

Comment Letter D

**From:** Cindy Buxton [mailto:iokuok2@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, December 16, 2011 1:14 AM  
**To:** Schneider, Matthew  
**Subject:** Wind Energy Ordinance Comments

Dear Mr. Schneider:

Please accept these as some comments from myself concerning the County Wind Ordinance proposal out for public commenting. Thank you for reading and considering our comments.

I find this project just about the most upsetting cap on the whole five and a half year long Energy "battle" that seemed to begin with the Sunrise Powerlink.-or perhaps the Energy Act of 2005. I started to respond to a friend who sent me a link , see below, but as I considered the ramifications this letter became my first but possibly not my last in commenting on this proposal. The maps in the proposal alone speak to the incredible scope, and sweeping impacts to San Diego County, that are being considered.

There is no way the public as a whole has any idea what is being considered. That this is occurring right at Christmas, during an economic down turn, makes the public awareness and ability to comment all the more difficult. I do not believe that this was appropriate timing. Please consider extending the public comment period through January. The scope of this warrants more time.

In reviewing the link forwarded to me below I am reminded how this lays right on top of the whole wind energy "fandango" before our county currently—and out in public comment period as the San Diego County Wind Ordinance until Dec. 23. (Merry Christmas)

I hate to dignify wind farms at all with detailed research and attention. In my opinion at this stage of the game, my first concern is that they dignify organized crime or something entirely too close for comfort. We should not be encouraging it, or setting a new precedent, environmental issues aside. It is hard to even approach concerns for the details of environmental laws when the potential for corruption eclipses the initial review. **It appears that we are being manipulated out of half of the land mass of our San Diego County;** given away for corporate profit. We are not even assured a profit benefit in exchange to the community.

Has anyone beside me thought how interesting it is that these energy corporations tend to be politically "conservative"; and "conservative" tends to take a strict position against carelessly doling out welfare? -I think this is a very reasonable and commonly held observation. -Yet they want us to give them a blanket handout consisting of our perpetual public land resources with little oversight and imposing a loosening of the environmental laws "in order to get `er done". When was the purpose of law to "get" anything "done"? –seriously?

D-1

Should permanent public laws dictate the tangible creation of anything?

("The law? What law?" -Burt Reynolds, Deliverance)

Do the laws of our land even allow for the broad taking of this much land from the public by one county jurisdiction? Even on county and private property, the project is so interspersed to **impact every square inch of Federal Forest Service, and BLM resources as well**. I would think that the same logic that was used in the 9<sup>th</sup> district court, August 2009, over the Forest Service Inventoried Roadless Rule which thus **NEPA required an EIS at the time of administrative concept**, not at the time of future construction, should apply to requiring an EIS for the sweeping impacts that this proposal does to Federal resources.

Just because it is county land, the haphazard speckling of our county impacts the entire eastern half of the county, and every natural resource therein including the entire eagle population.

They should not be installing these huge wind farms scattered all over the place at all. I fear there will be no place left where they are not somewhere nearby; someplace where you can not see or hear them, someplace left that is truly left in natural condition in our forests and deserts. They did not seem to consider that anything should be set aside or in what projects others had pursued to do so. Every form of outdoor recreation, every habitat, and corridor could be impacted.

I hope you can find the time to take a look at the size of the Wind Ordinance that our dear County Board of Supervisors (objections from Jacobs and Slater notwithstanding, Godlove'em) is suggesting. It is intolerable.

The initial concept for this came from RETI –from a State based review collaborative-whose Sierra Club rep apparently was Carl Zichella, was handed to the BLM at the beginning of this year and then now to the county. (Google RETI, Please! Google RETI) Guess they can bury the accountability that way but I'm telling you our beloved Sierra Club national board, (since somewhat reprimanded locally) is what I see was initially letting it get started at all. They allowed these guys from San Francisco and Sacramento to make this widespread and sweeping recommendations-decisions for us way down here without genuine representation--" How can, in the USA , Some guy or group of guys, ie Carl Zichella, with investments in energy-yes they were quite specifically even, see RETI, and a Sierra Club membership be considered a representative? Additionally, it appears the Forest Service rep to RETI was from Oregon and I don't think he was sending out weekly memos for the Cleveland web site for input and feedback. They hid behind the state, then the BLM, and a big government facade to intimidate locally. I don't even think the fed-certainly not the local personnel, is really all that thrilled either. I even have to wonder about SDG&E; (whatever that really is) clearly not even they pictured this at first, way back when in 2006 and 2007.



D-1  
Cont.

Locals have complained about the inexplicable harassment all over the area well outside a footprint from Sunrise Powerlink from its conception back in 2007, yet we never saw the connected actions in that EIS of these proportions. But they were harassed inexplicably and now we know at least in part, why: Someone even then wanted this project real bad.

When a State government employee hand picks "stakeholders" that benefit from a project and provides resources, allows them the leverage upon which enormous and far reaching decisions will be made for everyone, some of which are not state resources, and clearly they did, for a project that will put huge revenue in their pockets-and their investors, -many, many investors, well what do you call that? Come on now, this has a name, or two, and probably time in a federal pen if caught..

