

O1 Backcountry Against Dumps

- O1-1** This comment requests that the attached documents be included in the formal public response for the Campo Wind Project with Boulder Brush Facilities (Project) Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). These documents are included as part of the formal record and are responded to herein.
- O1-2** The comment states that Appendix A to the Draft EIR confirms that the attached comments were not included or addressed in the Draft EIR. These comments are addressed in this Response to Comment document, thereby ensuring the comments are included and responded to within the Final EIR and are included in the administrative record of the Project. No further response or edits to the Draft EIR are required.
- O1-3** The comment requests the confirmation of receipt of the letter. The County of San Diego (County) previously provided confirmation of receipt of the letter. In addition, this response also serves as confirmation of receipt, and the letter will be included as part of the formal record.
- O1-4** The comment expresses opposition to previously approved wind energy projects, including Kumeyaay Wind, Tule Wind, and Ocotillo Wind projects. The comment also states wind turbines for these projects were constructed far too close to homes and other sensitive receptors. The comment does not raise an issue with the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR. However, the County notes that the Draft EIR includes a cumulative analysis in Chapter 1, Section 1.7, List of Past, Present, and Reasonably Anticipated Future Projects in the Project Area, in the Draft EIR.
- O1-5** The comment expresses concerns regarding the impacts of previously approved wind energy projects on homes and properties. The comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR. As stated in Response O1-4, the Draft EIR includes a cumulative analysis in Chapter 1, Section 1.7, in the Draft EIR.
- O1-6** The comment states that home and property values have been significantly reduced, making it harder to leave and move somewhere away from the turbines, or for Tribal members to move to safer ground. The comment does not raise an issue with the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR. As explained in Global Response GR-1, Socio-Economic Impacts, property values are not a California Environmental Quality Act issue.

Responses to Comments

O1-7 The comment requests the attached opposition letters be included in the formal record for the Environmental Impact Statement prepared for the Project by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The comment is noted. In addition, the attached letters are included in the formal record for the EIR and are addressed in Response to Comments O1-7a through O1-7d.

O1-7a The comment refers to and consists of a petition with 45 signatures opposing the Project. The petition letter begins with a general statement of opposition to the Project, summarizes the components of the Project, and states that the Project is part of one big connected project, not three separate projects. The petition letter also states that the Tribal vote to approve the lease was illegal, as it was not properly noticed. The letter further states that the jobs will go to out-of-the-area contractors and labor, not locals. The petitioner urges decision makers to deny the Project based on significant, cumulative, and disproportionately adverse impacts to public health and safety, sleep deprivation and stress-related illnesses, noise, low-frequency noise, infrasound and vibrations, increased fire risk and insurance costs, loss of scenic landscapes and property values, light and electrical pollution, well water, wildlife, pets and livestock, and habitat.

In response, the comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR; thus, no edits to the Draft EIR are required. However, in regard to the issues raised in the comment, please refer to Global Response GR-3, Piecemealing, which explains that the Draft EIR analyzes the Campo Wind Project with Boulder Brush Facilities as one project, which is not dependent on other projects. Global Response GR-2, Public Health, includes a discussion of public health concerns. The Draft EIR adequately analyzes noise (Chapter 2.6) and also discusses noise in Global Response GR-4; wildfire is addressed in Chapter 2.9 and in the Boulder Brush Facilities Fire Protection Plan (Appendix I to the Draft EIR); aesthetics, including scenic landscapes, is analyzed in Chapter 2.1 and also discussed in Global Response GR-8, Visual Impacts; groundwater is analyzed in Chapter 3.1.5 and Appendices J-1, J-2, and J-3; and biological resources are analyzed in Chapter 2.3 and Appendix D of the Draft EIR.

O1-7b The comment consists of six signed Campo Wind Opposition letters. It also contains a request to consider the No Action Alternative for the Project. The comment does not raise an issue with the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR, and no further response is required.

