

Comment Letter AA

-----Original Message-----
From: Cindy Buxton [mailto:iokuok2@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 22, 2011 4:29 PM
To: Schneider, Matthew
Cc: donna tisdale; Nathan Weflen
Subject: Comments on the County Wind Ordinance

Dear Mr. Schneider
See attached comments and the same copied below.

Thank you for reading.
Cindy Buxton

Comments on the POD10-007, log No 09-00-003; Sch no. 2010091030
County of San Diego Wind Ordinance.

Please accept further comments on the above EIS for this project. Thank you for reading.

1. The maps in the description section are impossible to read. There are little or no features included that assist the reader in determining where these areas are. I have extensive experience in this are and with effort by putting both the small and large maps from pages 31 and 33 together I could tell where this is. Most of the public is not going to be adequately informed. You can not go forward without disclosing what you are doing and where. These maps simply do not provide this. I perceive already an attempt to be vague and not be specific and clear about what is planned. If it was your intention to be clear and forthcoming you would over lay this on a topo map containing some road names so that the public, especially the land owners would know where this is.

AA-1

Nepa and CEQA laws dictate that the public has a clear idea what is being proposed. This is not adequately describing this project. You can not tell what is above Cuyamaca and what is down on Boulder Creek Road unless you are very skilled with this area. I do not think this is satisfying this NEPA and CEQA

AA-2

Response to Comment Letter AA

Individual
Cindy Buxton
December 22, 2011

AA-1 Figure 1-4 has been revised in response to this comment and comment E4. The provisions for small wind turbines and MET facilities in the draft Wind Energy Ordinance will apply to all private lands in the unincorporated county (Figure 1-3). The provisions for large wind turbines in the draft ordinance will apply to the wind resource areas that occur on private lands in the unincorporated county (Figure 1-4). The County does not agree that these figures should include topographic information and road names, as that would make the maps too difficult to read.

AA-2 The County mailed the Notice of Preparation to the Forest Service on September 9, 2010. The County also mailed the Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR to the Forest Service on November 8, 2011. The notices were sent to their offices at 10845 Rancho Bernardo Rd, Suite 200. The proposed project for a Wind Energy Ordinance is not subject to NEPA and would not apply to federal lands.

Reponses to Comments

<p>requirement. These areas are so interspersed with the forest that all Federal NEPA laws apply as well. You are not adequately informing the Federal Forest Service of your intentions. I asked Will Metz myself if he had seen RETI he had not. There is not enough discussion as to how this will impact the forest.</p>	<p>↑ AA-2 Cont.</p>	<p>AA-3 Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, the questions pertaining to impacts to recreation are concerned with whether the project will necessitate new recreational facilities or expansion of existing recreational facilities that will have environmental impacts. For example, a new large housing development would require new or improved recreational facilities that may otherwise be overlooked in the review of environmental effects. The questions do not ask whether a project will affect recreational activities. This would be a social impact rather than an environmental impact. Social and economic effects need not be considered in an EIR. See CEQA Guidelines section 15064(e).</p>
<p>2 The recreation section states that there are no impacts to recreation. Maybe that is true if you only include recreation on county land. I'm not sure I even could agree with that considering the juxtaposition to William Heisse Park. This will hugely impact every form of recreation in our backcountry. It will impact all hunting hiking camping rock climbing, biking and even offroading between Ramona, Santa Ysabel, Julian and Descanso. This impacts every form of recreation in McCain Valley, Every form of recreation in the desert, gee is there anything left beside going to the movies and skateboarding? This claim is so erroneous I already begin to doubt the legitimacy of this report.</p>	<p>↑ AA-3</p>	
<p>There seems to be the mindset among people who do not get out of town or off the pavement that if they are not directly under a project they are not impacted by it. I heard some marketers at Earth Day try to tell people that a wind mill wouldn't impact much because it only took up a small amount of ground. This is not true and I'm sure they already know this. Why are we doing business with people that lie like this? Anyone providing this logic should be removed from the project. This is so false it should not be dignified. These projects impact areas for miles especially when they are places in unspoiled areas.</p>	<p>↑ AA-4</p>	
<p>3. The environmental review states that the trade off due to clean energy would somehow off set the significant impacts of this proposal. I do not think you could possibly know that this is true. Again the people making these claims have little experience or they would know better. Our back country and our ecosystems are unique in the world and irreplaceable. . There are many energy technologies that do not remove nearly as much land as the large wind in this proposal.</p>	<p>↑ AA-5 AA-6</p>	
<p>4. I do not think your wind maps are accurate as they leave out some areas and include areas that are too specific for you to be speculating. This, per my last comment letter would lead me to question if these are contrived for the purpose of taking land to make money from development. The way in which certain areas are arbitrarily targeted are not consistent with wind data or with my experience out there. This is specifically true of the development that was pitched to Michael Beck in the upper San Diego River Gorge area. Clearly you failed to be forthcoming about the full scope of what you were planning in an attempt to deceive a public figure.</p>	<p>↑ AA-7</p>	<p>AA-5 The County does not agree with this comment. The DEIR does not conclude that clean energy would offset significant impacts. The DEIR analyzes and discloses the potentially significant environmental impacts of the project and will be provided to the decision makers for their consideration.</p>
<p>4. Your own Biological assessment answers many of your own questions about this area. The impacts are far reaching and significant and permanent. They change the character of our backcountry, they kill threatened and endangered species, they threaten critical habitats, the would stand to eliminate the entire golden</p>	<p>↑ AA-8 ↓</p>	<p>AA-6 The County agrees that future small and large wind turbines and MET facilities will have a significant impact on the environment. The County also agrees that there are other types of renewable energy systems</p>