In 2009 the former State Attorney General's office sent comments on the SEERS expansion at Warner Springs saying, "don't forget, we are planning wind mills in the area". And apparently, oh Boy, were they!

Seriously, is there new responsibility in the job description of the Attorney General, who as it turns out got a "promotion" recently and didn't have to champagne "until the first snow fall"? Hmmm.

How do they justify this even in economic sense for the county; they suggest taking our land resources and keeping the money too? Is that legal? Hmmm twice.

Hence I do not think any wind project is valid, -should be legal, until they, the entity approving for all of us, **are actually on the ground; and there is no way they were, especially not back in 2006 and 2007, no way. I challenge that there was a lick of genuine ground truthing.**

What is considered representation has taken on dubious character. I provide a classic example: I had people tell me that Steve Evans--I think it was him-aka the president or "chief" of Friends of the River was here and he is soooo great etc. etc. I'm sooooo sorry to burst the hero worship but I'm going to weigh in, since in spite of the fact that he HAS most definitely done a lot of good for the Rivers in our state, after five years of Sunrise Powerlink, I'm a fool if I believe this on face value. I HAVE been there, all over our county and especially the length of our local streams many times over. Why would I worship his vague out of town opinion when I have my own faculties? What gives with this thinking? No specific expertise from the input other than a title has been offered up. I don't know him and to date he hasn't returned my emails, the first strike against him.

In general terms, I want some proof that if "he", -anyone labeled the expert in charge of a decision affecting "my" public resources, has been here at all, it was more than a casual walk to Inaja Memorial lookout and maybe the trailhead and saddle to Three Sisters Waterfall (where we take about anyone wanting the initial survey



D-1  
Cont.

## Draft Responses to Comments

---

tour.) Considering the general bogus reaction to suggesting that there might possibly be local vulnerabilities to our watersheds, by some of the others in the FS LMP collaborative, whose representation homed from hundreds of miles from here, especially at the end, I'm very skeptical. Ok maybe, just maybe he made it to Cedar Creek Falls because we know that anyone that is anyone has of course been to Cedar Creek Falls and would hence, be an expert on all of our watersheds. **Mind you I did NOT hear him make this claim myself first hand. Just beware of the hype in justifying a "representative" opinion because someone with a recognizable name, no less from way out of town, supposedly weighed in.** I've had this line used on me at least three times now. I've seen no substance to go with it, but Aliances, not connected action disclosure, seems to the the "Hallmark" and "MO" of RETI.

This proposal needs massive ground surveying--and should have had it well before presenting such an alarming proposal at year end and Christmas no less. Most relatively normal people who know beauty and fun when they see it, would never do this if they saw it-it as in our backcountry-I can not buy that it has thorough foot-to-the-ground visual review.

GIS, the predominating resource used, -I perceive, is a godsend for many things. It should not be substitute for democracy.

I might add (ohh no here it comes-put on your cringe--remember we comment to maintain standing, not intending to single out anyone in particular: )  
For the duration of the initial Sunrise Powerlink up to now, I perceive when we talk about the ground, especially ground truthing and ground data, the tendency time and again is to disregard, or marginalize input from women. Don't. This girl has been there and she has standing. Along with other non-directly-environmental concerns consider that the whole public input process has been discriminatory on the basis of gender when it comes to receiving ground input from women or considering women as stakeholders. Hence, for example, Steve Evans or some other organizational chair, may have been rumored to have been anywhere in say for example, Cedar Creek Gorge, and a governing body shudders with reverence-to a name and a position, albeit a male one, over it direct, repeated, and photographically documented in four seasons, before and after fire, flood, and drought from a woman. This is what I experience and it is unacceptable-and illegal.

Unfortunately it was Sunrise and its connected actions that taught me to think like this with this vigilance. There was a time when I did not have to only five years ago. Hence, these projects have carried horrible impacts to the personal and social infrastructure of our community as well.

You could have taken all of the eagle nests -published, and suspected, in the county and connected them like dots and I swear that would be on the route they

D-1  
Cont.

choose. (With this project "route" pretty much is a thing of the past-it is everywhere) Maybe they confused "find where not to go" with "find where the nests are, and go " ...

(For some odd reason it reminds me of that Monty Python Movie: "I give you 15.. <tablet drops and breaks> errr um....10 commandments..." same level of on-the-fly competence...)

There is just no way to articulate the disgust for what boneheads conceptualized this on the proverbial bar napkin and actually are taking it seriously enough to materialize it. ... The county plan shows the cliffs the full length of the Laguna's and down to the desert as the "hottest" or most desirable on their list: goodbye Garnet Peak and miles of the PCT in the Laguna's- or at the very least the integrity and quality of the view from there-or from S2 below, for that matter, never mind a lot of it has been suggested proposed wilderness.

Additionally these maps of desirability go into dubious details, some of the private land owners would never have allowed this. Did they make up the detail or trespass?

They would also wrap this around, not only our back country landmark, Julian, but the top of the San Diego River and the Daley ranch by Temescal Canyon hunting preserve, and adjacent to the San Diego River. It is as rugged and unspoiled as it gets there: several enormous waterfalls, crystal clear water, huge trees, ancient history, and untouched environmentally intact stream bed. Wild and Scenic. -and very unique as flowing water within Mediterranean systems go. You would think with as much as the San Diego River has been promoted to the county Supervisors that they would have been looking out for at least the "no brainers". Why they even get everybody going right before Christmas is really bad form.

Clearly the whole idea needs at least another month of commenting by the public to ensure that they know this is being suggested.

*There are MANY budding energy technologies, as can be seen all over the net. Some much more legitimate than others but the point is that to waste, give away, half the county, for essentially all of time, when many other promising ideas and technologies are out there, now and in the near future, including increasingly efficient roof top solar, is beyond premature; it is just criminal.*

If anybody did this in manufacturing without serious testing of the prototype they would be out the door, probably for embezzlement among other things-much less intersecting with public money under traditional terms. They picked the one, apparently only one that has the most land requirements under it. Why should we be at all surprised?



D-1  
Cont.

Surely it is only a matter of time before the significant concern for potential racketeering and insider trading will get the attention of the public as well as law enforcement? Could we ask Santa for a clean sweep: the possibility that this was moved from State to Fed to County jurisdiction, so that they, the SEC, FTC, and FBI can bust all three jurisdictions at once? I can only hope and pray....

That the corporations push vicious marketing of their wares is one thing, but our county decision makers are tasked with researching and making quality unbiased decisions for 3 million people that will be affecting us the rest of our lives. In the case of RETI -which I believe ultimately the Wind Ordinance still is-if not the remnants of ENRON, - we had no representation and no choice and long before the wheels of this brainstorm were put into motion.

Essentially what I glean from the handouts from others last week,

- Private use of energy in SD county is around 50% of the total used.
- It is very doable to put this on the roof.
- In fact it is doable to put enough on the roof to run both the home and the car.
- Our state has a law that allows governments to choose the best energy resources including bringing that function into the municipality for management rather than a private company.
- Putting energy infrastructure under local management provides financing to leverage roof top solar.
- Energy solutions need to be close to the place where energy will be used,
- hence, scrape the large scale wind projects now while all we loose is money.

"In basin" (whatever basin is="In town", she said?)

Of course the big energy companies make it as difficult as possible as they do everything. That is the real root-cause-capability, in my opinion, that needs some serious oversight by the public, and our elected officials.

If we are tempted to believe this project has anything to do with rectifying global warming, consider that the vegetation and topsoil removed, as well as the complex functioning ecosystems, are necessary to stemming global warming in that they, unlike windmills, actually REMOVE CO2. See numerous recent studies in the magazine Science. The sweeping scope of this project removes an enormous local capacity in our plant communities for doing so. If you want to stop global warming replant, replant, replant; and restore and preserve complex vegetation communities, such as our forests, ANYWHERE they exist.

But most especially:

**Put Democracy First** –or the politics will never, ever, ever, engrave it in stone, ever, - the biggest lesson from the human experience, ever, allow anything else to move forward.

D-1  
Cont.

## Draft Responses to Comments

---

Tyranny will never make good. Power corrupts. Still.

You may forward and respond on my thoughts about this.

**I have a channel on [www.youtube.com](http://www.youtube.com) iokuok2 with many videos concerning the impacts to our county from these project.**

**See the following link for a specific video of some of these areas of concern:**

**[http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GQbaRNusCnE&list=UU7FmHnVQ9ziIgd uR3Q\\_uvw&index=3&feature=plcp](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GQbaRNusCnE&list=UU7FmHnVQ9ziIgd uR3Q_uvw&index=3&feature=plcp)**

Thank you for receipt of my first set of comments on this project.

take care,

Cindy Buxton

Chair of the Forest Committee, San Diego Chapter of the Sierra Club

[put Democracy First](#)

.....

Subject: ABC files petition re wind turbine impact regulations for migratory birds

Date: Wed, 14 Dec 2011 13:03:24 -0800

In case you haven't seen it yet, ABC has submitted a rulemaking petition to FWS regarding regulating impacts of wind projects on migratory birds:

[http://www.abcbirds.org/abcprograms/policy/collisions/pdf/wind\\_rulemaking\\_petition.pdf](http://www.abcbirds.org/abcprograms/policy/collisions/pdf/wind_rulemaking_petition.pdf)

↑  
D-1  
Cont.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**Response to Comment Letter D**

**Individual  
Cindy Buxton  
December 16, 2011**

- D1** This letter expresses the commenter's opposition to the project. Ultimately, the Board of Supervisors must determine whether to approve the project or any alternatives. The information in this letter will be in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the County Board of Supervisors.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK