Responses to Comments

O2 Backcountry Against Dumps

O2-1 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.

O2-2 The comment states that the attached comments were not included or addressed in the Draft EIR or included within Appendix A, despite the fact that they were provided to County of San Diego (County) staff 6 months before, on July 5, 2019. In response, these attachments include the Backcountry Against Dumps community meeting PowerPoint from June 27, 2019, and two Wind Turbine Neighbor Surveys. Appendix A to the Draft EIR includes the Notice of Preparation (NOP), Initial Study prepared for the Project, and public comment letters received during the NOP public review period. As stated in the NOP, all comments were to be received by the County no later than March 18, 2019. The commenter states in this comment that the attachments were provided to County staff on July 5, 2019. Because the NOP 30-day public review period closed on March 18, 2019, the referenced attachments were not recorded as comments to the NOP, nor were the attachments included in Appendix A to the Draft EIR. Additionally, the original email with the two attachments sent by the commenter to the County on July 5, 2019 has a subject line specific to the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) prepared for the Project by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), “Campo Wind Draft EIS – comments.” The email and attachments were not identified as intending to be submitted in response to the Draft EIR. However, this comment and associated attachments are addressed herein, and are included in the Final EIR and administrative record of the Project. No further response or edits to the Draft EIR are required.

O2-3 The comment requests confirmation of receipt of the letter. The County previously provided confirmation of receipt. In addition, this response also serves as confirmation of receipt, and the letter will be included as part of the formal record. Please see Response to Comment O2-2.

O2-4 The comment consists of a forwarded email dated July 5, 2019, to the federal BIA and the County requesting that the attached documents be included as part of the record for the Campo Wind Draft EIS. In response, Draft EIS refers to the EIS prepared for the Project under the federal National Environmental Policy Act. Please also see Response to Comment O2-2.
Responses to Comments

O2-4a  The comment references two documents. The first refers to a PowerPoint presentation given on June 27, 2019, by the commenter. However, the comment letter does not provide the PowerPoint presentation as an attachment. The presentation is included as Letter H and responded to in the Final EIS (Appendix T to the Final EIS) prepared for the Project by the BIA. Please also see Response to Comment O2-4. The second document referred to includes two Wind Turbine Neighbor Surveys, which are addressed under Responses to Comments O2-5 through O2-6a.

O2-4b  The comment states that of the 60 people who attended a June 27, 2019, meeting, no one raised their hand in support of the Campo Wind, Torrey Wind, or Boulder Brush Gen-tie projects. The comment also states Terra-Gen representatives declined to participate in the June 27, 2019, meeting. 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.

O2-5  The comment consists of a Wind Turbine Neighbor Survey and an additional statement offered by the commenter. Refer to Response to Comment O2-5a for responses to the additional statement.

O2-5a  The commenter expresses a wish the housing development had been approved. The comment also states the turbines are an eyesore, unhealthy, and depreciate your property. The comments do not raise a specific issue regarding the adequacy of the analysis within the Draft EIR; thus, no further response can be provided. For a discussion of impacts regarding aesthetics, refer to Draft EIR Chapter 2.1 and Global Response GR-8. In regard to health issues, please see Draft EIR Chapter 2.5, Section 2.5.3.5, and Global Response GR-2. Also, as explained in Global Response GR-1, Socioeconomic Impacts, impacts to property values are not analyzed under the California Environmental Quality Act.

O2-6  The comment consists of a Wind Turbine Neighbor Survey and an additional statement offered by the commenter. Refer to Response to Comment O2-6a for responses to the additional statement.

O2-6a  The commenter states their doctor has verified that the wind turbines negatively affect their health. 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.