Reponses to Comments

	<p>that may have fewer environmental impacts. This comment is not inconsistent with the existing content of the DEIR.</p> <p>AA-7 The provisions for small wind turbines and MET facilities in the draft Wind Energy Ordinance will apply to all private lands in the unincorporated county (Figure 1-3). The provisions for large wind turbines in the draft ordinance will apply to the wind resource areas that occur on private lands in the unincorporated county, as shown in Figure 1-4. This figure depicts the proposed wind resource map. The map label has been revised to clarify that it is the "Proposed Wind Resource Map." The map is based on National Renewable Energy Lab (NREL) data. Should additional data become available, the County may amend the map. NREL data is the most readily available data and is, therefore, an appropriate basis for the County's Wind Resource Map. Therefore, no areas are "arbitrarily targeted." Moreover, the County will not be taking any land as part of this project.</p> <p>AA-8 The County does not agree with the allegations in this comment. The project proposes to revise and clarify the permitting process for wind turbines and MET facilities. These types of developments are already allowed under the existing Zoning Ordinance; however, the proposed amendments would streamline the permitting process and potentially allow for</p>
--	---

Reponses to Comments

<p>eagle population. All of these issues are addressed by environmental laws many times over but yet you seek approval to go around them like any kid in a candy store. This project breaks laws, it is illegal. It exploits the current economic status to attempt to get us to weaken our environment. Our environment is the one thing we have and you should not take it just to fix the economy or we have nothing of substance left.</p>	<p>AA-8 Cont.</p>	
<p>Your Maps show this in many areas that are existing Inventoried Roadless areas and proposed wilderness areas. These projects can not be anywhere near any of these areas. They will seriously impact them even from miles away. There was a local bulldozer that inadequately bulldozed a property up on Cuyamaca off of Boulder Creek Road. The erosion resulted in the annual rains filling a pond down stream with silt in one season. To this day you can stand on Boulder Creek Road and look down into Boulder Creek Canyon and see muddy water from this channel joining crystal clear water from the side canyon to the north of it before they both flow into Boulder Creek. To date no one has adequately fixed the issue yet there are breeding trout upstream as documented by Allen Greenwood only a few months ago. To assert that small wind would not have impacts to water quality is not true. The threat from erosion is great and it contributes in a very big way to global warming, in fact erosion is ultimately one of the biggest environmental issues .</p>	<p>AA-9</p>	<p>AA-9 The project does not propose development of any specific wind energy projects, but establishes standards for obtaining permits. Under the ordinance, future large wind turbine projects will be required to undergo site-specific environmental review and will be required to comply with stormwater regulations. Erosion and siltation from installation of small wind turbines is not anticipated to be significant (see response to comment Z10).</p>
<p>There have been documented breeding trout in Cedar Gorge and the San Diego river as well. Cedar Gorge is the most untouched gorge in the area and the least visited. You can not be doing anything that will impact this area. This is a unique natural resource already studied for wild and scenic river status and was endorsed by the Board of Supervisors years ago. It should be set aside in unspoiled condition. Assuming that a windmill up on top of a ridge is ok because the creek is below is not true. These projects , the energy farms and the transmission lines should not be anywhere in this area. I would far prefer economic hardship to ruining our backcountry forever.</p>	<p>AA-10</p>	
<p>5. At the very least the top environments listed in your report as critical and sensitive exist in the areas between Ramona, Santa Ysabel, Julian, and Descanso. Essentially this is the areas that the county Board of Supervisors already endorsed as the proposed Eagle Peak Wilderness. The areas around the upper San Diego River and the Rancho Alegria Boulder Creek Area, and Sunshine Mountain and Cedar Creek Areas are particularly alarming. These are the last of any unspoiled areas within these types of habitat left. Many of them I would challenge that you have real date or have ever attempted to visit foot to the ground. Under no circumstances should any transmission or energy projects be placed in the mountains west of hwy 79!!!</p>	<p>AA-11</p>	<p>AA-10 The County is not proposing any specific development in the area described in this comment. Small wind turbines may be permitted on any privately owned lands in the County's jurisdiction; however, they are prohibited on ridgelines. In addition, the County has added a requirement that small wind turbines have a minimum 300-foot setback from blue-line watercourses and water bodies shown on the USGS topographic map and from mapped riparian vegetation. It should be noted that the County's General Plan requires that developments preserve</p>
<p>This is absolutely the most critical portion of the county in terms of water resources, diversity, habitat, and recreation and scenic integrity. I have said it in every comment period in the last six years. This area must be set aside for perpetuity. It is not the bulk of your map and there is no significant reason for destroying this area. The Former RETI maps show the upper San Diego</p>		

Reponses to Comments

<p>area as an area for development. I do not agree that the wind data there would even show this as a desirable area. I do know that from the periodical, SCIENCE , this entire region is effective in sequestering carbon and should be left alone. According to Science these areas are more important to curtailing global warming than wind farms are. If people are trying to develop this area for money, they are breaking many laws well beyond environmental ones.</p>	<p>↑ AA-11 Cont.</p>	<p>ridgelines and hillsides (Policies COS-12.1 and COS-12.2). And under the proposed ordinance, all large wind turbines will require site-specific environmental review and mitigation measures.</p>
<p>Putting wind mills across the face of Cuyamaca where they are seen by all of town and 3 million people is totally out of bounds.</p>	<p>AA-12</p>	<p>AA-11 The County is not proposing any specific development in the areas described in this comment. Most of the areas noted in the comment would not be in the project area for future large wind turbines (see Figure 1-4 of the DEIR). The proposed wind resource map defines areas where private landowners may propose large wind turbine projects. In addition, under the existing and the proposed ordinance, a large wind turbine project requires a Major Use Permit and site-specific environmental review (see also response to comment W3).</p>
<p>The scope of this project was not documented in the connected actions of the EIS of the Sunrise Powerlink. Please reference all of my comments and references on that project as comments to this project as well. This includes all videos under iokuok2 on www.youtube.com <http://www.youtube.com/> .</p>	<p>AA-13</p>	<p>The proposed Wind Energy Ordinance is not related to the Sunrise Powerlink. The County does not agree that comments on the Sunrise Powerlink apply to this project.</p>
<p>It is clear that the state supported RETI and the BLM which handed this project to you are trying to hide behind our board of supervisors. They obviously knew they intended to do this project but they did not disclose this to the public.</p>	<p>AA-14</p>	<p>AA-13 It is unclear what this comment means and, therefore, no response is provided.</p>
<p>Recently SDG&E tried to compensate by flying a double secret tiny meeting groups with environmentalists and project people with more stakeholders they hand picked. Presumably they were afraid to talk to the rest of us directly. They expected these people to be the representatives that they hand picked. New democracy; brand new. Apparently they tried to persuade the San Diego River Park Foundation to agree to their plans without yet again disclosing all of them . Of course they are also major contributors to the River Park Foundation. Apparently they failed to mention to Rob Hutsel that RETI wanted to build wind mills around the entire top of the San Diego River Gorge and around Julian and through the Girl Scout Camp , William Heise county Park, even though you say this will not impact any county recreation, and Pine Hills. Gee. Once deceitful always deceitful. Of course they told Michal Beck that it was to be some new age housing project in the Eagle Peak area, but apparently the massive wind farm escaped the discussion. They donated Chocolate Canyon to the River Park because like everything they are bribing and blackmailing their way through this project. Which bodes an interesting question: How is the power to get from all of these windmills out in the middle of nowhere to the grid? Shall we speculate that this is not all and behind it are a mass of powerlines yet undisclosed that now have to criss cross the county as well? Perhaps that is the interesting upgrades to the substations lately? Why did you not finish the metal pole project?</p>	<p>AA-15</p>	<p>AA-14 It is unclear what this comment means. The proposed Wind Energy Ordinance is not related to any SDG&E projects and does not include any specific development projects.</p>
<p>6. I have experienced many people even within the Sierra Club that were trying to push this area for development. The first clue was Kelly Fuller stating "Dave Hogan wants that area in case he has to decide". He? Senator Hogan? Decide? Upon inquiry they knew nothing about the area, had never been there and were not particularly interested in going. Some of these people were in the original Smart Energy Task Force. Neither Kelly Fuller nor Micha Mitrosky went to this</p>	<p>AA-15</p>	<p>AA-15 This comment appears to identify issues with the</p>

Reponses to Comments

<p>area during the time they were actively representing the Sierra Club for the original Sunrise EIS. Some of the Sierra Club board run their own "green mutual funds". No conflict of interest there. Neither the current chapter Sierra Club president, nor the past, nor the one before him has been up Boulder Creek Road to these areas. Both paid representatives from the Sierra club Regional Four Forests group on the California Wild Heritage Campaign, locally our Eagle Peak wilderness proposal, later participated in these transmission sitings and energy projects. Did they tell the people here working on projects? Of course not.. Our time and money was recruited for over a decade for what apparently was to find out who gave a damn about the area and discredit them.</p> <p>(otherwise known as racketeering-which is illegal, btw)</p> <p>The members who knew these areas were not allowed to input and participate in the Smart Energy Task Force. Some of those members were marginalized and isolated from input, anyone that disagreed and knew these areas. It has been appalling.</p> <p>Women were essentially not allowed to participate on the Eagle-Rock climber collaborative and the Sierra Club specifically tried to block my input including video of rock climbers hammer drilling, but allowed participation by men who had not been there at all.</p> <p>You are nevertheless responsible for the information that you use to make these decisions. I am certain that not all of the information is factual and legitimate. I have been very suspicious that some of them are participating in investing schemes in these projects and are not willfully interested in preserving the ecology of the land as is the charter of the Sierra Club to do. I am equally certain that there is not a reason in the world for these projects to go forward except that the people who are invested in them want them solely to make money. Taking public land for this reason is illegal and you are tasked for ensuring that the law is followed. Now you have been told that potential racketeering and insider trading is going on, you are responsible for seeing that it doesn't.</p> <p>7. How many on the Board of Supervisors live within even 30 miles of Boulevard? Deciding for this community to basically destroy its whole character is barbaric. I thought we had representative government? Should someone from Orange County come down here and decide that your neighborhood should become industrialized? Essentially that is what happened when RETI kicked this whole thing off from San Francisco and Sacramento more than 500 miles away.</p>	<p>Sierra Club and fails to raise any issue or make a substantive comment related to the Wind Energy Ordinance or DEIR.</p> <p>AA-16 The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the project. This information will be in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the Board of Supervisors.</p>
--	--

AA-15
Cont.

AA-16

Reponses to Comments

<p>8. If these projects go forward I personally will experience severe hardship. Especially in the Boulder Creek / Eagle Peak areas including Cedar Gorge and the San Diego River Gorge, they represent my life and everything meaningful in it. I have experienced physical, emotional, and financial hardships from trying endlessly to input to this process for six years, only to find out that the people who were supposed to be supportive were not, there was deliberate intention to deceive and steal, and the people representing the law makers already had in mind way back in 2007 that this would happen in spite of the current laws. You allowed us to continue to use resources knowing all along as RETI clearly indicates that you did. If these continue and harm comes to these areas, you are responsible for compensating us for our losses. In my case alone they are in the millions of dollars financially, though you could not replace the relationship with this area. . The price of destruction to these areas that are unique and irreplaceable is of course priceless. There is no amount of money that would replace them. I do not get paid for any of my participation in any way but the land itself is the reason for doing so. If you take it away you should be held fully responsible and accountable.</p>	AA-17	AA-17	<p>It is unclear whether or not this comment pertains to the proposed Wind Energy Ordinance or other projects. The proposed Wind Energy Ordinance consists of ordinance amendments that revise and clarify the permitting process for wind energy turbines and MET facilities. Should the Board of Supervisors adopt the proposed project, the County does not agree that the action would require any financial compensation to the commenter.</p>
<p>I have been followed, phone taped, had false allegations made along with the usual marginalization and I speculate to my employer as well, as did several others, some of which I busted simply because the print indicated that they were new users of Windows 10 which under the bell curve not too many lay people have in this economy. My car has had the thermostat reversed causing the heads to blow twice, among other things, such as my alarm mysteriously going off on several occasions. I am not alone there are many reports of harassment in this area. I complained that I was followed by two large black cars rather recently, and a couple of days later I was followed by a small white car-similar tag -at least they have a sense of humor at my expense.</p>	AA-18	AA-18	<p>This comment does not raise an environmental issue or make a substantive comment related to the Wind Energy Ordinance or DEIR.</p>
<p>Is this the new "democracy" and America that is to be your legacy? Who is intimidating our local representatives into believing they have no power over this?</p>	AA-19	AA-19	<p>The project is not subject to NEPA; however, it is subject to CEQA. The DEIR identifies 24 environmental topics for which impacts are estimated to be significant and unavoidable. The County has included all feasible design features (i.e., draft ordinance provisions) and mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts.</p>
<p>In short every NEPA CEQA category sustains sweeping unmitigatable impacts. There is ample evidence that this is not necessary. It is being taken from the public for profit by a few. This is criminal; it should be investigated and the criminals should be prosecuted. Anyone offering or accepting a bribe in exchange for their silence or their approval should be included in those investigated.</p>	AA-20	AA-20	<p>It is unclear what this comment means and, therefore, no response is provided.</p>
<p>The impact to me is total. I now have a glimpse into what Native America went through. What do you do for fun for meaningful existence when all of our back country is gone? Frankly I have no idea. Video Games? Reality TV? Golf,</p>	AA-21		

Reponses to Comments

<p>shopping at the mall? I want nothing to do with any of it. You would impose any number of contrived urban activities on all of us so that you can make billions. This is imposing insidious slavery as well; which is illegal.</p> <p>Thank you for reading these substantive comments. Please include them in the record.</p> <p>Sincerely, Chair of the Forest Committee for the San Diego Sierra Club Cindy Buxton put Democracy First</p>	<p>AA-21 This comment does not raise an environmental issue or make a substantive comment related to the Wind Energy Ordinance or DEIR.</p> <p>AA-22 These comments will be included in the Final EIR provided to the Board of Supervisors for consideration.</p>
--	---

↑
AA-21
Cont.

↑
AA-22

Reponses to Comments

From: Cindy Buxton [mailto:iokuok2@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, December 23, 2011 11:56 PM
To: Schneider, Matthew
Subject: Comments on the County Wind Ordinance

Here are some additional comments on the County of San Diego Wind Ordinance. Thank you for reading our comments. Please include these in the record.

This map, (page 33 of the general description) included private property on a public announcement without having said anything to the property owners first. That alone I find alarming and they should provide property owners the opportunity to input. Most of them do not know about this ordinance proposal. It is additionally very difficult to tell from the map where their land is. How can they publish an intention to the whole wide world of investors that they think an individual's place would be great for a wind farm when they never told the owners? That has to be breaking some law. If they have not gotten permission to enter private land, than how can they publish the detailed "desirability" on the map if they have not actually been there. That is outrageous.

This is an inappropriate time for commenting and NEPA (federal environmental laws) and CEQA (State) require a reasonable disclosure and commenting from the public. In my opinion this is falling way short. The map is anything but clear, hence the public does not have a clear disclosure where this is.

More points for the Boulder Creek Areas near the Eagle Peak IRA and proposed Wilderness

- Rancho Alegria has a lot of history recent and ancient. It still has some period architecture.
- It has enormous Engleman Oaks, which are critical species of interest. I suspect there are many other species of interest up there too, toads, bats, kangaroo rats, owls, gnat catchers and other birds--birds are at particular risk, butterflies.
- Seeps and Natural Meadows.
- This is a total complex ecosystem, it is inappropriate to disturb it. Complex systems are effective at combating global warming, as much or more than wind farms, hence they should not be used for energy projects. (Science periodical)
- breathtaking unspoiled views of Cuyamaca and Eagle Peak, any impact compromises this. The area is not comparably large. It does not take much to destroy it. It can not be further segmented by more compromises.
- There is no hunting on Rancho Alegria so the deer there have a chance to develop their natural "culture". There is surprisingly little that is really researched and known about our local Mule Deer. Hence Rancho Alegria represents an environment that is unique in the world.
- Rancho Alegria and the Face of Cuyamaca, and Eagle Peak are surrounded by three Inventoried Roadless areas, or IRA's, in a very unspoiled and breathtaking part of the county. The IRA's are Eagle Peak, Sill Hill and "No Name".
- Industrial scale development would significantly and adversely impact all three of these IRA's.
- Because these are on Federal Forest land any project requires compliance with NEPA as well as CEQA.

AA-23

AA-24

AA-25

AA-26

AA-27

AA-28

AA-29

AA-23 These comments will be included in the Final EIR provided to the Board of Supervisors for consideration.

AA-24 The County of San Diego published the Notice of Preparation on September 9, 2010 and the Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR on November 8, 2011. The proposed ordinance applies to the entire unincorporated county, and sending specific notices to all landowners is not feasible or required.

AA-25 The proposed Wind Energy Ordinance does not encourage new wind farms in the areas identified in the wind resources map. Rather, the map defines the areas where large wind turbine projects may be permitted with a Major Use Permit. Any specific Major Use Permit will undergo a public review process.

AA-26 The wind resources map is based on National Renewable Energy Lab (NREL) data. Access to private lands was not required.

Reponses to Comments

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They should not be doing ANY development on public land in the entire region west of HWY 79. This is the heart of the proposed Eagle Peak Wilderness. Since they are planning to impact so much of the eastern part of our County, This particular area, the Eagle Peak IRA region, so to speak , we believe should have particularly high priority for setting aside in its unspoiled condition. It is unique Mediterranean ecology and rather small compared to other regions. • We have very little extensive unspoiled areas. Any development in these areas essentially downgrades their near pristine condition. They continue to use the compromise- to-compromise pressure. We can not accept this any longer, especially considering the scale of these wind projects. • They are not considering multiple technologies. Some technologies, even wind driven ones do not take up so much land. There is a "Maglev" type wind mill that only takes up 100 acres (only she says) and powers 700,000 homes. • The best solution by far is to put solar on the roof of every residence, small business, and parking garage, etc , IN TOWN as well as promoting efficiency. There has been a study out for some time that indicates that this would address up to 50% of our energy needs without any impact to our natural resources and far less costly to our county.. If they increased roof capacity to 6kW an average home could supply most of the energy for a small electric car as well. This we know because our former Sierra club Board member had a Tesla and 6kW of solar, and basically was able to travel 200 miles a day for free. Those are not numbers that "the Power over the Power" is comfortable with, I presume the true root cause of our troubles. • Large wind construction can create erosion etc and impact clean water. In the Boulder Creek Area this is critical. That entire region was purchased by the Forest Service to protect the watershed. The map also includes wind mills on Eagle Peak, Boulder Creek, Cedar Creek and possibly the San Diego River; essentially all of our mountain streams that flow into El Capitan that they could impact. These streams are now home to semi native trout thanks to efforts by our local Fly Fishers Clubs. (aka Allen Greenwood among others.) • Wind Mills cause numerous health hazards to humans and other animals living near them. • This region is a major habitat for Golden Eagles, Prairie falcons, and peregrine falcons, and there have been several siting of Bald Eagles as well. • There should not be any industrial wind farms west of Hwy 79. I do not know of a compelling reason to have them at all but this area must be set aside for preserving this unique unspoiled environment for perpetuity. • There are well over 100 recreationalists driving Boulder Creek Road every day to go to the Three Sisters/Eagle Peak Area right below and to the north of Rancho Alegria. How do you explain that your ordinance claims no impact to recreation, yet it covers half the county? • By your methods is the only considerable recreation contrived? • What criteria make an area "desirable"? • Was this determined largely by a GIS map overlay? • Are you suggesting that these areas on Federal property have approval for industrial development? Otherwise why are they pictured with this project? 	<p>AA-30</p> <p>AA-31</p> <p>AA-32</p> <p>AA-33</p> <p>AA-34</p> <p>AA-35</p> <p>AA-36</p> <p>AA-37</p> <p>AA-38</p> <p>AA-39</p> <p>AA-40</p>	<p>AA-27 The project is not subject to NEPA; however, it is subject to CEQA. The County used public review times stated in CEQA Statute (PRC Section 21091 and 21092). The County regrets that the map depicted in Figure 1-4 was not entirely clear (see response to comment E4).</p> <p>AA-28 The information provided in this comment is not inconsistent with the existing contents of the DEIR. The comment provides additional details on the existing conditions in the County. It does not result in any new significant environmental impacts, an increase in the severity of previously identified project impacts, or new feasible project alternatives or mitigation measures.</p> <p>AA-29 The project does not propose any specific wind energy projects. Large wind energy projects proposed in the future would be required to obtain a Major Use Permit and would undergo site-specific environmental review. The proposed project would not apply to any federal lands.</p> <p>AA-30 The County is not proposing any specific development in the areas described in this comment. The wind resource maps define areas where private landowners may propose large wind turbine projects. However, under the existing and the proposed ordinance, a large wind turbine project requires a Major Use Permit and environmental review. Small wind turbines can be</p>
---	--	---

Reponses to Comments

	<p>permitted on any private lands in the unincorporated county; however, they must be accessories to existing uses on site.</p>
AA-31	This comment appears to pertain to large wind turbine projects. The Wind Energy Ordinance does not preclude using new technologies.
AA-32	The Wind Energy Ordinance does not preclude using alternative renewable energy facilities (e.g., solar).
AA-33	See responses to comments AA9 and AA10.
AA-34	There is much disagreement among experts regarding potential adverse health effects from wind turbine projects. This comment will be included in the final EIR for consideration by decision makers. It should be noted, however, that disagreement among experts does not result in an inadequate EIR (CEQA Guidelines §15151).
AA-35	The County agrees with this comment, which is not inconsistent with the existing content of the DEIR.
AA-36	The County acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the project. This information will be in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the Board of Supervisors.
AA-37	See response to comment AA3.

Responses to Comments

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not see a clear correlation with wind and the "desireable" locations. Do these areas already have bidding investors trying to develop? AA-41 • What are you doing to ensure that this is objective and investors don't just overrun the issues? AA-42 • How are you insuring that this proposal is not driven by money but protecting the human factor of our community? AA-43 • When was this determination made? AA-44 • How much of this information was provided by the prior work of RETI? AA-45 • Did another agency mandate this? Please indicate the paperwork available for public inspection. AA-46 • How much input do you have from the Cleveland so far? AA-47 • How much input came from the EIS to Sunrise? AA-47 <p>Why is the county suggesting this decision for public forest land? The large scale wind areas on these maps are on Federal Property. How can this Wind Ordinance be dictating the management of these lands? In the case of the Boulder Creek area, isn't that the decision of the Cleveland Forest Supervisor? The suggestion on this project is that you are deciding the fate of these lands and how they are to be accessed and managed. However a large part of them are on Cleveland Forest Property and BLM and even Anza Borrego State Park. Many of these areas are on IRA's and even federally protected Wilderness as is the case in the Otay Mountain area. How can the county board of Supervisors frame this in a way as to suggest that they are making decisions there? Significant Federal Wilderness management changes can require a 2/3 majority vote from Congress. AA-48</p> <p>Thank you for reading another comment letter on the San Diego County Wind Ordinance Proposal.</p> <p>Sincerely, Cindy Buxton Chair of the Forest Committee of the San Diego Sierra Club</p> <p><small>put Democracy First</small></p>	<p>AA-38 It is unclear what this comment means and, therefore, no response is provided. However, see response AA7 regarding the wind resource map.</p> <p>AA-39 See response to comment AA7.</p> <p>AA-40 See responses to comments E4 and AA29.</p> <p>AA-41 County staff does not know where the commenter is seeing the term "desirable locations." The County is aware of some proposed large wind turbine projects which are in process and has been contacted by developers regarding potential areas where more large wind turbine projects may be proposed in the future. Figures 1-3 and 1-4 were prepared from National Renewable Energy Lab (NREL) data and not from any development requests.</p> <p>AA-42 Future large wind turbine projects located on private lands in the County unincorporated area must go through the Major Use Permit process and site-specific environmental review. Each proposed project will be analyzed and reviewed by decision makers based on its merits.</p>
---	--

Reponses to Comments

From: Cindy Buxton [mailto:iokuok2@hotmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, December 24, 2011 3:05 AM
To: Schneider, Matthew
Cc: donna tisdale; Will Metz
Subject:

Dear Mr Schneider,
 Along with my comment letters on the Wind Ordinance, please note attached photos of some of the areas on your proposed wind ordinance map of the areas around the San Diego River and a couple near Eagle Peak. I have thousands. I believe the general character indicated in these photos demonstrate the inappropriateness of developing these area. I can extrapolate that if there are oversights here where I know the ground very well that there are oversights all over? These photos were taken today and last Sunday. Down in many of these canyons are meadows, seeps, and flowing streams and therein all of the expected collection of environmental concerns.

This area was noted for Wind development in RETI and again here. I heard that a man who was an employee or former employee of General Atomic, energy related company, was buying a lot of land there, in the upper San Diego River Gorge and Eagle Peak road Areas, and claiming to be developing a contained housing community. Nevertheless the maps indicate wind farms. Since this has not been determined, how can this be sold prematurely and still make assumptions about the outcome? Can you assure that if he makes an investment before the process determines suitability and demands exception as seems to happen too often that you will be able to stop the predatory pressure? How can you assure that this issue isn't being manhandled with disregard for the process as well as the preservation of the things our citizenry hold dear about our back country from "predatory" development?

This is very suspicious and certainly very vague. This area should not be developed, nothing west of 79 should be a part of this project because these areas have been part of an effort for over a decade to preserve them for ecology and recreation in more or less protective status. More broadly these windmills can cause health issues and shouldn't be constructed at all.

This area should be set aside. If this sort of aggressive predation is being allowed in one area we can assume it is everywhere. That is not addressing global warming it is just taking from the people to make money by people who do not care about us. This must be stopped and reviewed.

There is a lot of wind all over this county. There are also times when the wind doesn't blow. I do not see how these ratings indicated on the maps provided can be in place. What I can observe is that every place that we love and talk up, every place in the Late Jerry Shad's books, seem to be included in this project. It is like everything that is cherished for its beauty in this county is being destroyed, and unfortunately that is not hype or an exaggeration. I have to ask because it is so pervasive, how can you be sure this is not being recommended by someone as a hate crime against

AA-49

AA-50

- AA-43** No decision on the project has been made. However, on February 25, 2009, the County Board of Supervisors directed County staff to begin drafting the ordinance and preparing environmental review. Staff has involved the public in the process as required by law.
- AA-44** Information in the draft ordinance and DEIR was not provided by RETI.
- AA-45** On February 25, 2009, the County Board of Supervisors directed County staff on February 25, 2009 to begin drafting the ordinance and preparing environmental review. Board meeting information can be accessed at http://sdcounty.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2.
- AA-46** The County has not received comments from the Cleveland National Forest.
- AA-47** The County did not use information from the Sunrise Powerlink EIR/EIS.
- AA-48** See responses to comments E4 and AA29.
- AA-49** The County appreciates this information and has included the photos in the record with the comment letters.
- AA-50** See responses to comments E4, W3, AA11, AA29, and AA34.

Reponses to Comments

environmentalists and outdoor enthusiasts? I can not see how any reasonable developer would suggest such a huge proportion of the places that are cherished in this county be destroyed. No competent business would do this; it would not do their reputation any benefit.

It is not like there aren't many places to put wind mills that are relatively uncomplex and low diversity but they chose the most diverse and beautiful places they could find. I'm suspicious of their motives and even sound headedness. Is someone targeting us and how can you be sure? Is someone using this to grab land for other development such as real estate and using wind mills and federal land to slip them in as well since we are already seeing it here?

It may seem like a bit extreme to ask in this forum, but when I look at the whole map it has my attention and it is so extensive that it is a question that has become hard to ignore. This is true for many of the desert areas as well. There are flat open areas that can be windy as heck but they are nondescript-as you would hope they would be if one were to industrialize them--but they are not indicated. Nevertheless, I perceive, it is the more popular destinations for hikers, even in the desert that are chosen. I think what is really eye-opening is that they would even suggest putting this the whole length of the Laguna's along the desert edge. This has to be the most popular well known and well developed and well visited part of our whole forest. What on earth? I'm not sure how but I hope you will research this concern and consider the implication before moving forward. In the mean time please consider an extention to this comment process.

AA-50
Cont.

Thank you for reading.

Sincerely,

Cindy Buxton

Chair of the Forest Committee for the San Diego Chapter of he Sierra Club

[put Democracy First](#)

ATTACHMENT AA1























