated to address undeveloped or other natural habitat areas adjacent to construction activities as a result of adverse edge effects.	Revised based on comments from California Department of Fish and Wildlife on the Draft EIR
Page 2.3-75 Section 2.3.3.5	In Section 2.3.3.5, Wildlife Movement and Nursery Sites, a footnote has been added to Guideline C for the Determination of Significance.	Revised based on comments from California Department of Fish and Wildlife on the Draft EIR
Page 2.3-78 Section 2.3.3.5	In Section 2.3.3.5, Wildlife Movement and Nursery Sites, the Project Effects Relevant to Guideline E has been updated include PDF-BIO-1	Revised based on comments from California Department of Fish and Wildlife on the Draft EIR (
Page 2.3-83 Section 2.3.3.6	In Section 2.3.3.6, Local Policies, Ordinance, and Adopted Plans, the Project Effect as Relevant to Guideline B has been updated to discuss the Planning	Revised based on comments from California Department of Fish and Wildlife on the Draft EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
	Agreement for the North and East County Multiple Species Conservation Plan with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the United States Wildlife Service.	
Page 2.3-85 Section 2.3.3.6	In Section 2.3.3.6, Local Policies, Ordinances, and Adopted Plans, the Impact BI-WLC-1, BI-WLC-2, and BI-WLC-3 has been updated to discuss Impacts to Cougar.	Revised based on comments from California Department of Fish and Wildlife on the Draft EIR
Pages 2.3-85 and 2.3-86 Section 2.3.3.6	In Section 2.3.3.6, Local Policies, Ordinances, and Adopted Plans, the Impact BI-W-2, Impacts to Tricolored Blackbird has been updated	Revised based on comments from California Department of Fish and Wildlife on the Draft EIR
Page 2.3-88 Section 2.3.3.6	In Section 2.3.3.6, Local Policies, Ordinance, and Adopted Plan, the Project Effect as Relevant to Guideline J has been updated to discuss Cougars.	Revised based on comments from California Department of Fish and Wildlife on the Draft EIR
Page 2.3-88 Section 2.3.4	In Section 2.3.4, Cumulative Impact Analysis, the Cumulative Methodology discussion has been updated to include the Sunrise Powerlink Transmission Line.	Update to the Cumulative Methodology discussion to include the Sunrise Powerlink Transmission
Page 2.3-95 Section 2.3.5	In Section 2.3.5, Significance of Impacts Prior to Mitigation, the Project Effects Relevant to Guideline A discussion has been updated to discuss Cougar.	Revised based on comments from California Department of Fish and Wildlife on the Draft EIR
Page 2.3-105 Section 2.3.5	In Section 2.3.5, Significance of Impacts Prior to Mitigation, the Project Effects Relevant to Guideline J discussion has been updated to discuss Cougar.	Revised based on comments from California Department of Fish and Wildlife on the Draft EIR
Page 2.3-108 Section 2.3.6	In Section 2.3.6, Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features, text has been deleted in **M-BI-1**, Biological Monitoring as follows: c. Review ~~and/or designate~~ the construction area in the field with the contractor in accordance with the final grading plan prior to clearing, grubbing, or grading.	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-BI-1**
Page 2.3-108 Section 2.3.6	In Section 2.3.6, Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features, text has been added to **M-BI-1**, Biological Monitoring, to include a Worker Environmental Awareness Program requirement.	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-BI-1**
Page 2.3-111 Section 2.3.6	In Section 2.3.6, Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features, text has been added to **M-BI-3**, Habitat Preservation, in order to clarify that even with the reduced Major Use Permit area in the new Project design, the applicant shall	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-BI-3**

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
	provide a total of 435 acres of biological open space easement as described in the Draft and Final EIR.	
Pages 2.3-114 and 2.3-115 Section 2.3.6	In Section 2.3.6, Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features, text has been added to **M-BI-4**, Resource Management Plan (RMP) to include Project specific requirements and Goals in the Final Resources Management Plan	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-BI-4**
Page 2.3-115 Section 2.3.6	In Section 2.3.6, Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features, text has been added to **M-BI-5** to include language about avoiding trampling and crushing special-status reptiles, San Diego desert woodrat or American badger	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-BI-5**
Page 2.3-118 Section 2.3.6	In Section 2.3.6, Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features, **M-BI-5** has been updated to remove the language take avoidance and replace it with preconstruction surveys.	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-BI-5**
Pages 2.3-119 to2.3-121 Section 2.3.6	In Section 2.3.6, Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features, text has been added to **M-BI-5** to clarify how Special-Status Preconstruction Surveys and Relocation Plan shall be conducted, documented, timed and monitored.	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-BI-5**
Page 2.3-121 Section 2.3.6	In Section 2.3.6, Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features, text has been added to **M-BI-5** to include American badger, San Diego desert woodrat, and special status reptile species.	Clarification in mitigation measure **M-BI-5**
Pages 2.3-121 to 2.3-123 Section 2.3.6	In Section 2.3.6, Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features, text has been revised and/or added to **M-BI-6**, Bat Surveys and Roost Avoidance or Exclusion, to clarify how Bat Surveys and Roost Avoidance or Exclusion activities shall be conducted, documented, timed and monitored.	Clarification in mitigation measure **M-BI-6**
Page 2.3-124 Section 2.3.6	In Section 2.3.6, Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features, text has been added to **M-BI-8**, Prevention of Chemical Pollutants, to include pesticides.	Clarification in mitigation measure **M-BI-8**
Page 2.3-127 Section 2.3.6	Project Design Feature PDF-BIO-1, APLIC Standards, has been added to Section 2.3.6, Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features.	Addition of new Project Design Feature PDF-BIO-1 APLIC Standards
Pages 2.3-128 and 2.3-129 Section 2.3.7	In Section 2.3.7, Conclusion, the Candidate, Sensitive or Special-Status Species discussion has been updated.	Update to Candidate, Sensitive or Special=Status Species conclusion
Pages 2.3-133 to 2.3-152 Table 2.3.3	Table 2.3-3, Permanent Impacts to Special-Status Wildlife Species Present within the Project Site or with High Potential to Occur, has been updated.	Update to Permanent Impacts to Special-Status Wildlife Species Present within the Project Site

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Pages 2.3-156 and 2.3-158 Table 2.3-7	Table 2.3-7, Consistency Analysis for the North and East County MSCP Principles, has been added to Page 2.3-156 of the Final EIR.	Addition of Table 2.3-7 to discuss the Proposed Project's consistency with the North and East County MSCP Principles
Pages 2.3-158 to 2.3-165 Table 2.3-8	Table 2.3-7, Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation, has been updated to be Table 2.3-8 and to include impacts to Cougar.	Update of Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation in Table 2.3-8
Section 2.4 Cultural Resources		
Page 2.4-1 Section 2.4	In the introduction to Section 2.4, the list of reports the analysis was based upon has been updated to include Ground Penetrating Radar Study Fieldwork Summary (Appendix F of Appendix E, Cultural Resources Report) and the Proposed Project Revisions Technical Memorandum (Appendix R).	Updated list of technical documents relied upon in the Final EIR
Page 2.4-1 Section 2.4	In the introduction to Section 2.4, text has been updated to include minor revisions to the Proposed Project including the increased setback from Jacumba Community Park, the increased setbacks from the north and south sides of Old Highway 80, and the water main realignment. These revisions to the Proposed Project will not change any significance determinations in this section. Section 2.4 has been revised to account for the Proposed Project revisions.	Provide description of minor revisions to the Proposed Project which were made in response to comments received regarding the Proposed Project in the Draft EIR. Updated Section 2.4 as needed.
Page 2.4-2 Section 2.4.1	In Section 2.4.1, Existing Conditions, the has been added to the Natural Setting discussion clarifying that additional information pertaining to the biological resources in the Project area, including vegetation communities and wildlife, can be found in Section 2.3, Biological Resources, of the EIR	Clarify which section in EIR includes additional information regarding biological resources
Page 2.4-3 Section 2.4.1	In Section 2.4.1, Existing Conditions, text was added in the Area of Direct Impact discussion to include the water main realignment component and the trenching required to realign the water main.	Updated analysis to include water main realignment
Page 2.4-5 Section 2.4.1.1	In Section 2.4.1.1, Methodology, text has been added to the Field Methods discussion about the Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) Study that was conducted in November 2020 in the portion of the Project ADI where the substation and Switchyard Facilities are proposed. Text was also added referring readers to the new Appendix F of the Cultural Resources Report (Appendix E) for details regarding the GPR methodology and results.	Additional analysis added regarding Ground Penetrating Radar survey that was conducted November 2020 in response to comments received from the Imperial Valley Desert Museum on the Draft EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Pages 2.4-8 and 2.4-9 Section 2.4.1.3	Section 2.4.1.3, Survey and Evaluation Results to document the Ground Penetrating Radar Results has been added.	Additional analysis added regarding the Ground Penetrating Radar survey
Page 2.4-18 Section 2.4.3.1	Text has been added to Section 2.4.3.1, Analysis, about the Ground Penetrating Radar Study	Additional analysis added regarding the Ground Penetrating Radar survey
Page 2.4-23 Section 2.4.3.1	In Section 2.4.3.1, Analysis, under the Switchyard Facilities Historical Resources (Guidelines 1 and 3) discussion, the following text has been added and/or deleted from Page 2.4-23 of the Final EIR as follows: The Proposed Project would include a 138-kilovolt (kV) switchyard located adjacent to the proposed collector substation. The ~~size of the switchyard~~ Switchyard Facilities would include the ~~be~~ approximately 140,000 square feet switchyard, the 138kV transmission lines and the switchyard access road. ~~Within this area would be 8-foot high security fence (445 feet by 300 feet) surrounded by a 5-foot shoulder for grounding protection inside the fence.~~	Revised due to comments received from San Diego Gas & Electric on the Draft EIR
Page 2.4-27 Section 2.4.3.1	In Section 2.4.3.1, Analysis, under the Archaeological Resources (Guidelines 2 and 3), text has been revised clarifying all Proposed Project components would be decommissioned except the Switchyard facilities and realigned water main.	Clarification in response to comments on the Draft EIR
Page 2.4-29 Section 2.4.3.1	In Section 2.4.3.1, Analysis, under the Human Remains (Guidelines 3 and 4) analysis, text has been revised clarifying all Proposed Project components would be decommissioned except the Switchyard facilities and realigned water main.	Clarification in response to comments on the Draft EIR
Page 2.4-30 Section 2.4.4	In Section 2.4.4, Cumulative Impact Analysis, text has been revised as follows: The artifact collections from any potentially significant site would also be curated at a facility within ~~the~~ San Diego or Imperial County or with an affiliated tribal curation facility.	Clarification in response to comments on the Draft EIR
Page 2.4-31 Section 2.4.4	In Section 2.4.4, Cumulative Impact Analysis, text has been added as follows: Considering the possibility that the current Project might impact a cultural landscape, Dudek considered the significance of the impacted sites in relationship to the larger cultural context. The sites do not represent or convey the significant elements of character defining archaeological sites in the broader	Updated cumulative analysis in response to comments on the Draft EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
	region. As such, the sites within the proposed Project ADI are not significant contributing elements to the larger cultural landscape.	
Pages 2.4-34 to 2.4-36 Section 2.4.6	In Section 2.4.6, Mitigation Measures, **M-CR-2** Archeological Monitoring, has been revised.	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-CR-2** in response to comments on the Draft EIR
Page 2.4-36 Section 2.4.6	In Section 2.4.6, Mitigation Measures, **M-C-R-3**, Cultural Resources Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan, has been revised.	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-CR-3** in response to comments on the Draft EIR
Pages 2.4-39, 2.4-41, and 2.4-43 Figures 2A, 2B and 2C.	Figures 2A, 2B and 2C have been updated to show the revised area of direct impact.	Figures updated to show the revised area of direct impact due to the revisions to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR
Section 2.5 Geology, Soils and Seismicity		
Page 2.5-1 Section 2.5	In the introduction to Section 2.5, the list of reports the analysis was based upon has been updated to include the Geology Mitigation Measures Memorandum (Appendix F) and the Proposed Project Revisions Technical Memorandum (new Appendix R).	Updated list of technical documents relied upon in the Final EIR
Page 2.5-1 Section 2.5	In the introduction to Section 2.,5, text has been updated to include minor revisions to the Proposed Project including the increased setback from Jacumba Community Park, the increased setbacks from the north and south sides of Old Highway 80 and the water main realignment. The added text clarifies that the revisions to the Proposed Project will not change any significance determinations in Section 2.5. The Section has not been updated to account for the changed Project area and conservatively reports impacts associated with a 643-acre Project.	Provide description of minor revisions to the Proposed Project which were made in response to comments received regarding the Proposed Project in the Draft EIR
Page 2.5-14 Section 2.5.3.2	In Section 2.5.3.2, Ground Shaking, the following text in the Proposed Project analysis has been added and/or deleted.: The maximum height of the solar facilities that would be constructed would be up to ~~four~~ five ~~80~~ 70 to 115-foot tall poles located in the ~~switchyard~~ Switchyard Facilities, which would be located in the center of the Project site, approximately 4,500 feet from the occupied residences.	Correction based on the updated Project Description in Chapter 1 of the Final EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Page 2.5-16 Section 2.5.3.2	In Section 2.5.3.2, Ground Shaking, the following text in the Switchyard Facilities analysis has been added or deleted as follows: The ~~switchyard~~ Switchyard Facilities would include the construction of up to ~~four~~ five ~~80~~70 to 115-foot-high poles to support the 138- kilovolt overhead transmission line; however, since the ~~switchyard~~ Switchyard Facilities would consist of a stand-alone facility that would not house operational employees, the public safety implications of damage or collapse of this facility would be negligible.	Correction based on the updated Project Description in Chapter 1 of the Final EIR
Page 2.5-23 Section 2.5.6	In Section 2.5.6, Mitigation Measures, **M-GEO-1** has been revised.	Clarification to **M-GEO-1** based on new technical memorandum the Appendix F of the Final EIR
Page 2.5-23 Section 2.5.7	In Section 2.5.7, Conclusion, a footnote has been added to Page 2.5-23 to explain that **M-GEO-1** has been revised to comport with all applicable geotechnical standards and practices for a utility-scale solar project.	Clarification in **M-GEO-1** based on new technical memorandum the Appendix F of the Final EIR
Section 2.6 - Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
Page 2.6-1 Section 2.6	In Section 2.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the list of reports the analysis was based upon on Page 2.6-1 of the Final EIR has been updated to include the 2021 Glare Study (Appendix A of Visual Resources Technical Report), Airport Issues Technical Memorandum (Appendix T), and the Proposed Project Revisions Technical Memorandum (Appendix R).	Updated list of technical documents relied upon in the Final EIR
Page 2.6-2 Section 2.6	In the introduction to Section 2.6, text has been updated to include minor revisions to the Proposed Project including the increased setback from Jacumba Community Park, the increased setbacks from the north and south sides of Old Highway 80 and the water main realignment. These revisions to the Proposed Project will not change any significance determinations in this section. Section 2.6 has been revised to account for the Proposed Project revisions.	Provide description of minor revisions to the Proposed Project which were made in response to comments received regarding the Proposed Project in the Draft EIR
Page 2.6-3 Section 2.6.1	In Section 2.6.1, Existing Conditions the discussion of Potential Hazardous Material Association with Historical Land Uses, text was added regarding an additional site visit conducted by Dudek in January 2021.	Updated text regarding additional site visit which was conducted based on comments on the Draft EIR regarding underground storage tanks