Responses to Comments

- O1-7c** The comment consists of 11 Wind Turbine Neighbor Surveys listing symptoms and other issues experienced by the persons surveyed, and provides a summary statement of the Project components. The contents contained within the survey document do not raise any issues regarding the analysis provided within the Draft EIR. Please see Draft EIR Chapter 2.5, Section 2.5.3.5, Public Concerns of Health Effects, and Global Response GR-2.
- O1-7d** The comment refers to a further 38 completed Wind Turbine Neighbor Surveys, dated March 2 to June 6, 2019. Refer to Response to Comment O1-7c.
- O1-8** The comment consists of a Wind Turbine Neighbor Survey (refer to Response to Comment O1-7c) and an additional statement offered by the commenter. Refer to Responses to Comments O1-8a through O1-8c for a response to the additional statement.
- O1-8a** The comment raises concerns with the public health effects that result from the Project. Please see Draft EIR Chapter 2.5, Section 2.5.3.5, and Global Response GR-2.
- O1-8b** The comment states putting the turbines in McCain Valley is a conflict of interest and that California State Parks Department should be protecting land. In response, for clarification, the County notes the Project proposes to install turbines on the Campo Band of Diegueño Mission Indians Reservation. The comment does not raise an issue with the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR, and no further response is provided or required.
- O1-8c** The comment expresses concerns about sleep issues as a result of existing turbines. The comment does not raise an issue with the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR, and no further response is provided or required.
- O1-9** The comment consists of a Wind Turbine Neighbor Survey (refer to Response to Comment O1-7c) and an additional statement offered by the commenter. Refer to Responses to Comments O1-9a through O1-9b for responses to the additional statement.
- O1-9a** The comment refers to the commenter's symptoms and attributes these to existing wind energy projects. This comment does not raise an issue regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Please see Draft EIR Chapter 2.5, Section 2.5.3.5, and Global Response GR-2.
- O1-9b** The comment states that the commenter has underlying health issues. The comment does not raise an issue with the adequacy of the analysis contained within the Draft EIR.

Responses to Comments

- O1-10** The comment consists of a Wind Turbine Neighbor Survey (refer to Response to Comment O1-7c), and an additional statement offered by the commenter. Refer to Responses to Comments O1-10a through O1-10d for a response to the additional statement.
- O1-10a** The comment states the commenter has experienced health issues and attributes these to existing wind turbines. The comment does not raise any issue concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Please see Draft EIR Chapter 2.5, Section 2.5.3.5, and Global Response GR-2.
- O1-10b** The comment refers to additional health issues experienced by the commenter and correlates these health effects to existing wind turbines. The comment does not raise any issue concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Please see Draft EIR Chapter 2.5, Section 2.5.3.5, and Global Response GR-2.
- O1-10c** The comment expresses concern about distance between homes and wind turbines. The comment, however, does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR or specific environmental effect, and therefore no further response is provided.
- O1-10d** The comment states class actions suits will be brought against the wind energy project if problems are not addressed. The comment does not raise any issue concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR. No further response is required.
- O1-10e** The comment expresses opposition to the Project and states the Bureau of Indian Affairs did not protect the Tribal people from the Project wind turbines. The comment does not raise any issue concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR, and no further response is required.
- O1-11** The comment consists of a Wind Turbine Neighbor Survey (refer to Response to Comment O1-7c) and an additional statement offered by the commenter. Refer to Responses to Comments O1-11a through O1-11b for a response to the additional statement.
- O1-11a** The comment expresses the commenter’s concern over the decrease in property value caused by the wind turbines. As explain in Global Response GR-1, property values are not analyzed under the California Environmental Quality Act. The comment does not raise any issue concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR, and no further response is required.
- O1-11b** The comment expresses concern about traffic increasing on “our road” and that the modifications will be needed because the existing road is dirt. According to the comment letter, the commenter resides on Ribbonwood Road, which would provide access to the proposed Boulder Brush Facilities on private lands. As described in

Responses to Comments

Chapter 1, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, an approximately 1-mile segment of existing Ribbonwood Road from the Opalocka Road/Ribbonwood Road intersection to the Boulder Brush Facilities site entrance would be improved as part of the Project. The existing unpaved road is proposed to be widened up to 30 feet and paved. In addition, a 20-foot-wide fuel modification on either side of the road would be provided where feasible. The impacts of the proposed improvements to Ribbonwood Road are assessed throughout the Draft EIR, including in Chapter 2.8, Traffic and Transportation. As discussed in detail in Chapter 2.8 of the Draft EIR, during construction of the Boulder Brush Facilities, a County-required construction Traffic Control Plan and notification procedures would be implemented.

- O1-12** The comment consists of a Wind Turbine Neighbor Survey (refer to Response to Comment O1-7c) and an additional statement offered by the commenter. Refer to Responses to Comments O1-12a through O1-12b for responses to the additional comments.
- O1-12a** The comment states the Project would destroy one of the last pieces of open space in Boulevard. The comment does not raise any specific issue concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR, and no further response is required. For a discussion of impacts to biological resources, please refer to Draft EIR Chapter 2.3 and Global Response GR-5. Also, please refer to Draft EIR Chapter 2.1 and Global Response GR-8 regarding visual impacts.
- O1-12b** The comment expresses concern that the Project will destroy many creatures. The comment does not raise a specific issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis within the Draft EIR. For a discussion of impacts to biological resources, refer to Chapter 2.3 of the Draft EIR and Global Response GR-5.
- O1-13** The comment consists of a Wind Turbine Neighbor Survey (refer to Response to Comment O1-7c) and an additional statement offered by the commenter. Refer to Responses to Comments O1-13a through O1-13e for a response to the additional statement.
- O1-13a** The commenter expresses concern about experiencing ringing in ears when at home, which is not noticeable when not at home. The comment does not raise a specific issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis within the Draft EIR; thus, no further response can be provided. Please see Draft EIR Chapter 2.5, Section 2.5.3.5, and Global Response GR-2.
- O1-13b** The comment expresses health concerns regarding migraines. The comment does not raise a specific issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis within the Draft EIR; thus, no further response can be provided. Please see Draft EIR Chapter 2.5, Section 2.5.3.5, and Global Response GR-2.

Responses to Comments

- O1-13c** The comment expresses concerns about the shadows of wind turbines while traveling on the freeway. The comment does not raise a specific issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis within the Draft EIR; thus, no further response can be provided. A discussion of impacts regarding shadow flicker from wind turbines can be found in Chapter 2.1 and Chapter 2.5, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, within the Draft EIR. Also, please refer to Global Response GR-2, which also discusses shadow flicker.
- O1-13d** The comment expresses concerns regarding eye fatigue and states the cause is not known. The comment does not raise a specific issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis within the Draft EIR; thus, no further response can be provided.
- O1-13e** The comment expresses concerns regarding cell phone service. The comment does not raise a specific issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis within the Draft EIR; thus, no further response can be provided.
- O1-14** The comment consists of a Wind Turbine Neighbor Survey (refer to Response to Comment O1-7c) and an additional statement offered by the commenter. Refer to Response to Comment O1-14a for a response to the additional statement.
- O1-14a** The comment states issues (related to health as responded to in survey) began after the Sierra Juarez and Tule Wind projects. The comment does not raise a specific issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis within the Draft EIR; thus, no further response can be provided. Please see Draft EIR Chapter 2.5, Section 2.5.3.5, and Global Response GR-2 regarding public health concerns.
- O1-15** The comment consists of a Wind Turbine Neighbor Survey (refer to Response to Comment O1-7c) and an additional statement offered by the commenter. Refer to Response to Comment O1-15a for a response to the additional statement.
- O1-15a** The comment expresses concerns regarding health effects and noise effects from the Project. The comment does not raise a specific issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis within the Draft EIR; thus, no further response can be provided. Refer to Global Response GR-2 regarding health effects, and refer to Global Response GR-4 for a detailed discussion of noise impacts.
- O1-16** The comment consists of a Wind Turbine Neighbor Survey (refer to Response to Comment O1-7c) and an additional statement offered by the commenter. Refer to Response to Comment O1-16a for a response to the additional statement.

Responses to Comments

- O1-16a** The comment states the “Co.” involved really do not care about any people. The comment does not raise any issue concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR; thus, no further response can be provided.
- O1-17** The comment consists of a Wind Turbine Neighbor Survey (refer to Response to Comment O1-7c) and an additional statement offered by the commenter. Refer to Responses to Comments O1-17a through O1-17c for a response to the additional statement.
- O1-17a** The commenter expresses support for clean energy projects, but makes the request not to “pepper” windmills in clumps on private land and in neighborhoods. The comment does not raise a specific issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis within the Draft EIR; thus, no further response can be provided.
- O1-17b** The comment expresses concerns related to views, landscape, and impacts to birds. The comment does not raise a specific issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis within the Draft EIR. For a discussion of impacts regarding views and impacts to the landscape, refer to Draft EIR Chapter 2.1 and Global Response GR-8. For a discussion of impacts to birds, refer to Chapter 2.3. In addition, Global Response GR-5 addresses impacts to biological resources, including birds.
- O1-17c** The comment expresses opposition to the Project. The comment does not raise any issue concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR; thus, no further response can be provided.
- O1-18** The comment consists of a Wind Turbine Neighbor Survey (refer to Response to Comment O1-7c) and an additional statement offered by the commenter. Refer to Responses to Comments O1-18a through O1-18b for a response to the additional statement.
- O1-18a** The commenter refers to a feeling of an electric current through their body. The comment does not raise a specific issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis within the Draft EIR; thus, no further response can be provided. Please see Draft EIR Chapter 2.5, Section 2.5.3.5, and Global Response GR-2 regarding public health concerns.
- O1-18b** The comment states when they have company they feel dizzy and weak, which the commenter feels most of the time. The comment does not raise a specific issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis within the Draft EIR; thus, no further response can be provided. Please see Draft EIR Chapter 2.5, Section 2.5.3.5, and Global Response GR-2 regarding public health concerns.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK