

DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	23-OPT-01
Project Title:	Fountain Wind Project
TN #:	253395
Document Title:	Joseph Osa Comments - Scoping Meeting Comments of Opposition & Alternative Projects
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Joseph Osa
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	11/30/2023 11:20:12 AM
Docketed Date:	11/30/2023

*Comment Received From: Joseph Osa
Submitted On: 11/30/2023
Docket Number: 23-OPT-01*

Scoping Mtg Comments of Opposition & Alternative Projects

Additional submitted attachment is included below.

Mr. Chairman, and Commission.

My name is Joseph Osa. I'm a retired electrical engineer and I reside in the Montgomery Creek area along with my wife and 86-year-old Mother whom I recently moved up from Chico after the previous Fountain Wind denial knowing I would not be putting her in harms way.

Shasta County is already one of the top 5 renewable energy producers amongst all other California Counties and one of the lowest consumers of energy.

Biomass is a suitable renewable energy technology that is synergistic with both California's clean energy goals and the dire need to manage our overgrown forests, with their dangerous abundance of dead and dying trees.

Multiple biomass plants, like the recently approved Hat Creek Biomass facility, which would process materials produced by forest thinning and tree salvage operations, provide even more long-term local employment and is an appropriate type of renewable energy project for our area. Transportation of biomass fuels is costly, so a larger number of smaller plants could help to solve the transportation problem.

Other suitable technologies could include large scale solar. There are lands throughout Shasta County that would likely be suitable, some of which are adjacent to existing electrical transmission lines. Solar, even at the commercial scale, would not have the same environmental impacts; particularly that of Aerial Firefighting impediment.

Another problem with the Fountain Wind Project is the impact it would have on the existing Hatchet Wind development. The Wake effect of the Fountain Wind project would have a significant impact of the Hatchet project, so much so that Pattern Energy, the developer/owner of Hatchet Wind, was concerned it would prevent them from meeting their contractual requirements with PG&E, as stated in a comment letter they wrote during the previous County led CEQA process. The alternative technologies suggested above would not produce this negative impact on an existing clean energy development.

Of the above technologies, only biomass produces dispatchable energy. It can generate power as needed, vice only when the wind blows or the sun shines. As such, it aids in grid stability, and does not require that it be curtailed as wind and solar power does because they often produce power when it isn't needed.

Also, the 205 MW of the Fountain Wind Project is nameplate capacity, where actual production is likely to only be 30-35% of that, and even then, it will be further reduced by another 20-25% of that due to curtailment, so only about 23-26% will be usable or 47-53MW. The equivalent net usable power could reasonably be produced by a single or multiple Biomass plants.

Please explore these and other viable and much more suitable technologies for our area and deny the Fountain Wind Project.