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Page 2.6-5 Section 2.6.1	In Section 2.6.1, Existing Conditions, the residential use discussion was updated to discuss the findings of a site visit Dudek conducted during January 2021 to look for evidence of underground storage tanks.	Updated text regarding additional site visit which was conducted based on comments on the Draft EIR regarding underground storage tanks
Page 2.6-27 Section 2.6.3.3	In Section 2.6.3.3, Hazardous Materials, the following text was added to the analysis as follows: No underground storage tanks are proposed as a part of the Proposed Project and no underground storage tanks have been identified at the Project site. The Proposed Project would comply with all applicable regulations governing the use of hazardous substances during construction, including but not limited to the Underground Storage Tank Act in the event that an undisclosed underground storage tank is discovered.	Revised based on additional site visit and comments on the Draft EIR regarding underground storage tanks
Page 2.6-31 and 2.6-32 Section 2.6.3.4	In Section 2.6.3.4, Airport Hazards, the Lot Coverage discussion for the Proposed Project was updated to be consistent with new Appendix T, Jacumba Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Technical Memorandum, in the Final EIR.	Revised based on comments received on the Draft EIR regarding airport hazards and to be consistent with new Appendix T in the Final EIR
Page 2.6-32 and 2.6-33 Section 2.6.3.4	In Section 2.6.3.4, Airport Hazards, the Open Land discussion for the Proposed Project was updated to be consistent with new Appendix T in the Final EIR.	Revised based on comments received on the Draft EIR regarding airport hazards and to be consistent with new Appendix T in the Final EIR
Page 2.6-33 Section 2.6.3.4	In Section 2.6.3.4, Airport Hazards, the Structures discussion for the Proposed project has been updated.	Revised based on comments received on the Draft EIR on airport hazards
Page 2.6-34 to 2.6-36 Section 2.6.3.4	In Section 2.6.3.4, Airport Hazards, the Glare discussion was updated to be consistent with the 2021 Glare Study (Appendix A to the Visual Resources Report in the Final EIR).	Revised based on comments received on the Draft EIR on airport hazards and to be consistent with the updated 2021 Glare Study
Page 2.6-49 Section 2.6.3.7	In Section 2.6.3.7, text has been deleted as follows: The ~~aboveground (detachable)~~ equipment and structures would be disassembled and removed from the site.	Clarification that equipment and structures would be dissembled and removed, including underground connections
Page 2.6-53 Section 2.6.5	In Section 2.6.5, Significance of Impacts Prior to Mitigaiton, the Airport Hazards discussion has been updated with new information from the 2021 Glare Study for the Proposed Project and to discuss the implementation of PDF-HAZ-1.	Revised based on comments received on the Draft EIR regarding airport hazards and to be consistent with new Appendix T in the Final EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Page 2.6-56 Section 2.6.6	In Section 2.6.6, Mitigation and Project Design Features, Project Design Feature PDF-HAZ-1 has been added to the Final EIR.	New Project Design Feature PDF-HAZ-1 has been added in response to comments received on Draft EIR during public review regarding airport hazards and glare
Pages 2.6-57 and 2.6-58 Section 2.6.7	In Section 2.6.7, Conclusion, the Airport Hazards discussion has been updated.	Text added in response to comments received on Draft EIR during public review regarding airport hazards and glare
Section 2.7 – Hydrology and Water Quality		
Page 2.7-1 Section 2.7	In Section 2.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, the list of reports the analysis was based upon on Page 2.7-1 has been updated to include the JVR Energy Park Project Revised Construction Water Demand Memorandum (Appendix B of the Groundwater Investigation Report), the Proposed Project Revisions Technical Memorandum (Appendix R) and Hydrology Technical Memorandum (Appendix U).	Updated list of technical documents relied upon in the Final EIR
Page 2.7-2 Section 2.6	In Section 2.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, text has been updated to include minor revisions to the Proposed Project including the increased setback from Jacumba Community Park, the increased setbacks from the north and south sides of Old Highway 80 and the water main realignment. These Proposed Project revisions will not change any significance determinations in this section and Section 2.7 has been revised to account for the Proposed Project changes.	Provide description of minor revisions to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR
Page 2.7-18 Section 2.7.3.1	In Section 2.7.3.1, Hydrology and Drainage Patterns, the following text was added and/or deleted to the analysis on Page 2.7-18 of the Final EIR as follows: Project construction would involve clearing and grubbing of the existing vegetation within the 643-acre development footprint. Grading would be required throughout the development footprint. Grading is expected to be balanced on site, with approximately ~~264,000~~ 280,000 cubic yards of cut redistributed across the site. It was determined that the Project would add ~~1.9~~ 6.65 acres (~~0.0030~~ 0.1004 square miles) of impervious surface, an amount not large enough to significantly affect runoff. Impervious surface calculations are discussed further in Appendix U to the Final EIR.	As discussed in Appendix B, JVR Energy Park Project Revised Construction Water Demand, of the Groundwater Resources Technical Memorandum (Appendix J of the EIR), the amount of grading has been updated. As discussed in Appendix U, Hydrology Technical Memorandum, the calculation of impervious surface area has been updated.

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Pages 2.7-19 and 2.7-20 Section 2.7.3.1	In Section 2.7.3.1, Hydrology and Drainage Patterns, the following text has been added as follows: Further, the portions of the Project site not overlain by roads, inverters, battery storage containers, the substation, and the Switchyard Facilities shall be reseeded with a native hydroseed mix to provide vegetation cover during Project operations in accordance with Project Design Feature **PDF-HYD-3**.	Additional text regarding new Project Design Feature PDF-HYD-3 in response to comments received on the Draft EIR regarding fugitive dust during Project operations
Page 2.7-23 Section 2.7.3.2	In Section 2.7.3.2, Flood Hazards, the following text was added to the analysis as follows: Project Design Feature PDF-HYD-4 describes the types of perimeter flood fencing that would be installed. It Installation of the perimeter fencing could result in additional scour and/or sedimentation that would not have otherwise occurred absent the perimeter fencing.	Additional text regarding new Project Design Feature PDF-HYD-4 regarding fencing types and flood flows
Page 2.7-32 Section 2.7.3.4	In Section 2.7.3.4, Groundwater Resources, the analysis on page 2.7-32 was updated to account for the new annual operating demand post construction and to clarify the operational life of the Proposed Project.	Clarification on water demand based on revised Proposed Project in Final EIR
Page 2.7-33 Section 2.7.3.4	In Section 2.7.3.4, Groundwater Resources, the analysis under County Threshold of 50% Reduction in Groundwater Storage section and the analysis in Well Interference and Groundwater-Dependent Ecosystems section has been updated.	Revised analysis
Page 2.7-37 Section 2.7.4.1	In Section 2.7.4.1, Hydrology, Drainage Patterns and Water Quality, the analysis has been updated to include the new impervious area calculation.	As discussed in Appendix U, Hydrology Technical Memorandum, the calculation of impervious surface area has been updated. Text revised to reflect Appendix U.
Page 2.7-40 Section 2.7.5	In Section 2.7.5, Significance of Impact Prior to Mitigation, the text in the Drainage Patterns discussion was updated to show the increase in impervious surface acres and to include Project Design Feature PDF-HYD-4.	As discussed in Appendix U, Hydrology Technical Memorandum, the calculation of impervious surface area has been updated. Text added to reflect Appendix U. Text also updated to include new Project Design Feature PDF-HYD-4

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Page 2.7-44 Section 2.7.6	In Section 2.7.6, Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features, new Project Design Feature PDF-HYD-3.	New Project Design Feature PDF-HYD-3 added in response to comments received on the Draft EIR regarding fugitive dust during Project operations
Page 2.7-44 Section 2.7.6	In Section 2.7.6, Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features, new Project Design Feature PDF-HYD-4 was added.	New Project Design Feature PDF-HYD-4 added to address perimeter fencing types and flood flows
Page 2.7-44 Section 2.7.7	In section 2.7.7, Conclusion, under the Hydrology and Drainage Patterns discussion, text was added regarding Project Design Feature PDF-HYD-3 (vegetative cover during Project operation)	Clarification based on new Project Design Feature PDF-HYD-3
Section 2.8 – Mineral Resources		
Page 2.8-1 Section 2.8	In the introduction to Section 2.8.1, the Proposed Project Revisions Technical Memorandum (Appendix R) was added to the list of technical data relied upon for Section 2.8, Mineral Resources.	Updated list of technical documents relied upon in the Final EIR
Page 2.8-1 Section 2.8	In the introduction to Section 2.8, the text has been updated to include minor revisions to the Proposed Project including the increased setback from Jacumba Community Park, the increased setbacks from the north and south sides of Old Highway 80 and the water main realignment. Text has also been added stating these Proposed Project revisions will not change any significance determinations in Section 2.8. The Section has been revised to account for these Proposed Project changes.	Updated based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR
Pages 2.8-9 and 2.8-10 Section 2.8.3	In Section 2.8.3, Analysis of Project Effects and Determination as to Significance, the analysis under Guideline 1 has been updated for minor revisions to the Proposed Project.	Analysis revised to reflect minor revisions to the Proposed Project
Page 2.8-17 Figure 2.8-1	Figure 2.8-1, Potential Mitigation Lands, has been updated to reflect the 8.1-acre site for the Switchyard Facilities.	Figure updated in response reflect updated Switchyard Facilities development footprint.
Section 2.9 – Noise		
Page 2.9-1 Section 2.9	In the introduction to Section 2.9.1, the Proposed Project Revisions Technical Memorandum (Appendix R) memorandum has been added to the list of technical data relied upon for Section 2.9, Noise.	Updated list of technical documents relied upon in the Final EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Page 2.9-1 Section 2.9	In the introduction to Section 2.9, the text has been updated to include minor revisions to the Proposed Project including the increased setback from Jacumba Community Park, the increased setbacks from the north and south sides of Old Highway 80 and the water main realignment. The text has also been updated to state these Proposed Project revisions will not change any significance determinations in Section 2.9. The Section has been updated to account for these Project changes.	Updated based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR
Pages 2.9-12 and 2.9-13 Section 2.9.4.1	In Section 2.9.4.1, Methodology and Noise Calculations, the Noise Formulas and Calculations discussion has been updated to include a new assumption regarding the height of all modeled noise sources and describing this conservative analysis. A footnote regarding the methodology has also been added.	Text revisions made based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project
Page 2.9-14 Section 2.9.4.2	In Section 2.9.4.2, NSLU Affected by Airborne Noise – Exterior (Non-Construction), the Inverter/Transformer Platforms noise discussion has been updated.	Revisions made based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project
Pages 2.9-14 and 2.9-15 Section 2.9.4.2	In Section 2.9.4.2, NSLU Affected by Airborne Noise – Exterior (Non-Construction), the Battery Energy Storage System noise discussion has been updated. A footnote has also been added.	Revisions made based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project
Pages 2.9-16 to 2.9-20 Section 2.9.4.2	In Section 2.9.4.2, NSLU Affected by Airborne Noise – Exterior (Non-Construction), the Mobile Sources (PV Pane Power-washing) discussion has been updated to discuss how the predicted noise levels for the self-propelled PV panel washing option were remodeled in the Acoustical Assessment Report (Appendix M to the Final EIR) based on a new set of assumptions regarding how the self-propelled PV panel washing process would occur in proximity to an NSLU or its property line adjoining the Proposed Project. The analysis discusses a new finding and includes new Project Design Feature PDF-NOI-1.	Revisions made based on a new set of assumptions regarding how the self-propelled PV panel washing process would occur in proximity to an NSLU or its property line
Pages 2.9-20 and 2.9-21 Section 2.9.4.2	In Section 2.9.4.2, NSLU Affected by Airborne Noise – Exterior (Non-Construction), the Switchyard Facilities discussion has been updated to discuss the sound that may be produced from corona associated with the interconnection lines.	Clarification added regarding corona

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Page 2.9-21 Section 2.9.4.2	In Section 2.9.4.2, NSLU Affected by Airborne Noise – Exterior (Non-Construction), the conclusions about the combined operation noise at NSLU have been updated.	Revisions made based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project
Page 2.9-22 Section 2.9.4.3	In Section 2.9.4.3, NSLU Affected by Airborne Noise – Interior (Non-Construction), the analysis has been revised regarding onsite PV panel washing activity in accordance with PDF-NOI-1.	Revisions regarding updated analysis in Acoustical Analysis Assessment (Appendix M) and implementation of a new Project Design Feature PDF-NOI-1
Page 2.9-23 Section 2.9.4.4	In Section 2.9.4.4, Proposed-Project-Generated Noise, Operation, the analysis of the Combined Stationary Noise Sources has been updated to include a description of how a new representative location (B4) at a residence on the south side of Old Highway 80 was added to predict outdoor noise levels.	Revisions regarding updated analysis in Acoustical Analysis Assessment (Appendix M) and implementation of a new Project Design Feature PDF-NOI-1
Pages 2.9-23 and 2.9-24 Section 2.9.4.4	In Section 2.9.4.4, Proposed-Project-Generated Noise, Operation, the analysis of the Mobile Sources (PV Panel Power-washing) has been updated to discuss the implementation of the distance constraints of new Project Design Feature PDF-NOI-1.	Revisions regarding updated analysis in Acoustical Analysis Assessment (Appendix M) and implementation of a new Project Design Feature PDF-NOI-1
Page 2.9-25 Section 2.9.4.5	In Section 2.9.4.5, Proposed-Project-Generated Noise, Low-Frequency, the G-weighted noise level discussion and estimates have been updated.	Updated based on updated analysis in the Acoustical Assessment Report (Appendix M of the Final EIR)
Page 2.9-27 Section 2.9.4.6	In Section 2.9.4.6, Proposed Project-Generated Noise, Construction and Decommissioning, an analysis of the Decommissioning Activities has been inserted.	Updated based on updated analysis in the Acoustical Assessment Report (Appendix M of the Final EIR)
Page 2.9-38 Section 2.9.6	In Section 2.9.6, Significance of Impacts Prior to Mitigation, the Operation Noise Levels analysis has been updated to include the implementation of PDF-NOI-1.	Additional text included regarding the updated analysis in Acoustical Analysis Assessment (Appendix M of the Final EIR) and implementation of a new Project Design Feature PDF-NOI-1
Pages 2.9-42 and 2.9-43 Section 2.9.7	In Section 2.9.7, Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features, **M-NOI-2** has been revised on Page 2.9-42 and 2.9-43 of the Final EIR.	Text deleted in **M-NOI-2** based on updated analysis in Acoustical Analysis Assessment (Appendix M of the Final EIR) and implementation of new Project Design Feature PDF-NOI-1

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Page 2.9-47 Section 2.9.7	In Section 2.9.7, Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features, PDF-NOI-1 has been inserted as a Project Design Feature.	Revisions based on updated analysis in Acoustical Analysis Assessment (Appendix M of the Finale EIR) and implementation of new Project Design Feature PDF-NOI-1
Page 2.9-48 Section 2.9.8	In Section 2.9.8, Conclusion, the Operational Noise conclusion has been updated to include the implementation of PDF-NOI-1	Revisions based on updated analysis in Acoustical Analysis Assessment (Appendix M of the Final EIR) and implementation of new Project Design Feature PDF-NOI-1
Page 2.9-50 Table 2.9-2	Table 2.9-2, Measured Outdoor Ambient Noise Levels in Proposed Project Vicinity, has been updated.	Revisions based on updated analysis in Acoustical Analysis Assessment (Appendix M of the Final EIR) and implementation of new Project Design Feature PDF-NOI-1
Page 2.9-51 Table 2.9-4	Table 2.9-4, Predicted Proposed Project Stationary Equipment Operations Noise Level at Property Line and Off-Site Locations has been updated.	Revisions based on updated analysis in Acoustical Analysis Assessment (Appendix M of the Final EIR) and implementation of new Project Design Feature PDF-NOI-1
Page 2.9-53 Figure 2.9-1	Figure 2.9-1, Environmental Setting, has been updated to reflect the revised Proposed Project site plan.	Updated Figure based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project
Page 2.9-55 Figure 2.9-2	Figure 2.9-2, Noise Measurement Locations, has been updated to reflect the revised Proposed Project site plan.	Updated Figure based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project
Page 2.9-57 Figure 2.9-3	Figure 2.9-3, Predicted Project Operations Noise Contour (45 dBA Leq) has been updated to reflect the revised Proposed Project site plan.	Updated Figure based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project
Section 2.10 - Paleontological Resources		
Page 2.10-1 Section 2.10	In Section 2.10-1, the Proposed Project Revisions Technical Memorandum (Appendix R) has been added to the list of technical data relied upon for Section 2.10, Paleontological Resources.	Updated list of technical documents relied upon in the Final EIR
Page 2.10-1 Section 2.10	In Section 2.10, Paleontological Resources, the text has been updated to include minor revisions to the Proposed Project including the increased setback from Jacumba Community Park, the increased setbacks from the north and south sides of Old Highway 80 and the water main realignment. Text has also been added clarifying that this Section has been revised to account for the Proposed Project revisions.	Update based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Page 2.10.6 Section 2.10.3	In Section 2.10.3, Analysis of Project Effects and Determination of Significance, the analysis of the Proposed Project has been updated to account for minor revisions to the Proposed Project.	Clarification regarding the updated amount of grading required for the Proposed Project.
Page 2.10-11 Figure 2.10-11	Figure 2.10-11, Paleontological Resource Potential, has been updated to reflect the revised Proposed Project site plan.	Updated Figure based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project.
Section 2.11 - Tribal Cultural Resources		
Page 2.11-1 Section 2.11	In Section 2.11, Tribal Cultural Resources, the text has been updated to include minor revisions to the Proposed Project including the increased setback from Jacumba Community Park, the increased setbacks from the north and south sides of Old Highway 80 and the water main realignment. The text has also been updated to clarify a how this Section has been revised to account for the Proposed Project revisions.	Updated based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR
Page 2.11-14 Section 2.11.3	In Section 2.11.3, the analysis has been updated to account for minor Proposed Project revisions such as the decreased development footprint, trenching that would occur for the water main realignment and increased grading from 264,000 cubic yard to 280,000 cubic yards of cut redistributed across the site.	Clarification regarding the grading and trenching required for the Proposed Project.
Page 2.11-16 Section 2.11.3	In Section 2.11.3, Analysis of Project Effects and Determination of Significance, the Switchyard Facilities analysis has been updated.	Updated based on revised Switchyard Facilities description
Page 2.11-17 Section 2.11.4	In Section 2.11.4, Cumulative Impact Analysis, the text has been updated to clarify that the artifact collections from any potentially significant site would also be curated at a facility with the San Diego County, Imperial County or with an affiliated tribal curation facility.	Clarification in response to comments received on the Draft EIR
Page 2.11-20 Section 2.11.6	In Section 2.11.6, Mitigation Measures, **M-TCR-2** Archeological and Tribal Monitoring, has been revised to state the Project Archaeologist shall notify the Campo Band of Mission Indians, Manzanita Band of Kumeyaay Nation, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians of the unanticipated discovery or for identification of human remains. **M-TCR-2** was also revised to state should a potential TCR be identified, the Project archaeologist shall consult with consulting tribes for a final determination.	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-TCR-2** in response to comments on the Draft EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Page 2.11-21 Section 2.11.6	In Section 2.11.6, Mitigation Measures, **M-TCR-2** has been updated to clarify that in the final report shall provide evidence that all prehistoric materials have been curated at a San Diego County, Imperial County or with an affiliated tribal curation facility.	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-TCR-2** in response to comments on the Draft EIR
Page 2.11-23 Figure 2.11-1	Figure 2.11-1, ADI Map, has been updated to reflect the revised Proposed Project site plan.	Figure updated based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project
Section 2.12 – Wildfire		
Page 2.12-1 Section 2.12	In Section 2.12-1, the Proposed Project Revisions Technical Memorandum (Appendix R) has been added to the information contained in Wildfire Section 2.12.	Updated list of technical documents relied upon in the Final EIR
Page 2.12-1 Section 2.12	In Section 2.12, Wildfire, the text has been updated to include minor revisions to the Proposed Project including the increased setback from Jacumba Community Park, the increased setbacks from the north and south sides of Old Highway 80 and the water main realignment. Text has also been added to clarify how this Section has been updated to account for the changed Project area.	Updated based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR
Page 2.12-33 Section 2.12.3.2	In Section 2.12.3.2, Wildfire Risk, under the Defensible Space and Fuel Management discussion, text has been corrected regarding the water tanks.	Correction
Page 2.12-33 Section 2.12.3.2	In Section 2.12.3.2, Wildfire Risk, under the Construction and Decommissioning discussion, the text has been added and/or deleted regarding Switchyard Facilities and equipment to be decommissioned.	Clarification based on Switchyard Facilities description in Final EIR and to clarify equipment to be removed, which includes underground collection system
Pages 2.12-35 and 2.12-36, Section 2.12.3.3	In Section 2.12.3.3, Infrastructure Contribution to Increased Wildfire Risk analysis, the components of the Proposed Project have been updated to reflect minor revisions to the Proposed Project.	Updated based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project.
Page 2.12-38 Section 2.12.3.3	In Section 2.12.3.3, Infrastructure Contribution to Increased Wildfire Risk, text has been added regarding breakaway or flow through fencing	Clarification regarding fencing for flood flows
Page 2.12-40 Section 2.12.4	In Section 2.12-4, Cumulative Impact Analysis, text has been added and/or deleted from the Emergency Response analysis as follows:	Correction

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
	Therefore, the Proposed Project, in combination with cumulative projects, would result in a cumulatively considerable impact to emergency response ~~an adopted emergency response and emergency evacuation plan~~ (Impact WF-CU-1)	
Page 2.12.-43 Section 2.12.5	In Section 2.12.5, Significance of Impact Prior to Mitigation, the following text has been added or deleted from the discussion: The Proposed Project, in combination with cumulative projects, **would result in a cumulatively considerable impact** to emergency response ~~an adopted emergency response and emergency evacuation plan~~ (**Impact WF-CU-1**).	Correction
Page 2.12-42 Section 2.12.6	In Section 2.12.6, Mitigation Measures, the following text from **M-WF-1** has been corrected for consistency with the revised Fire Protection Plan: • ~~Motion sensor l~~ illuminated (and/or reflective) signage at main entrance with inverter and contact information for a 24-hour remote operations center for the Project ~~electrical grid disconnect and isolation information and identification~~ (Required measure).	Correction for consistency with the Fire Protection Plan (Appendix N of the Final EIR)
Page 2.12-44 Section 2.12.6	In Section 2.12.6, Mitigation Measures, the following text from **M-WF-2** has been added and/or deleted for consistency with the Construction Fire Protection Plan: • The Project will be equipped with at least ~~one and up to~~ two water trucks each of 4,000- gallon capacity • ~~During construction, the project site will have at a minimum two pick-up trucks outfitted with Type 6 Skid-Mounted Units, including fire pump, hose, and nozzle, that are staffed with personnel properly trained to use the equipment.~~	Correction for consistency with the Construction Fire Protection Plan (Appendix N of the Final EIR)
Page 2.12-49 Section 2.12.7	In Section 2.12.7, Conclusion, the Cumulative Impacts discussion has been revised as follows: Emergency Response and Emergency Evacuation As discussed in Section 2.12.4 above, Cumulative Impact Analysis, the Proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, would have a cumulatively considerable impact related to emergency response ~~and emergency evacuation~~ (Impact WF-CU-1). With implementation of mitigation	Correction in Cumulative Impacts

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
	measuresM-WF-1(FPP),M-WF-2(CFPP) andM-WF-3(Fire Protection and Mitigation Agreement), the Project would result in a less than significant cumulative impact.	
	Section 3.1.1 Agricultural Resources	
Page 3.1.1-1 Section 3.1.1	In Section 3.1.1, the Proposed Project Revisions Technical Memorandum (Appendix R) has been added,	Updated list of technical documents relied upon in the Final EIR
Page 3.1.1-1 Section 3.1.1	In Section 3.1.1, Agricultural Resources, text has been updated to include minor revisions to the Proposed Project including the increased setback from Jacumba Community Park, the increased setbacks from the north and south sides of Old Highway 80 and the water main realignment. Text has also been added to clarify that this Section has not been updated to account for the changed Project area and conservatively reports impacts associated with a 643-acre Project.	Updated based on minor revisions to Proposed Project in the Final EIR
Page 3.1.1-3 Section 3.1.1.1	In Section 3.1.1.1, Existing Conditions, under the Current Historical Agricultural Use, the text has been revised to clarify analysis was based on the most recent data from the California Department of Conservation (2018)	Updated reference to data from California Department of Conservation
Page 3.1.1-14 Section 3.1.1.3.2	In Section 3.1.1.3.2, Direct Impacts to Important Agricultural Resources, under the under the Primary LARA Model Factors discussion, a footnote has been added regarding the LARA model and dissolved solids.	Clarification regarding LARA model
Page 3.1.1-15 Section 3.1.1.3.2	In Section 3.1.1.3.2, Direct Impacts to Important Agricultural Resources, the Switchyard Facilities discussion has been updated to state the total area of the Switchyard Facilities would be approximately 8.1 acres.	Clarification regarding Switchyard Facilities
Page 3.1.1-26 Table 3.1.1-4	Table 3.1.1-4, Agricultural Goals and Policies, under the Agricultural Goal of the Mountain Empire Subregional Plan, the Switchyard Facilities and the realigned water main have been added to the analysis.	Revised based on addition of the water main realignment and updated Switchyard Facilities description in the Final EIR
	Section 3.1.2 – Energy	
Page 3.1.2-1 Section 3.1.2	In the introduction to Section 3.1.2, the Proposed Project Revisions Technical Memorandum (Appendix R) was added to the list of documents relied upon.	Updated list of technical documents relied upon in the Final EIR
Page 3.1.2-1 Section 3.1.2	In the introduction to Section 3.1.2, the text has been updated to include minor revisions to the Proposed Project including the increased setback from Jacumba	Updated based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
	Community Park, the increased setbacks from the north and south sides of Old Highway 80 and the water main realignment. Text has also been added to clarify how this Section has been updated to account for the Proposed Project revisions.	
Page 3.1.2-13 Section 3.1.2.3	In Section 3.1.2.3, Analysis of Proposed project Effects and Determination as to Significance, text was updated regarding the revisions to the Proposed Project.	Updated based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR
Page 3.1.2-15 Section 3.1.2.3.1	In Section 3.1.2.3.1, the analysis of the Operational Use discussion has been updated to reflect the revisions to the Proposed Project including the use of bi-facial PV modules and increased wattage. Due to these technological improvements, the estimated amount of renewable electricity production for the revised Proposed Project is approximately 283,000 MWh/yr.	Updated based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR
Page 3.1.2-16 Section 3.1.2.3.1	In Section 3.1.2.3.1, under the Construction and Decommissioning Use analysis, the estimated hours of operation of diesel-fueled construction and decommissioning equipment was revised.	Correction
Page 3.1.2-17 Section 3.1.2.3.1	In Section 3.1.2.3.1, under the Construction and Decommissioning Use analysis, the estimated gallons of petroleum consumed during the construction and decommissioning phases was revised.	Correction to include construction and decommissioning duration.
Page 3.1.2-19 Section 3.1.2.3.1	In Section 3.1.2.3.1, under the Operational Use discussion, text has been added to clarify water would be provided by onsite wells.	Clarification water would be provided by onsite wells
Page 3.1.2-20 Section 3.1.2.3.1	In Section 3.1.2.3.1, under the Operational Use discussion, the number of megawatt hours of renewable electricity produced over the Proposed Project's 35-year lifetime was updated.	Clarification regarding the renewable energy produced over the Proposed Project's lifetime
Page 3.1.2-21 Section 3.1.2.3.2	In Section 3.1.2.3.2, Conflict with Energy Standards, Regulations, Plans and Policies, the MWh/yr the Proposed Project is expected to produce was updated.	Clarification regarding the energy the Proposed Project is expected to produce
Page 3.1.2-22 Section 3.1.2.3.2	In Section 3.1.2.3.2, Conflict with Energy Standards, Regulations, Plans and Policies, the MWh of renewable energy the Proposed Project is estimated to generate over its 35-year lifetime was updated.	Clarification regarding the energy the Proposed Project is expected to generate

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Page 3.1.2-22 Section 3.1.2.5	In Section 3.1.2.5, Significance of Impacts Prior to Mitigation, the MWh of renewable electricity the Proposed Project would generate over its 35-year lifetime has been updated.	Clarification regarding the energy the Proposed Project is expected to generate
Page 3.1.2-23 Section 3.1.2.7	In Section 3.1.2.7, Conclusion, the MWh of renewable electricity the Proposed Project would generate over its 35-year lifetime has been updated.	Clarification regarding the energy the Proposed Project is expected to generate
Page 3.1.2-24 Table 3.1.2-1	Table 3.1.2-1, Hours of Operation for Construction and Decommissioning Equipment – JVR Energy Park, was updated to include the Water Main Realignment Component.	Updated to include realignment of an existing water main
Page 3.1.2-25 Table 3.1.2.2	Table 3.1.2-2, Construction and Decommissioning Equipment Diesel Demand – JVR Energy Park was updated to include the Water Main Realignment Component.	Updated to include realignment of an existing water main
Page 3.1.2-28 Table 3.1.2-5	Table 3.1.2-5, Construction and Decommissioning Haul Truck Diesel Demand - JVR Energy Park was updated to include minor revisions to the Proposed Project. Updated list of technical documents relied upon in the Final EIR	Updated to include the minor revisions to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR
Section 3.1.3 - Greenhouse Gas Emissions		
Page 3.1.3-1 Section 3.1.3	In the introduction to Section 3.1.3, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, a Proposed Project Revisions Technical Memorandum (Appendix R) and an Energy Generation Technical Memorandum (Appendix V) was added to the technical reports relied upon.	Updated list of technical documents relied upon in the Final EIR
Page 3.1.3-1 Section 3.1.3	In the introduction to Section 3.1.3, text has been updated to include minor revisions to the Proposed Project including the increased setback from Jacumba Community Park, the increased setbacks from the north and south sides of Old Highway 80 and the water main realignment. The text has also been updated to discuss how this Section has been revised to account for this change.	Updated based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR
Page 3.1.3-9 Section 3.1.3.2	In Section 3.1.3.2, Regulatory Setting, the Federal discussion has been updated to include the latest actions of the Biden Administration regarding Greenhouse Gas Emissions.	Revisions made to discuss Greenhouse Gas emissions policies under the Biden Administration
Pages 3.1.3-16 and 3.1.3-17, Section 3.1.3.2	In Section 3.1.3.2, Regulatory Setting, a discussion of the Trump Administration and Environmental Protection Agency's intentions to halt federal regulatory activities to reduce GHG emissions has been deleted. A discussion of the Biden	Text regarding policies of the Administration updated to reflect current administration

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
	Administration's Executive Order 13990 for the Environmental Protection Agency was added to the discussion.	
Page 3.1.3-21 Section 3.1.3.2	InSection 3.1.3.2, Regulatory Setting, under the Climate Action Plan discussion, text has been added to state the County Board of Supervisors decertified the Final SEIR and rescinded approval of the Climate Action Plan. However, direction was given to amend the EIR to address the court's finding and continue the GHG reduction measures that were not challenged in court.	Revisions made to discuss the regulatory setting under the Climate Action Plan discussion
Page 3.1.3-27 Section 3.1.3.3.1	In Section 3.1.3.3.1, the construction phases on Page 3.1.3-27 of the Final EIR have been updated to include the water main realignment.	Updated to include minor revisions to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR
Page 3.1.3-27 Section 3.1.3.3.1	In Section 3.1.3.3.1, the following text has been added and/or deleted on page 3.1.3-27 of the Water discussion as follows: Early in the Proposed Project planning process, the Applicant considered the potential of using water from the Jacumba Community Services District as back up to onsite well water; however, subsequently it was determined that only onsite well water would be used. ~~The water would be sourced from on-site groundwater wells with backup water coming from the Jacumba Community Services District.~~ However, ~~this~~ the greenhouse gas emissions analysis conservatively assumed all water would be provided by the Jacumba Community Services District, which would be delivered via water truck. Although the Jacumba Community Services District will not be relied upon for backup water, the greenhouse gas emissions analysis was not revised because it is more conservative as trucking water to the site would cause the Proposed Project to produce more greenhouse gas emissions than producing water from onsite wells. CalEEMod default emission factors were assumed	Clarification that the Jacumba Community Services District would not be relied upon for back water
Page 3.1.3-30 Section 3.1.3.3.1	In Section 3.1.3.3.1, the text on Page 3.1.3-30 of the Switchyard Facilities has been added and/or deleted on Page 3.1.3-30 as follows: This is a conservative assumption as the water will exclusively ~~primarily~~ come from on- site groundwater wells and trucking water to the site would cause the Proposed Project to produce more greenhouse gas emissions than producing water from onsite wells.	Updated to include minor revisions to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Pages 3.1.3-31 and 3.1.3-32, Section 3.1.3.3.1	In Section 3.1.3.3.1, under the analysis of avoided GHG Emissions, text has been added to explain that the Proposed Project in the Draft EIR included the use of mono-facial PV modules. Subsequent public review of the Draft EIR, revisions to the Proposed Project include the use of bifacial PV modules and modules with increased wattage. Due to these technological improvements, the estimated renewable electricity production of the Project has been increased to approximately 283,000 MWh/yr. The analysis has also been updated due to these technological improvements.	Updated to include use of bifacial PV module with increased wattage and to reflect the new Energy Generation Memorandum (Appendix V to the Final EIR)
Page 3.1.3-37 Section 3.1.3.7	In Section 3.1.3.7, Conclusion, the amount of metric tons of CO_{2e} produced by the Proposed Project was updated.	Updated based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR
Page 3.1.3-39 Table 3.1.3-3	Table 3.1.3-3, Estimated Annual Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions has been updated based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project.	Updated based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR
Page 3.1.3-39 Table 3.1.3-4	Table 3.1.3-4, Estimated Annual Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions has been updated based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project.	Updated based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR
Page 3.1.3-41 Table 3.1.3-9	Table 3.1.3-9, Estimated Annual Operational and Avoided Greenhouse Gas Emissions has been updated based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project.	Updated based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR
Section 3.1.4 – Land Use and Planning		
Page 3.1.4-1 Section 3.1.4	In the introduction to Section 3.1.4, the text has been updated to include minor revisions to the Proposed Project including the increased setback from Jacumba Community Park, the increased setbacks from the north and south sides of Old Highway 80 and the water main realignment. The text has also been updated to clarify how the changes will result in land use and planning impacts that are equal to or less than presented in the Draft EIR and will not change any significance determinations in this Section.	Updated based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR
Page 3.1.4-8 Section 3.1.4.2	In Section 3.1.4.2, Regulatory Setting, Policy LU-1.9: Achievement of Planned Densities was added under County of San Diego General Plan Land Use Element discussion.	Added Policy LU-1-9 in response to comments received on the Draft EIR
Page 3.1.4-21 Section 3.1.4.2	In Section 3.1.4.2, Regulatory Setting, a Community Character Goal was added under the Mountain Empire Subregional Plan discussion.	Added Community Character Goal based on comments receive don the Draft EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Page 3.1.4-24 Section 3.1.4.2	In Section 3.1.4.2, Regulatory Setting, under the County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance discussion, text has been added to explain that the Switchyard Facilities are considered a Minor Impact Utility pursuant to County Zoning Ordinance Section 2883.	Added text to explain the Minor Impact Utility zoning ordinance
Page 3.1.4-26 Section 3.1.4.2	In Section 3.1.4.2, Regulatory Setting, under the County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance discussion, language has been updated to discuss the increased setbacks along Old Highway 80 and along the Jacumba Community Park.	Updated based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR
Page 3.1.4-38 Section 3.1.4.3.2	IN Section 3.1.4.3.2, Conflict with an Applicable Land Use Plan, Policy, or Regulation analysis, text has been added that states pursuant to County Zoning Ordinance Section 2884, until a Specific Plan applicable to the property is adopted, Minor Impact Utilities are permitted use in the area zoned as Specific Planning Area upon issuance of a Minor Use Permit.	Clarification regarding County Zoning Ordinance 2884
Page 3.1.4-38 Section 3.1.4.3.2	In Section 3.1.4.3.2, Conflict with an Applicable Land Use Plan, Policy, or Regulation analysis, language has been added that states while the Major Use Permit will govern both the interim uses subject to County Zoning Ordinance Section 2888 and the Switchyard Facilities , as a Minor Impact Utilities use, will not be required to be decommissioned because it is only subject to County Zoning Ordinance Section 2884 and will be transferred to SDG&E and only subject to California Public Utilities Commission jurisdiction.	Clarification regarding Major and Minor Impact Utilities uses
Page 3.1.4-47 Table 3.1.4-4	In Table 3.1.4-4, County General Plan Consistency Analysis, Policy LU-1.9: Achievement of Planned Densities and analysis has been added	Analysis regarding Policy LU-1-9 added in response to comments received on the Draft EIR
Page 3.1.4-70 Table 3.1.4-4	In Table 3.1.4-4, County General Plan Consistency Analysis, text has been added to Policy COS-15.6: Design and Construction Methods to clarify that during operations, the Proposed Project would comply with PDF-HYD-3 to maintain vegetative cover under the solar panels.	Analysis regarding Policy COS-15.6 added in response to comments received on the Draft EIR
Page 3.1.4-78 Table 3.1.4-5	In Table 3.1.4-5, Mountain Empire Subregional Plan Consistency Analysis, the The Community Character Goal and analysis was added.	Analysis regarding Community Character Goad added in response to comments received on the Draft EIR
Pages 3.1.4-89 and 3.1.4-90 Table 3.1.4-6	In Table 3.1.4-6, Jacumba Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Consistency Analysis, Policy JAC 2.8 (a) analysis has been updated to address the minor	Analysis regarding ALUCP Policy JAC 2.8 (a) added in response to comments received on the Draft EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
	revisions to the Proposed Project as described in Appendix T, Airport Land Use Compatibility Memorandum, in the Final EIR.	
Page 3.1.4.-90 Table 3.1.4-6	In Table 3.1.4-6, Jacumba Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Consistency Analysis, Policy JAC 2. Open Land analysis has been updated to address the minor revisions to the Proposed Project.	Analysis regarding Jacumba ALUCP Policy JAC-2 added in response to comments received on the Draft EIR
Page 3.1.4-90 Table 3.1.4-6	In Table 3.1.4-6, Jacumba Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Consistency Analysis, Policy JAC 2.11 Parcels Lying with Two or More Safety Zones analysis has been updated to address the minor revisions to the Proposed Project as described in Appendix T, Airport Land Use Compatibility Memorandum, in the Final EIR.	Analysis regarding Jacumba ALUCP Policy JAC.2.11 added in response to comments received on the Draft EIR
Pages 3.1.4-93 and 3.1.4-94, Table 3.1.4-6	In Table 3.1.4-6, Jacumba Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Consistency Analysis, Policy JAC 3.5: Other Flight Hazards analysis has been updated to include analysis from the 2021 Glare Analysis and the inclusion of PDF-HAZ-1.	Analysis regarding Policy JAC 3.5 added in response to comments received on the Draft EIR
Section 3.1.5 – Parks and Recreation		
Page 3.1.5-1 Section 3.1.5	In the introduction to Section 3.1.5, text has been updated to include minor revisions to the Proposed Project including the increased setback from Jacumba Community Park, the increased setbacks from the north and south sides of Old Highway 80 and the water main realignment.	Updated based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR
Section 3.1.6 – Public Services		
Page 3.1.6-1 Section 3.1.6	In the introduction to Section 3.1.6, text has been updated to include minor revisions to the Proposed Project including the increased setback from Jacumba Community Park, the increased setbacks from the north and south sides of Old Highway 80 and the water main realignment.	Updated based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR
Page 3.1.6-11 Section 3.1.6.3.2	In Section 3.1.6.3.2, Police Protection, under the Switchyard Facilities, text was updated to reflect the Switchyard Facilities and that lighting would be low impact.	Updated for consistency with Project Description in Chapter 1 of the Final EIR
Page 3.1.6-12 Section 3.1.6.3.3	In Section 3.1.6.3.3, Schools, under the Analysis discussion, the construction duration was revised from 16 months to 13 months and the decommissioning duration was revised from 12 months to 10 months.	Updated for consistency with Project Description in Chapter 1 of the Final EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
	Section 3.1.7 – Transportation	
Page 3.1.7-1 Section 3.1.7	In the introduction to Section 3.1.7, the text has been updated to include minor revisions to the Proposed Project including the increased setback from Jacumba Community Park, the increased setbacks from the north and south sides of Old Highway 80 and the water main realignment.	Updated based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR
Page 3.1.7-11 Section 3.1.7.4.2	In Section 3.1.7.4.2, Vehicle Miles Traveled, under the Analysis discussion text was added as follows: With the exception of one major maintenance inspection which would take place annually, requiring approximately 20 personnel for approximately one week, the operation of the Proposed Project would not generate significant number of daily trips.	Clarification in the Vehicle Miles Traveled analysis
Page 3.1.7-15 Section 3.1.7.4.3	In Section 3.1.7.4.3, Hazards, under the Analysis discussion, the time the workers would arrive and depart the site was corrected from 6:00 am to 4:00 pm to 7:00 am to 4:00 pm on page 3.1.7-14 of the Final EIR.	Correction
Page 3.1.7-16 Section 3.1.7.4.3	In Section 3.1.7.4.3, Hazards, under the Analysis discussion, the following text was added as follows: A Glare Study was prepared for the Proposed Project which evaluates and documents any occurrences of glare that would potentially cause distractions to viewers from roadways. Solar facility operations were analyzed at Key Observation Points located at I-8, Old Highway 80 and Carrizo Gorge Road. Based on the Glare Study results, no potential glare is anticipated for motorists. The Glare Study is included as Appendix A to the Visual Resources Report (Appendix B of the Final EIR).	Added text based on analysis in the new February 2021 Glare Study
Page 3.1.7-17 Section 3.1.7.4.3	In Section 3.1.7.4.3, Hazards, under the Switchyard Facilities Analysis, the following text was added as follows: The ~~switchyard~~ Switchyard Facilities site would be accessed from Carrizo Gorge Road via an existing SDG&E access road which would be improved.	Clarification of access to the Switchyard Facilities.

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Page 3.1.7-23 Section 3.1.7.7	In Section 3.1.7.7, Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features, a new Project Design Feature PDF-TR-4 has been added that requires the Project applicant to implement a voluntary construction period Transportation Demand Management program to encourage construction workers to carpool or use alternative transportation modes.	Additional text regarding new Project Design Feature PDF-TR-4 in response to comments received on Draft EIR during public review
Page 3.1.7-24 Section 3.1.7.8	In Section 3.1.7.8, Conclusion, under the Hazards discussion text was added as follows: Based on the Glare Study for the Proposed Project, no potential glare is anticipated for motorists on I-8, Old Highway 80, and Carrizo Gorge Road.	Clarification based on the new February 2021 Glare Study
Section 3.1.8 – Utilities and Service Systems		
Page 3.1.8-1 Section 3.1.8	In the introduction to Section 3.1.8, the list of reports the analysis was based upon has been updated to include the JVR Energy Park Project Revised Construction Water Demand Memorandum (Appendix B of the Groundwater Investigation Report) and the Proposed Project Revisions Technical Memorandum (Appendix R)	Updated list of technical documents relied upon in the Final EIR
Page 3.1.8-1 Section 3.1.8	In the introduction to Section 3.1.8, the text has been updated to include minor revisions to the Proposed Project including the increased setback from Jacumba Community Park, the increased setbacks from the north and south sides of Old Highway 80 and the water main realignment.	Updated based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR
Page 3.1.8-14 Section 3.1.8.3.1	In Section 3.1.8.3.1, Water/Wastewater under the Construction discussion of estimated total construction water demand for the Proposed Project was updated from approximately 140 acre-feet to 141.4 acre-feet (af). The construction period was updated from 365 days to 13 months.	Updated for consistency with Appendix B,JVR Energy Park Project Revised Construction Water Demand, of the Groundwater Resources Technical Memorandum (Appendix J of the EIR) the updated construction duration in Chapter 1 of the Final EIR.
Page 3.1.8-15 Section 3.1.8.3.1	In Section 3.1.8.3.1, Water Wastewater under the Total Estimated Water Demand for Proposed Project, the text has been revised as follows: In summary, the Project would use up to ~~140~~ 141.4 af (~~45.6~~ ~~46.~~1 million gallons) during a 13-month period for construction ~~for 1 year~~, approximately 11 afy during operations and maintenance over 38 years, and 50 af for a 10-month	Updated water demand and clarification of the term of the Major Use Permit

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
	period during decommissioning. The operational life of the Proposed Project under the Major Use Permit is approximately 35 years; however, solely for the purposes of conservatively estimating operation water demand a period of 38 years was used.	
Page 3.1.8-16 Section 3.1.8.3.1	In Section 3.1.8.3.1 under the Estimated Future Demand by all Users of the Basin discussion, the text has been revised as follows: ~~Potable groundwater use from JCSD, the Jacumba Valley Ranch Water Company, and private domestic users.~~ JCSD has the potential to serve non-potable from the Highland Center and the Park Well. JCSD completed a manganese water treatment system for Wells #7 and #8 that is serving all potable water demands for its customers (Appendix J). This treatment system came online on March 6, 2020. Wells #7 and #8 source water from the fractured rock aquifer rather than the Jacumba Valley alluvial aquifer. The future projected water demand conservatively evaluates the Proposed Project and other projects taking place concurrently. An additional ~~140~~ 141.4 af would be extracted during Proposed Project construction, resulting in an annual ~~1 year~~ extraction ~~of~~rate of approximately ~~442~~ 443.4 af from the aquifer, assuming other groundwater users continue their current estimated extraction amounts.	Update of the source of water and the amount of water demand for the Proposed Project.
Page 3.1.8-17 Section 3.1.8.3.1	In Section 3.1.8.3.1 under the Supply from Well No. 2 and Well No. 3 discussion, the text has been revised as follows: These tests determined a maximum annual production of approximately 511 afy from well #2 and 564 afy from well #3, which are significantly greater than the Project water demand of ~~140~~ 141.4 af of water during Project construction (13 months ~~1year~~), 11 afy for ongoing operations and maintenance (conservatively estimated to be 38 years ~~35 years~~), and 50 af for decommissioning and dismantling (10 months ~~1 year~~).	Correction of the amount of water required and the duration of construction and operation
Page 3.1.8-17 Section 3.1.8.3.1	In Section 3.1.8.3.1 under the Groundwater Storage, text has been revised as follows:	Updated construction water demand

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
	The Proposed Project proposes to extract groundwater ~~for 1 year~~ during construction at a maximum quantity of ~~140~~ 141.4 af.	
Page 3.1.8-18 Section 3.1.8.3.1	In Section 3.1.8.3.1 under the Supply and Demand Comparison discussion, the text has been revised as follows: The Proposed Project proposes to use ~~140~~ 141.4 af during construction ~~for 1 year~~. Assuming no recharge to the aquifer, the Proposed Project alone would reduce groundwater in storage by 1.6% during construction. As discussed above, the estimated maximum extraction from all known sources during the period of Proposed Project construction is ~~442~~ 443.4 af. Thus, the total reduction of groundwater in storage from all sources during the construction period is estimated to be 4.9%. Assuming a Proposed Project lifetime of 40 years (~~1~~ 13 months ~~year~~ of construction, conservative estimate of 38 years of operation and maintenance, and 10 months ~~year~~ of decommissioning), the Groundwater Investigation Report found that the Proposed Project would use ~~619~~ 620.3 af of groundwater from the alluvial aquifer total. As discussed above, the most recent estimates calculated groundwater in storage in the aquifer to be 9,005 af. Other groundwater uses within the basin including reasonably foreseeable projects would use 1,054 af of water. This equates to a total water demand of 1,~~673~~ 1,674.4 af, which results in an 18.6% reduction in storage over 40 years, assuming no recharge to the aquifer.	Update of the construction, operation and decommissioning duration, the amount of acre feet in the alluvial aquifer total and the water demand of water for the Proposed Project
Page 3.1.8-20 Section 3.1.8.3.1	InSection 3.1.8.3.1 under the Stormwater discussion the analysis has been updated to reflect a new calculation of impervious surface area from 1.9 acres to 6.65 acres.	Update of calculation of impervious surface area for consistency with Appendix U in Final EIR
Page 3.1.8-21 Section 3.1.8.3.1	In Section 3.1.8.3.1 under the Stormwater discussion, text has been added as follows: Further, after Project construction, the portions of the Project site not overlain by roads, inverters, battery storage containers, the substation, and the Switchyard Facilities shall be reseeded with a native hydroseed mix in accordance with **PDF-HYD-3**.	Additional text regarding new Project Design Feature PDF-HYD-3

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Page 3.1.8-27 Table 3.1.8-1	Table 3.1.8-1, Estimated Construction Water Demand on has been updated to account for an increased amount of grading.	Construction water demand has been updated to account for an increased amount of grading
Page 3.1.8-28 Table 3.1.8-5	Table 3.1.8-5, Estimated Jacumba Valley Aquifer Groundwater Demand on page 3.1.8-29 of the Final EIR has been updated to account for an increased amount of grading.	Update to account for increased grading amount
Chapter 4 – Alternatives		
Page 4.2 Section 4.1	In Section 4.1, Rationale for Alternatives Selection, text revised to clarify that subsequent to public review of the Draft EIR, the Community Buffer Alternative was revised to include increased setbacks adjacent to Jacumba Community Park, increased setbacks along both sides of Old Highway 80 and the realignment of the existing water main.	Updated description of Community Buffer Alternative to include increased setbacks and water main realignment
Pages 4-13 and 4-14 Section 4.2.5	In Section 4.2.5, ECO Substation Connection Alternative (No Switchyard Facilities), the text and analysis in the Description, Feasibility, and Ability to Meet Project Objectives discussions has been updated.	Revised based on comments during public review of the Draft EIR
Pages 4-15 and 4-16 Section 4.2.6	In Section 4.2.6, Community Buffer and Southwest Corner Expansion, text was updated in the Description and Ability to Meet Project Objectives discussion.	Revised based on comments during public review of the Draft EIR
Page 4-17 Section 4.3.1	In Section 4.3.1, No Project Alternative Description and Setting, a footnote has been added as follows: <u>The water main relocation would also likely be required for the Buildout No Project Alternative, however, it is assumed that the environmental impacts of that relocation are included in the development impacts as described.</u>	Clarification in the No Project Alternative based on minor revisions to the Proposed Project
Page 4-22 Section 4.3.2	In Section 4.3.2, Comparison of the Effects of the No Project Alternative to the Proposed Project, under the Buildout No Project Alternative discussion, the acreage of the buildout scenario has been updated from 257 to 374	Clarification in the No Project Buildout Alternative
Page 4-25 Section 4.3.2	In Section 4.3.2, Comparison of the Effects of the No Project Alternative to the Proposed Project, under the Buildout No Project Alternative discussion, the amount of acre-feet needed for the total estimated groundwater extraction for the 40-year lifetime of the Proposed project has been updated from 2,673 acre feet to 1,674.4 acre feet.	Correction in estimated groundwater extraction

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Page 4-27 Section 4.3.2	In Section 4.3.2, Comparison of the Effects of the No Project Alternative to the Proposed Project, under the No Development No Project Alternative, the acreage of the Switchyard Facilities was updated from 3.2 acres to 7.1 acres of the 8.1-acres.	Updated description of Switchyard Facilities consistent with Chapter 1 of the Final EIR
Page 4-28 Section 4.3.2	In Section 4.3.2, No Project Alternative Description and Setting, under the Buildout No Project Alternative, the Impact was changed from Impact NOI-2 to Impact NOI-3.	Correction
Page 4-30 Section 4.3.2	In Section 4.3.2, the increased acreage anticipated under the Buildout No Project Alternative was corrected from 257 acres to 374 acres.	Correction
Page 4-32 Section 4.3.2	In Section 4.3.2, the estimated total GHG emission during the construction period was corrected on Page 4-32 of the Final EIR from 5,764 MT $CO2_e$ to 5,776 MT $CO2_e$.	Correction
Page 4-33, Section 4.3.2	In Section 4.3.2, the following text has been revised as follows: However, the Proposed Project is also expected to produce ~~211,159~~ 283,000 megawatt hours of electricity per year, providing a renewable energy source to achieve the RPS of 60% by 2030 and 100% by 2045. This renewable energy would offset ~~423,254~~ 567,254 MT CO_2 from 2022 through 2044, reducing GHG emissions generated by fossil fuel power plants during that time frame. After subtracting avoided GHG emissions from the Project's ~~GHG emissions~~ construction and operation, the Proposed Project would avoid approximately ~~296,744~~ 540,721 MT CO2e over its lifetime.	Correction
Pages 4-35 to 4-37 Section 4.4.1	In Section 4.4.1, Community Buffer Alternative Description and Setting, the description and setting discussions have been updated include increased setbacks and the water main realignment. The description has also been updated to discuss technological improvements to the solar panels	Revised the Community Buffer Alternative in response to comments on the Draft EIR
Page 4-36 Section 4.4.2	In Section 4.4.2, Comparison of the Effects of Community Buffer Alternative to the Proposed Project, the analysis has been updated to reflect the minor revisions to the Proposed Project.	Updated to reflect minor revisions to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Page 4-38 Section 4.4.2	In Section 4.4.2, Comparison of the Effects of Community Buffer Alternative to the Proposed Project, Air Quality discussion the acreage of the Community Buffer Alternative was updated from 15.4 to 18.9 acres and the cancer risk from construction exhaust was updated from 2.93 to 2.97 in a million.	Correction and update
Pages 4-38 to 4-29 Section 4.4.2	In the Section 4.4.2, Comparison of the Effects of Community Buffer Alternative to the Proposed Project, Biological Resources discussion the acreage of desert saltbrush scrub that must be mitigated was updated from 6.78 to 7.40 acres and fallow agriculture was updated from 5.35 to 6.63 acres.	Correction
Page 4-39 Section 4.4.2	In Section 4.4.2, Comparison of the Effects of Community Buffer Alternative to the Proposed Project, Cultural Resources discussion, the amount of acres impacted was updated from 627.7 acres to 607.24 acres.	Updated to reflect revisions to Community Buffer Alternative in the Final EIR
Page 4-40 Section 4.4.2	In Section 4.4.2, Comparison of the Effects of Community Buffer Alternative to the Proposed Project, the Geology, Soils and Seismicity discussion the amount of acres in the buffer was updated from 15.4 to 18.9 acres.	Correction
Page 4-41 Section 4.4.2	In Hydrology and Water Quality discussion of Section 4.4.2, Comparison of the Effects of Community Buffer Alternative to the Proposed Project, the amount of acres in the buffer was updated from 15.4 to 18.9 acres.	Correction
Page 4-41 Section 4.4.2	In Section 4.4.2, Comparison of the Effects of Community Buffer Alternative to the Proposed Project, Mineral Resources discussion the analysis was updated to reflect the buffer area being 18.9 acres instead of 15.4 acres. The discussion was also updated to reflect the new acreage of desert saltbrush being and fallow agriculture that mitigate, and the total mitigation requirement for habitat.	Correction and update regarding biological resources impacts
Page 4-42 Section 4.4.2	In Section 4.4.2, Comparison of the Effects of Community Buffer Alternative to the Proposed Project, Noise discussion the following text was deleted: ~~As detailed in the Acoustical Analysis Report (Appendix M), the operational panel cleaning noise within 450 feet of residential uses would lead to potential operational noise impacts.~~	Updated to reflect the Acoustical Assessment Report in the Final EIR
Page 4-42 Section 4.4.2	In Section 4.4.2, Comparison of the Effects of Community Buffer Alternative to the Proposed Project, Tribal Resources discussion, the acreage of the buffer was updated from 15.4 to 18.9 acres.	Correction

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Pages 4-43 and 4-44 Section 4.4.2	In Section 4.4.2, the Summary of the Community Buffer Alternatives Analysis in Section of Section 4.4.2 was updated.	Updated to reflect revised Community Buffer Alternative in the Final EIR
Pages 4-44 and 4-45 Section 4.5.1	In Section 4.5.1, the Reduced Project Description and Setting discussion in Section 4.5.1 was updated to reflect a development footprint from 501 acres to 484 acres. Text was added that the water main realignment south of the SDG&E easement would be the same as the Proposed Project; however, no realignment would occur north of the SDG&E easement.	Updated in the Reduced Project Alternative development footprint and to address the water main realignment
Page 4-47 Section 4.5.2	In Section 4.5.2, Comparison of the Effects of Reduced Project Alternative to the Proposed Project, the Aesthetics discussion has been updated.	Updated to reflect revisions to the Reduced Project Alternative in the Final EIR
Pages 4-45 and 4-.47 Section 4.5.2	In Section 4.5.2, Comparison of the Effects of Reduced Project Alternative to the Proposed Project, the Air Quality discussion has been updated.	Updated to reflect revisions to the Reduced Project Alternative in the Final EIR
Pages 4-45 and 4-48 Section 4.5.2	In Section 4.5.2, Comparison of the Effects of Reduced Project Alternative to the Proposed Project, the Biological Resource discussion has been updated.	Updated to reflect revisions to the Reduced Project Alternative in the Final EIR
Pages 4-45 and 4-49 Section 4.5.2	In Section 4.5.2, Comparison of the Effects of Reduced Project Alternative to the Proposed Project, the Cultural Resources discussion has been updated.	Updated to reflect revisions to the Reduced Project Alternative in the Final EIR
Pages 4-45 and 4-49 Section 4.5.2	In Section 4.5.2, Comparison of the Effects of Reduced Project Alternative to the Proposed Project, the Geology, Soils and Seismicity discussion has been updated.	Updated to reflect revisions to the Reduced Project Alternative in the Final EIR
Pages 4-45 and 4-50 Section 4.5.2	In Section 4.5.2, Comparison of the Effects of Reduced Project Alternative to the Proposed Project, the Hazards and Hazardous Materials discussion has been updated.	Updated to reflect revisions to the Reduced Project Alternative in the Final EIR
Pages 4-50 and 4-51 Section 4.5.2	In Section 4.5.2, Comparison of the Effects of Reduced Project Alternative to the Proposed Project, Mineral Resources discussion was updated.	Updated to reflect revisions to the Reduced Project Alternative in the Final EIR
Page 4-53 Section 4.5.3	In Section 4.5.3, the Summary of the Reduced Project Alternative Analysis the text has been updated.	Updated to reflect revisions to the Reduced Project Alternative in the Final EIR
Page 4-54 Section 4.7	In Section 4.7, Environmentally Superior Alternative discussion has been updated.	Updated Environmentally Superior Alternative discussion

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Pages 4-55 and 4-58 Table 4-1	Table 4-1, Summary of Alternatives, has been revised to show changes to the Summary of Alternatives.	Corrections
Page 4-59 Figure 4-1	Figure 4-1 Community Buffer Alternative has been replaced in the Final EIR.	Replaced Figure of Community Buffer Alternative to reflect increased setbacks and water main realignment
Page 4-61 Figure 4-2	Figure 4-2 Reduced Project Alternative has been replaced in the Final EIR.	Replaced Fgure of the Reduced Project Alternative to include water main realignment and change in footprint
Chapter 5 – Mitigation Measures		
Page 5-2 Aesthetics	Mitigation measure **M-AE-6** has been revised regarding the tan-colored slats and visual screening material where flood flow heights do not allow slats.	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-AE-6** to address flood flow
Page 5-5, Biological Resources	Text has been deleted in **M-BI-1**, Biological Monitoring	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-BI-1**
Page 5-5 Biological Resources	Text has been added to **M-BI-1** to include a Worker Environmental Awareness Program requirement.	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-BI-1**
Page 5-9 Biological Resources	Text has been added to **M-BI-3** to clarify that even with the reduced Major Use Permit area in the new Project design, the applicant shall provide a total of 435 acres of biological open space easement as described in the Draft and Final EIR.	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-BI-3** regarding acreage of biological open space easement
Page 5-11 Biological Resources	Text has been added to **M-BI-4** to include Project specific requirements and Goals in the Final Resources Management Plan	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-BI-4** regarding the Resources Management Plan
Page 5-12 Biological Resources	Text has been added to **M-BI-5** to include language about avoiding trampling and crushing special-status reptiles, San Diego desert woodrat or American badger	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-BI-5** in response to comments on the Draft EIR
Page 5-15 Biological Resources	**M-BI-5** has been updated to remove the language take avoidance and replace it with preconstruction surveys.	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-BI-5**
Pages 5-16 and 5-17 Biological Resources	Text has been added to **M-BI-5** regarding the Special-Status Preconstruction Surveys and Relocation Plan shall be conducted, documented, timed and monitored.	Revision to mitigation measure **M-BI-5** in response to comments on the Draft EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Page 5-18--5-20 Biological Resources	Text has been revised and/or added to **M-BI-6** to clarify how Bat Surveys and Roost Avoidance or Exclusion activities shall be conducted, documented, timed and monitored.	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-BI-6** in response to comments on the Draft EIR
Page 5-26 Cultural Resources	Text has been added to **M-CR-2** to clarify that the Campo Band of Mission Indians, Manzanita Band of the Kumeyaay Nation and Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians shall be notified of any unanticipated discovery and, should a potential TCR be identified, the Project Archaeologist shall consult with consulting tribes for a final determination.	Clarification in mitigation measure **M-CR-2** in response to comments on the Draft EIR
Page 5-27 Cultural Resources	Text has been added to **M-CR-2** to states that the Project Archaeologist shall notify the Campo Band of Mission Indians, Manaznita Band of Kumeyaay Nation, and Viejas Bank of Kumeyaay Indians of the identification of human remains.	Clarification in mitigation measure **M-CR-2** in response to comments on the Draft EIR
Page 5-27 Cultural Resources	Text has been added to **M-CR-2** to state that the final cultural Material Conveyance report shall include evidence that all prehistoric materials have been curated at a San Diego County, Imperial County, or culturally affiliated Tribal curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79.	Clarification in mitigation measure **M-CR-2** in response to comments on the Draft EIR
Page 5-28 Cultural Resources	Text has been added to **M-CR-3** to clarify that the Project archaeologist shall coordinate with consulting tribes and Kumeyaay Native American monitors	Clarification in mitigation measure **M-CR-3** in response to comments on the Draft EIR
Page 5-29 Geology, Soils and Seismicity	Text has been added to **M-GEO-1** to clarify how the mitigation measure shall be carried out.	Clarification in **M-GEO-1** based on new Geology Mitigation Measures Technical Memorandum (Appendix F to Final EIR)
Page 5-31 to 5-32 Noise	Text in **M-NOI-2** regarding the noise emission from self-propelled PV panel wasters has been deleted.	Clarification in **M-NOI-2** based on updated analysis in Acoustical Analysis Assessment (Appendix M to the Final EIR)
Page 5-39 Tribal Cultural Resources	Text has been added to **M-TCR-2** to clarify that the Campo Band of Mission Indians, Manzanita Band of the Kumeyaay Nation and Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians shall be notified of any unanticipated discovery and, should a potential TCR be identified, the Project Archaeologist shall consult with consulting tribes for a final determination.	Clarification in mitigation measure **M-TCR-2** in response to comments on the Draft EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Page 5-29 Tribal Cultural Resources	Text has been added to **M-TCR-2** to states that the Project Archaeologist shall notify the Campo Band of Mission Indians, Manaznita Band of Kumeyaay Nation, and Viejas Bank of Kumeyaay Indians of the identification of human remains.	Clarification in mitigation measure **M-TCR-2** in response to comments on the Draft EIR
Page 5-40 Tribal Cultural Resources	Text has been added to **M-TCR-2** to state that the final cultural Material Conveyance report shall include evidence that all prehistoric materials have been curated at a San Diego County, Imperial County, or culturally affiliated Tribal curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79.	Clarification in mitigation measure **M-TCR-2** in response to comments on the Draft EIR
Page 5-42 Wildfire	Text has been revised in **M-WF-1** to specify that signage with contact information for a 24-hour remote operations center will be provided.	Clarification in mitigation measure **M-WF-1** based on update to Fire Protection Plan (Appendix N to Final EIR)
Page 5-43 Wildfire	Text has been deleted from **M-WF-2** as follows: The Project will be equipped with at least ~~one and up to~~ two water trucks each of 4,000- gallon capacity.	Clarification in mitigation measure **M-WF-2** based on update to Fire Protection Plan (Appendix N to Final EIR)
Page 5-44 Wildfire	The following text has been removed from **M-WF-2**: ~~During construction, the project site will have at a minimum two pick-up trucks outfitted with Type 6 Skid- Mounted Units, including fire pump, hose, and nozzle, that are staffed with personnel properly trained to use the equipment.~~	Clarification in mitigation measure **M-WF-2** based on update to Fire Protection Plan (Appendix N to Final EIR)
Chapter – Other CEQA Considerations		
Page 6-2 Section 6.1	In Section 6.1, Significant Environmental Impacts of the Project That Cannot Be Mitigated to Less Than Significant, under the Aesthetics discussion **M-AE-6** described as fence slats or screening.	Clarification to mitigation measure **M-AE-6** to allow other types of visual screening on fencing where slats are infeasible due to flood flows
Chapter 7 – References		
Page 7-1 Section 1	References in the Project Description have been updated.	References updated to include new references utilized during the preparation of the Final EIR
Page 7-4 and 7-5 Section 2.2	References in the Air Quality Section 2.2 have been updated.	References updated to include new references utilized during the preparation of the Final EIR
Pages 7-7, 7-9, 7-10, 7-12, 7-14, 7-15, 7-16, and 7-21	References in the Biological Resources Section 2.3 have been updated.	References updated to include new references utilized during the preparation of the Final EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Section 2.3		
Page 7-21 Section 2.7	References in the Hydrology and Water Quality Section 2.7 have been updated.	References updated to include new references utilized during the preparation of the Final EIR
Page 7-24 Section 2.9	References in the Noise Section 2.9 have been updated.	References updated to include new references utilized during the preparation of the Final EIR
Page 7-27 Section 2.12	The References in the Wildfire Section 2.12 were updated.	References updated to include new references utilized during the preparation of the Final EIR
Page 7-29 Section 3.1	References in the Environmental Effects Not Found to be Significant Have beenupdated.	References updated to include new references utilized during the preparation of the Final EIR
Page 7-32 Section 3.1.2	References in the Energy Section 3.1.2 have been updated.	References updated to include new references utilized during the preparation of the Final EIR
Page 7-33 Section 3.1.3	References in the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Section 3.1.3 have been updated.	References updated to include new references utilized during the preparation of the Final EIR
Page 7-37 Section 3.1.4	References in the Land Use and Planning Section 3.1.4 have been updated.	References updated to include new references utilized during the preparation of the Final EIR
Page 7-38 Section 3.1.5	References in the Parks and Recreation Section 3.1.5 have been updated.	References updated to include new references utilized during the preparation of the Final EIR
Page 7-41 Section 3.1.8	References in the Utilities and Service Systems Section 3.1.8 have been updated.	References updated to include new references utilized during the preparation of the Final EIR
Page 7-42 Section 4	References in the Chapter 4 Alternatives have been updated.	References updated to include new references utilized during the preparation of the Final EIR
Chapter 8 – List of Preparers		
Page 8-1 Section 8.1.1	In Section 8.1.1, updated to show Ashley Smith is now the Chief of Project Planning for County PDS.	Update for County staff
Pages 8-1 and 8-2 Section 8.1.2	In Section 8.1.2, the list of preparers has been updated to include the following preparers: Tommy Molioo, Senior Biologist; Brad Comeau, Archaeologist; Sarah Siren, Paleontologist; and Erin Phillips, Environmental Planner	Update of the List of Preparers to account for additional Dudek staff who contributed during preparation of the Final EIR

Table S-5
Errata Summary Table
JVR Energy Park Final EIR Changes

Page(s)/Section	Change	Reason for Change
Page 8-2 Section 8.1.3	In Section 8.1.3, the list of persons and organization has been updated to include: Alasdar Mullarney, Associated Glider Club of Southern California and Dr. David Breeckner, Imperial Valley Desert Museum.	Update of the List of Persons and Organizations Contacted to account for those persons and organization contacted during the preparation of the Final EIR

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table S-6
Summary of Changes to Appendices

Final EIR Appendices
Appendix A *Notice of Preparation Documentation, CEQA Initial Study- Environmental Checklist Form and Comment Letters*
No changes
Appendix B *Visual Resources Report for the JVR Energy Park Project*
Text revisions for consistency with Section 2.1 Aesthetics of Final EIR
Updated visual simulations
Updated 2021 JVR Solar Project Glare Study (Replaces Appendix A)
Appendix C *Air Quality Technical Report for the JVR Energy Park Project*
Text revisions for consistency with Section 2.2 Air Quality in Final EIR
Updated figure
Updated Air Quality Modeling Results (Appendices A and B)
Appendix D *Biological Resources Technical Report for the JVR Energy Park Project*
Text revisions for consistency with Section 2.3 Biological Resources in Final EIR
New Bat Survey Results Memorandum (Appendix B)
New Draft Resource Management Plan (Appendix I)
New Avian Power Line Interaction Committee (APLIC) Memorandum (Appendix J)
Appendix E *Cultural Resources Report for the JVR Energy Park Project*
Text revisions for consistency with Section 2.4 Cultural Resources in Final EIR
New Ground Penetrating Radar Results Memorandum (Appendix F)
Appendix F *Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation for the JVR Energy Park Project*
New memorandum regarding geology mitigation measures
Appendix G *Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment, JVR Energy Park Project (Jacumba Valley Ranch)* *Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment, JVR Energy Park Project (Landman Property)*
No changes
Appendix H *Asbestos Building Inspection and Lead-Based Paint Testing for the Ranch Property (APN 661-060-12)* *JVR Energy Park Project*
No changes
Appendix I *Drainage Study JVR Energy Park*
No changes
Appendix J *Groundwater Resources Investigation Report JVR Energy Park Project*
New JVR Energy Park Revised Construction Water Demand Memorandum (Appendix B)

Table S-6
Summary of Changes to Appendices

Final EIR Appendices
Appendix K *Stormwater Quality Management Plan JVR Energy Park Project*
No changes
Appendix L *Mineral Resources Technical Report JVR Energy Park Project*
Text revisions for consistency with Section 2.8 Mineral Resources in Final EIR
Updated figure
Appendix M *Acoustical Assessment Report for the JVR Energy Park Project*
Text revisions for consistency with Section 2.9 Noise in Final EIR
Updated figures
Updated Noise Modeling Results (Appendices A, B, C and D)
Appendix N *JVR Energy Park Project Fire Protection Plan*
Text revisions
Text revisions in Construction Fire Protection Plan (Appendix A)
Appendix O *Agricultural Resources Report for the JVR Energy Park Project*
Text revisions for consistency with Section 3.1.1 Agricultural Resources in Final EIR
Appendix P *Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report for the JVR Energy Park Project*
Text revisions for consistency with Section 3.1.3 Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Final EIR
Updated Greenhouse Gas Emissions Modeling Results (Appendices A and B)
Appendix Q *JVR Energy Park Project Local Mobility Analysis*
Text revisions
Appendix R *Proposed Project Revisions Memorandum*
New appendix which summarizes potential impacts associated with the reduction in the Major Use Permit area, increased setbacks north and south of Old Highway 80 and Jacumba Community Park, and realignment of an existing water main
Appendix S *U.S./Mexico Wildlife Corridor and Crossings at JVR Energy Park Memorandum*
New appendix which provides information related to wildlife movement and off-site crossings at U.S/Mexico border
Appendix T *Jacumba Airport Land Use Compatibility Memorandum – JVR Energy Park*
New appendix which discusses lot coverage and open area compliance
Appendix U *Hydrology Technical Memorandum – JVR Energy Park*
New appendix which discusses the Proposed Project design regarding flood flow and other hydrology issues
Appendix V *JVR Energy Park - Energy Generation Technical Memorandum*
New appendix which explains and substantiates the energy production of the Proposed Project and Community Buffer Alternative

Table S-6
Summary of Changes to Appendices

Final EIR Appendices
Appendix W *New/Updated General Plan Elements Consistency Evaluation*
New appendix which evaluates the Proposed Project's consistency with the updated Housing and Safety Elements of the San Diego County General Plan as well as the new Environmental Justice Element of the General Plan

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK