

<b>DOCKETED</b>	
<b>Docket Number:</b>	23-OPT-01
<b>Project Title:</b>	Fountain Wind Project
<b>TN #:</b>	254275
<b>Document Title:</b>	Certified Transcript of Shasta County Board of Supervisors Meeting of October 26_ 2021
<b>Description:</b>	N/A
<b>Filer:</b>	Kelly Lotz
<b>Organization:</b>	County of Shasta
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Public Agency
<b>Submission Date:</b>	1/31/2024 4:14:46 PM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	1/31/2024



# Shasta County

DEPARTMENT OF RESOURCE MANAGEMENT  
1855 Placer Street, Redding, CA 96001

Paul A. Hellman  
Director  
Adam Fieseler  
Assistant Director

January 31, 2024

Leonidas Payne, Project Manager  
California Energy Commission  
715 P Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: Docket Number 23-OPT-01 - Fountain Wind Project

Dear Mr. Payne,

The County of Shasta is hereby submitting the certified transcript of the October 26, 2021, Shasta County Board of Supervisors special meeting regarding Fountain Wind LLC's appeal of the Planning Commission's decision to deny Use Permit 16-007 concerning the Fountain Wind Project. This transcript is relevant to Fountain Wind's pending opt-in application, over which the County does not believe the Commission has jurisdiction. The transcript is being submitted pursuant to the County's review and comment obligations as a local agency reimbursable activity. The County reserves all rights including jurisdictional claims.

Sincerely,

Paul A. Hellman  
Director of Resource Management

□ Suite 101  
AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT  
(530) 225-5674  
Fax (530) 225-5237

□ Suite 102  
BUILDING DIVISION  
(530) 225-5761  
Fax (530) 245-6468

□ Suite 103  
PLANNING DIVISION  
(530) 225-5532  
Fax (530) 245-6468

□ Suite 201  
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DIVISION  
(530) 225-5787  
Fax (530) 225-5413

■ Suite 200  
ADMINISTRATION  
(530) 225-5789  
Fax (530) 225-5807



**GLOBAL ACCESS**  
**LITIGATION SERVICES**

**AUDIO TRANSCRIPTION OF  
SHASTA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
MEETING**

Taken on October 26, 2021

**IN RE: SHASTA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
MEETING**

**Global Access Litigation Services**  
**(949) 220-0449**  
**production@galscr.com**

In Re: )  
Shasta County Board of )  
Supervisors Meeting )  
\_\_\_\_\_)

AUDIO TRANSCRIPTION OF SHASTA COUNTY  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING

MEETING DATE: OCTOBER 26, 2021

Transcribed By: Valerie Nunemacher

CSR No. 10783

Job No. 103456

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 --oOo--

3

4 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Welcome everyone to  
5 the special meeting of the Board of Supervisors  
6 today, October 26th at 1:00 p.m.

7 We're going to go through some procedures  
8 here. First, I want to tell you that it is our  
9 intent to run this as close to how the Planning  
10 Commission ran theirs. I think there's a lot of  
11 reason for that consistency and we're going to try  
12 very diligently to do that.

13 I want to give you a heads up on how we're  
14 looking at things. It's very important that  
15 everybody get an opportunity who wants to speak,  
16 gets an opportunity to speak, and, obviously, we  
17 only have so much time.

18 So if you represent a group, and I'll use  
19 Shasta VOICES as an example, then that individual  
20 can speak up to 15 minutes. If you're just  
21 representing your company, even though your company  
22 has customer interests in this, whether it's a  
23 construction company or an Internet company, we're  
24 going to ask you please to limit it to three  
25 minutes. And I'm going to try to be tight on the

1 time.

2           Again, I want people to be able to speak.  
3 I want you to be conscious of the fact that that's  
4 what we're trying to do, so I don't have to be the  
5 enforcer here. This is a very important issue. But  
6 we do want to get as many people's opinions as we  
7 can so we can make the best and most informed  
8 decision that we can. So I just want people to  
9 understand that's the process that we're going to  
10 follow.

11           So with that, again, welcome everyone. We  
12 are in the Board chambers on the second floor of the  
13 County administration building. And now I've got to  
14 read some stuff to you, so bear with me.

15           Modifications have been made to protect  
16 public health while still encouraging engagement  
17 from the public members of the Board of Supervisors,  
18 County staff, and representatives may participate by  
19 teleconference. The following methods are available  
20 for persons wishing to participate.

21           Attend in person. If you want to attend  
22 in person, obviously you're here. We also have an  
23 overflow room. We had an expectation that we might  
24 have a lot of people. We don't want people out in  
25 the rain, so we created an overflow room, which is

1 at the City of Redding Community Center. That's  
2 right at their City Hall, right next to the council  
3 chambers at 777 Cypress Avenue in Redding.

4 We ask everyone to please fill out a  
5 speaker request form. It will just make it easier  
6 for us to flow through this. If you don't, there  
7 are forms in the back, they'll also be in the back  
8 of the community room. They're also online, and you  
9 can go upstairs and get them. But I would encourage  
10 you right now, since we're all here, to just go to  
11 the back of the room.

12 Persons may call in on the conference  
13 line. That number is (978)990-5000, (978)990-5000.  
14 And they use the access code 704163 hash tag.  
15 704163 hash tag. You will be called upon and  
16 unmuted when it's your turn to speak. If you simply  
17 want to observe the meeting and do not wish to make  
18 a comment, you do not need to call the conference  
19 line, and may observe the meeting via livestream on  
20 our website at BOS meeting-agendas.

21 Reasonable accommodations will be made for  
22 individuals with disabilities with any doubt being  
23 resolved in favor of accessibility. If anyone has  
24 an issue, please bring it to the Clerk of the Board  
25 and we'll address it as quickly as we can.

1           Okay. The Board wishes to ensure that  
2 business is conducted in an orderly fashion and that  
3 all have an equal opportunity to observe and  
4 participate in the proceedings. Each person who  
5 addresses the Board of Supervisors shall not use  
6 loud, threatening, profane, or abusive language,  
7 which disrupts, disturbs or otherwise impedes the  
8 orderly conduct of the board meeting. Any such  
9 language or any other disorderly conduct which  
10 disrupts, disturbs or otherwise impedes the orderly  
11 conduct of the board meeting is prohibited.

12           I've got some more things I've got to read  
13 to you, but right now I'm going to ask Supervisor  
14 Baugh to lead us in the pledge, please.

15           SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Please join us. I  
16 pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States  
17 of America, and to the republic for which it stands,  
18 one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and  
19 justice for all.

20           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, Supervisor.

21           SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Thank you.

22           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Okay. I'm going to  
23 take you through the process, but before I do that  
24 I'm going to ask county counsel just to briefly  
25 explain the appeal proceedings today.



1           MR. CRUSE: Thank you, Chair Chimenti.  
2     And also just briefly for the Board and for the  
3     members of the public, the gentleman to my right is  
4     Mr. Bill Abbott. Mr. Abbott is with the law firm of  
5     Abbott & Kindermann. He is the County's outside  
6     counsel who specializes in land use and planning  
7     issues. And he'll be here to provide any additional  
8     assistance that may be necessary as we move through  
9     the proceedings.

10           Today, the Board of Supervisors will  
11     consider the Applicant's appeal of the Planning  
12     Commission's decision to deny Use Permit 16-007  
13     concerning the Fountain Wind Project. Pursuant to  
14     the Shasta County code, the Board has the discretion  
15     to approve or deny, either wholly or partly, or  
16     modify that Use Permit as the project was originally  
17     proposed, or as revised by the Applicant, or may  
18     refer the matter back to the Planning Commission for  
19     further review in the port.

20           Under the law, the Board of Supervisors  
21     will be conducting what is called a de novo review  
22     and de novo fact finding. This means that all  
23     issues are subject to review before the Board of  
24     Supervisors, and the Board will be exercising its  
25     own independent judgment. As such, the Board may

1 lawfully consider the project as revised by the  
2 Applicant.

3           And as indicated in the staff report,  
4 Staff is of the opinion that the proposed revisions  
5 does not present new significant environmental  
6 impacts, and the proposed revisions are adequately  
7 addressed in the EIR that has been prepared.

8           As stated on today's agenda, after  
9 conducting the public hearing, the Board will  
10 consider taking one of the following actions:

11           By resolution, deny the Use Permit for the  
12 Fountain Wind Project as originally proposed, or as  
13 revised by the Applicant, or as may be otherwise  
14 modified; or by resolution, certify a final  
15 Environmental Impact Report for the Fountain Wind  
16 Project, as originally proposed, or as revised, or  
17 as may be otherwise modified; and by resolution,  
18 approve, either in whole or in part, or otherwise  
19 modify the Use Permit for Fountain Wind Project as  
20 originally proposed, or as revised by the Applicant,  
21 or as may be otherwise modified; or by resolution,  
22 refer the matter back to the Planning Commission for  
23 further review in accordance with the Shasta County  
24 code.

25           The Board may also consider providing

1 additional direction to Staff. And depending on the  
2 direction from the Board upon the conclusion of the  
3 public hearing, Staff will present the appropriate  
4 resolution or resolutions for the Board's adoption  
5 at this meeting. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, sir. So  
7 with that --

8 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: I have a question for  
9 Counsel.

10 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Go ahead.

11 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Thank you,  
12 Mr. Chairman.

13 Mr. Cruse, thank you. A lot of folks have  
14 written us letters or made public comments during  
15 the last year about our legal ability to hear this  
16 as opposed to referring it back to the Planning  
17 Commission and you have made that quite clear that  
18 it's legal for us to hear that.

19 But can you expand on that a little bit on  
20 what area of law covers -- some folks have presented  
21 the thought that enough changes have been made that  
22 it should go back for an additional review. Can you  
23 just clarify that a little bit more? I know I heard  
24 you say it once, but I want to make sure we get past  
25 this point in our meeting without that becoming our

1 main question.

2 MR. CRUSE: Sure. Absolutely.

3 Since this is a Use Permit and doesn't  
4 involve a zoning change -- and sometimes there are  
5 limitations in the State planning law concerning  
6 what has to be considered by the Planning Commission  
7 in connection with zoning amendments. Those laws do  
8 not apply here.

9 In this situation, the Planning Commission  
10 heard the Use Permit, issued a decision. And if  
11 there had been no appeal then that would have been  
12 the end of it. Since there was an appeal, this now  
13 is now being considered basically anew to this  
14 Board; a fresh start, if you will. So now it's a  
15 matter for the Board to consider all aspects of it,  
16 including revisions that are a reduction in the size  
17 and scope, which I understand has been submitted.

18 According to Staff, those revisions do not  
19 create significant new environmental impacts, which  
20 would require further environmental review. Based  
21 upon that understanding and Staff's opinion and  
22 recommendation, this Board can proceed with  
23 reviewing the proposed project as revised by the  
24 Applicant.

25 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: And if I read it

1 correctly, not outside the existing considered  
2 property with the Environmental Impact Report? It  
3 was all -- the changes were wholly contained within  
4 already reviewed area?

5 MR. CRUSE: That is my understanding, and  
6 from what Staff has informed me, yes.

7 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Okay. Thank you so  
8 much.

9 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Any other comments  
10 from the Board? Okay. With that, at 5:00 o'clock  
11 we'll take a 30-minute break -- some more  
12 housekeeping. We have to reboot our computer  
13 system, and, thereafter, we'll take breaks when  
14 appropriate, probably every couple of hours.

15 Due to limitations on the use of  
16 facilities and technologies during this meeting, we  
17 are really aiming to be adjourned no later than  
18 11:30 this evening.

19 As chair, I acknowledge that the Board has  
20 received documents offered as evidence and they're  
21 filed with the clerk -- Stefany over there. And the  
22 way it will work is Staff will make a presentation.  
23 Following Staff's presentation, it will come back to  
24 supervisors to ask questions of Staff, and then we  
25 will open it up to public comment.

1           The Applicant will have 25 minutes to make  
2 its presentation. And then groups and individuals  
3 in support -- we're going to try to divide this up  
4 into support and in opposition, very much like the  
5 Planning Commission did. Groups and individuals in  
6 support of the project will then be allowed to  
7 address the Board in person and from the remote  
8 location. Groups will be allowed up to 15 minutes  
9 to make a presentation; individuals in support will  
10 be permitted three minutes to address the Board.

11           Here's a little caveat. Due to  
12 limitations in County staff caused by illness, we  
13 will then take all comments that are being made by  
14 telephone, regardless of whether it's in support or  
15 in opposition to the project. Each group calling on  
16 the telephone will have 15 minutes to make their  
17 presentation. Any individual speakers calling on  
18 the telephone will each have three minutes to  
19 address the Board. All telephonic comments will be  
20 received during this time. After that time, the  
21 phone lines will be closed and no further telephone  
22 comments will be received. So I want to make sure  
23 everybody understands that. When we get to the  
24 portion we're accepting phone calls, we're accepting  
25 phone calls both in support and in opposition. Once

1 we're done with the phone calls, that will be the  
2 only time you will be allowed to call in. So  
3 hopefully everybody will get that.

4           Groups and individuals in opposition to  
5 the project will then be allowed to address the  
6 Board in person and from the remote site. Groups  
7 will be allowed up to 15 minutes to make a  
8 presentation. Individuals will be permitted three  
9 minutes to address the Board. Should there be any  
10 persons who are neither formally in support of or in  
11 opposition to the project, but wish to speak on the  
12 project, they will be allowed to address the Board  
13 in person or from the remote location and each  
14 person will be permitted three minutes to address  
15 the Board. Once we're done, the Applicant will then  
16 be allowed five minutes to respond.

17           Please note that due to the number of  
18 persons and presentations, I'm going to try to  
19 strictly enforce the above time limits.

20           Again, we all appreciate the gravity of  
21 the situation and how important it is to all of you  
22 but we also want to make sure everybody gets the  
23 appropriate time they need. So really ask you to be  
24 very cognizant of your time and the comments that  
25 you're making. If someone else has made those

1 comments, you might just say, "I support what that  
2 person said" to make sure everybody gets to speak.

3 The public hearing will be closed, and the  
4 supervisors will have the opportunity to ask  
5 questions to discuss the matter and take action.  
6 The Board suggests that members of the groups of  
7 persons aligned with groups making presentations  
8 either limit their comments to items not  
9 addressed -- I'm just reading what I just said --  
10 addressed by the representative of the group or  
11 merely state they agree. Again, so we can move  
12 through as quickly as possible.

13 The goal is not to get done fast, the goal  
14 is to get done efficiently and to get all the  
15 information. And, again, I want to be very clear  
16 with that.

17 So, also, please turn off any electronic  
18 devices that may interrupt us during this. I've  
19 done that a few times and I prefer we not.

20 So, at this time, I'm going to ask the  
21 Board members, any of the Board members if they have  
22 a conflict of interest disclosures that they need to  
23 make? And have they received information relating  
24 to this project prior to the public hearing that  
25 they wish to disclose at this time?



1 Supervisor Jones?

2 SUPERVISOR JONES: No.

3 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Baugh?

4 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Just state for the  
5 record that I've over the last few years had many  
6 conversations both from those who are proposing the  
7 project, as well as, those who are in opposition.  
8 You can't help but run through the grocery store and  
9 not run into about ten people you know that want to  
10 have that conversation. That I know of, I don't  
11 possess any information that has been received that  
12 is outside of the report that we have in front of  
13 us.

14 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Copy that.

15 Supervisor Moty?

16 SUPERVISOR MOTY: Yes. Like, Supervisor  
17 Baugh, I've also had occasion to occasionally have  
18 conversations -- general conversations from  
19 individuals in the public. I have over 600 e-mails  
20 that I've received over the last year and a half, I  
21 believe. And then I will state that I did meet with  
22 Henry Woltag, as well as, one other member of their  
23 management, which I cannot remember his name. On  
24 neither occasion did I discuss the project  
25 specifically or even generally. My discussion with

1    them was about their company, what they do, and  
2    where they're located, those kind of things, but  
3    nothing specific about the project itself.

4           SUPERVISOR RICKERT:   And for full  
5    disclosure, I had what I consider a listening tour.  
6    And whenever I met with anyone, I made it very clear  
7    to them that I was only there to listen.

8           Prior to Covid, which was probably two  
9    years ago, I did attend a citizen's group meeting in  
10   Round Mountain.  I've met with representatives from  
11   Avangrid when they were still involved in the  
12   project.  I attended the Planning Commission  
13   meeting.  I've met with many individual constituents  
14   on a listening basis only.  I also had a virtual  
15   listening meeting with the tribe.  And I've met with  
16   reps from Moose Camp, Mr. Gable.  I've met with John  
17   Vona, he's a proponent of the project.  And I also  
18   met with Henry Woltag and a couple other gentlemen,  
19   Mr. Squiggly, from ConnectGEN.  So it was all on --  
20   completely, I just listened.

21           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI:  Thank you.

22           And like my colleagues, I have received  
23   that you have brought to us, over the almost three  
24   years that I've been here.  So we've received a lot  
25   of information and I thank you all from both, you

1 know, the supporters and the opponents.

2 We just got a binder from -- from the  
3 Applicant. We get e-mails, but I certainly have,  
4 like my colleagues have, is we will listen, but we  
5 offer no other information. That's the purpose of  
6 this meeting today, and this is where we will make  
7 that decision.

8 So, with that, I'm just going to ask  
9 Stefany if she's got documents that have been given  
10 to her, we will get to those at some point in time.

11 THE CLERK: Documents that have been  
12 provided to the Clerk of the Board are on file at  
13 the Clerk of Board's office. And, yes, those have  
14 also been distributed to the Board of Supervisors.

15 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you.

16 I would read R-1 right now, but Mr. Cruse  
17 has been gracious enough to do that and read what  
18 we'll be acting on today. So I'm going to ask if  
19 Staff is ready to make their presentation.

20 MR. HELLMAN: Good afternoon, Chairman  
21 Chimenti and Board members. Paul Hellman, Director  
22 of Resource Management.

23 First, I'd like to introduce the staff and  
24 consultants who are seated in the first row directly  
25 behind me. We've got Janna Scott, Project Manager

1 with ESA, the County's environmental consultant for  
2 this project. Mike Manka, Project Director of the  
3 ESA. Lio Salazar, Senior Planner. Adam Fieseler,  
4 Planning Division Manager. And Jimmy Zanatelli,  
5 Shasta County Fire Marshal. Chief Bret Gouvea  
6 informed me he will be arriving a little bit after  
7 1:00, so he will be here shortly and seated next to  
8 Jimmy, I believe. We also have ESA subject matter  
9 experts on call, and they'll be joining the meeting  
10 remotely to assist with addressing your questions as  
11 necessary.

12 In addition to the staff members that I've  
13 introduced, I'd like to express my sincere  
14 appreciation to the numerous staff members from the  
15 County Administrative Office and County Counsel's  
16 Office for all the hard work and assistance along  
17 the way. It's unusual for a project from my  
18 department to require the level of assistance that  
19 was required in this case, so I'm really thankful  
20 for their assistance and cooperation that they've  
21 provided to myself and my staff. It's been quite a  
22 journey.

23 The Staff presentation will now be made by  
24 the project planner, Lio Salazar, as well as, Janna  
25 Scott, the project manager with ESA.

1           LIO SALAZAR: Good afternoon, Chairman,  
2 Members of the Board and the public in attendance.  
3 I'm Lio Salazar. I'm a senior planner with the  
4 Shasta County Department of Resource Management  
5 Planning Division. Item R-1 is Use Permit 16-007  
6 for Fountain Wind, LLC. And is here before you as  
7 noted on appeal of the Shasta County Planning  
8 Commission's decision to deny the project.

9           Next slide.

10           The Use Permit, otherwise known as the  
11 Fountain Wind Project, is proposed for leased  
12 private timberland property located approximately  
13 1 mile west of the existing Hatchet Ridge Wind  
14 Project, 6 miles west of Burney, and 35 miles  
15 northeast of Redding.

16           Next slide, please.

17           At the conclusion of this brief Staff  
18 presentation for this item that is recommended that  
19 the Board take these actions that Rubin described  
20 earlier.

21           Next slide.

22           So under discussion and as a matter of  
23 background for these recommendations, a duly-noticed  
24 Planning Commission public hearing for the project  
25 was conducted during a special meeting held on

1 June 22nd, 2021. Under consideration was the  
2 Applicant's Use Permit request for approval of a  
3 renewable wind energy generation development, at  
4 that time, consisting of the construction,  
5 operation, maintenance, and ultimately  
6 decommissioning of up to 71 wind turbines, and the  
7 associated transformers, together with associated  
8 infrastructure and ancillary facilities.

9 After considering a Staff presentation,  
10 public testimony in favor of and in opposition of  
11 the project, including testimony regarding  
12 detrimental project impacts to aesthetics, potential  
13 increased fire danger, damage to natural resources,  
14 and damage to the cultural and tribal resources, as  
15 well as, hearing an Applicant rebuttal of the  
16 opposition testimony, and having considered previous  
17 information provided in writing by the public and  
18 staff, including the Environmental Impact Report  
19 prepared for the project, the Planning Commission  
20 resolved that the project would be detrimental to  
21 persons living or working near the project or would  
22 be detrimental or injurious to property or  
23 improvements near the project or the general welfare  
24 of the County. And upon making that resolution,  
25 they denied the Use Permit by a five to zero vote.

1           Next slide, please.

2           The Applicant, on June 22nd of 2021, filed  
3 a timely appeal of the Planning Commission decision.  
4 In its appeal, the Applicant stated that the  
5 Commission erred in not taking actions recommended  
6 by Staff in denying the Use Permit, because,  
7 according to the appeal, the project is  
8 appropriately sited. And that in addition to being  
9 subject to measures and conditions designed to  
10 avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts, the project  
11 would provide substantial public benefits, and,  
12 therefore, would not be detrimental to persons  
13 residing or working nearby, or injurious or  
14 detrimental to property or improvements nearby, or  
15 the general welfare of the County.

16           Next slide, please. Stay on that slide.

17           On September 24th, 2021, the Applicant  
18 provided a memorandum with details of proposed  
19 revisions to the project, including reducing the  
20 maximum number of turbines from 71 to 48; reducing  
21 the maximum turbine height from 679 feet to  
22 610 feet; eliminating any turbines north of  
23 California State Route 299; modifying some of the  
24 locations of the turbines that were left in the  
25 project; and other potential modifications.

1           As you can see from this figure, which  
2 shows the proposal denied by the Planning Commission  
3 on the left and the proposed revisions on the right,  
4 the proposed revisions would reduce the overall  
5 scale of the project and the revised project site  
6 boundary would include no areas that were not  
7 analyzed in the EIR that was prepared in accordance  
8 with the California Environmental Quality Act.

9           Next slide. Previous slide, John. Thank  
10 you.

11           This table illustrates to what extent the  
12 revisions reduce the scale of certain aspects of the  
13 project including the amount of temporary and  
14 permanent ground disturbance length of new roads and  
15 widening of existing roads, and the length of  
16 overhead power lines.

17           Some key figures there is the number of  
18 towers would be reduced by 33 percent. The overhead  
19 electrical collector system or the power lines would  
20 be reduced by 58 percent. The total temporary  
21 construction disturbance of the project would be  
22 reduced by 35. And the anticipated total permit  
23 disturbance would be reduced by 33 percent.

24           As a result of this scaling back, the  
25 project's visual impacts, impacts to sensitive



1 biological species, and impacts associated with  
2 ground disturbance including the potential to result  
3 in inadvertent discoveries of subsurface cultural,  
4 tribal, and paleontological would be further  
5 reduced.

6 Next slide, John.

7 At this point, I would like to transition  
8 the presentation to address the Environmental Impact  
9 Report that was prepared for the project with the  
10 assistance of Environmental Science Associates, or  
11 ESA. Here to make the presentation from ESA is  
12 Project Manager, Janna Scott.

13 JANNA SCOTT: Hello. My name is Janna  
14 Scott. I'm a director with Environmental Science  
15 Associates, CEQA consultant to the County for  
16 purposes of this project.

17 Next slide, please.

18 Three steps in the CEQA process have  
19 preceded today's decision-making hearing. Scoping  
20 and preparation of the draft and final EIR. If the  
21 County approves the project today, other agencies  
22 will consider the EIR in their own permitting  
23 decisions for the project.

24 Next slide.

25 For today, I'd like to summarize CEQA

1 standards for evaluating the adequacy of an EIR, go  
2 over the impact and mitigation conclusions reached  
3 in the EIR, touch on alternatives, and very briefly  
4 address the Applicant's proposed changes to the  
5 project.

6 Next slide.

7 This EIR has been prepared based on input  
8 from the community, regulatory agencies,  
9 professional analyses prepared by relevant experts  
10 and independent review. It considers facts,  
11 reasonable assumptions based on facts, and expert  
12 opinions based on facts.

13 We invite the decision makers to consider  
14 evidence cited in the EIR and included in the  
15 record, whether provided by the County, its  
16 consultants, the Applicant team, tribal members, or  
17 others as part of the environmental review process  
18 in reaching a decision that this EIR meets CEQA's  
19 standards for adequacy.

20 Next slide.

21 Two other points are relevant here. One,  
22 you have discretion to weigh the evidence for  
23 yourselves. And, two, you may certify the EIR even  
24 if there is disagreement about some of its contents.

25 Next slide.

1           Impact conclusions reached in this EIR are  
2 consistent with CEQA, and are characterized as  
3 shown. I'd like to spend a minute on two of these.

4           "Less than significant with mitigation  
5 incorporated" means that a project caused change  
6 exceeds the significance threshold, but could be  
7 reduced below the threshold with the implementation  
8 of one or more mitigation measures.

9           In contrast, "significant and unavoidable"  
10 signifies that the project could cause a significant  
11 adverse effect, and either there are no feasible  
12 mitigation measures available, or even with the  
13 implementation of mitigation, the impact would  
14 remain significant.

15           Next slide.

16           Mitigation measures are actions that do  
17 one or more of the things listed on this slide.  
18 They minimize potential adverse effects, not  
19 necessarily eliminate them.

20           Next slide.

21           The EIR analyzes all of the questions that  
22 are posed in CEQA guidelines Appendix G. The  
23 analysis documented in the EIR supports conclusions  
24 that the project would have a less than significant  
25 impact with mitigation incorporated regarding one or

1 more of the factors considered in each of these nine  
2 resource areas.

3 Next slide.

4 The analysis also supports conclusions  
5 that the project, as proposed, would have  
6 significant unavoidable impacts regarding one or  
7 more of the questions considered in these areas.  
8 And we're going to go through each of these one by  
9 one.

10 Next slide.

11 Regarding aesthetics. This is a photo  
12 simulation of what's called in the EIR, Key  
13 Observation Point 1, which is the designated  
14 Fountain Fire overlook just off State Route 299.  
15 It's representative of views experienced by tourists  
16 traveling through the area on 299, and is intended  
17 to represent views of nearby residents traveling  
18 along Moose Camp Road.

19 If turbines D2 and D3 were sited in view  
20 of this location, then the project would cause a  
21 substantial change in a scenic vista, and in the  
22 visual character and quality of the area. This  
23 would be a significant impact.

24 Next slide.

25 To address this, mitigation measure 3.2-1

1 includes siting and painting requirements to try and  
2 minimize that potential effect. However, given  
3 uncertainty about the feasibility of removing or  
4 sufficiently moving the two turbines identified, the  
5 EIR concluded that the impact would be significant  
6 and unavoidable.

7           The EIR explained, though, that if these  
8 two turbines were to be removed from this viewing  
9 location, then the visual impact of the project from  
10 this location could be reduced to a less than  
11 significant impact.

12           As you heard from Lio, since the Planning  
13 Commission hearing was held, the Applicant made  
14 changes to the project to address identified impacts  
15 and community concerns, including by removing these  
16 two turbines.

17           Next slide. Oh -- yes, next slide,  
18 please.

19           The project would emit nitrogen oxides,  
20 NOx, which are a precursor compound for ozone in an  
21 area where existing conditions already fail to meet  
22 State ambient air quality standards. Accordingly,  
23 the EIR recommends implementation of mitigation  
24 measures 3.3-1A and 1B.

25           Even with the implementation of these

1 measures, the project's contribution to significant  
2 cumulative effects would remain significant and  
3 unavoidable.

4 Next slide.

5 The project could cause a significant  
6 unavoidable impact of birds and bats; both at the  
7 project's specific level and also cumulatively.  
8 Even with the implementation of recommended  
9 mitigation measures, these impacts to Golden Eagles,  
10 other raptors, and bats would remain significant and  
11 unavoidable.

12 Next slide.

13 The project would cause a significant  
14 unavoidable impact to tribal cultural resources.  
15 The EIR identifies five mitigation measures to  
16 reduce these impacts. Nonetheless, they would  
17 remain significant and unavoidable even with the  
18 implementation of these five measures.

19 Next slide.

20 Consistent with CEQA, the EIR relied on  
21 four screening criteria to determine whether to  
22 carry a potential alternative forward for more  
23 detailed review in the EIR. First, whether it would  
24 meet most of the basic project objectives. Second,  
25 whether it would be feasible for purposes of CEQA.

1 Third, whether it would be able to avoid or  
2 substantially lessen any of the potential  
3 significant impacts of the project. And, finally,  
4 that it not be remote or speculative.

5 Eleven potential alternatives initially  
6 were considered; three were carried forward for  
7 detailed review.

8 Next slide.

9 Under the "no project" alternative, the  
10 requested Use Permit would be denied. None of the  
11 turbines or other infrastructure would be  
12 constructed, operated, or maintained. None of the  
13 environmental impacts would occur, and none of the  
14 beneficial effects of the generation of renewable  
15 energy would result.

16 Under Alternative 1, none of the seven  
17 turbines proposed north of State Route 299 or  
18 related infrastructure would be developed. The area  
19 north of 299 would continue to be managed for timber  
20 production.

21 Scoping comments suggested that the County  
22 consider a reduced project alternative.  
23 Specifically, one with fewer turbines and/or a more  
24 concentrated placement of turbines, and a modified  
25 project alternative that would relocate the proposed

1 turbines to the south relative to the project as  
2 proposed. This Alternative 1 was developed to  
3 respond to those suggestions.

4 Under Alternative 2, proposed setbacks  
5 would be increased relative to the project to  
6 preclude turbine construction within three times the  
7 height of the turbine; i.e, within 2,037 feet of a  
8 residential property line, and with one-and-a-half  
9 times the overall height of the turbine, or within  
10 1,018 and a half feet of State Route 299, any other  
11 publicly maintained highway or street, and of Supan  
12 Road or of Terry Mill Road. These setback distances  
13 would be among the most protective of public health  
14 and safety in the State.

15 Scoping comments suggested that the County  
16 consider an alternative that would remove turbines  
17 farther from Moose Camp, and express concerns about  
18 noise, vibration, and safety. This Alternative 2  
19 was designed to be responsive to those suggestions.

20 Next slide.

21 Following the issuance of the draft EIR,  
22 the County received more than 2,000 pages of input.  
23 So I sympathize with the hundreds of pages of  
24 e-mails that you've all received over the last few  
25 years.



1 Multiple CEQA comments on the draft asked  
2 about aesthetics, biological resources and tribal  
3 cultural resources. My colleagues and I are  
4 available to discuss those issues, if you'd like.  
5 Multiple comments also were received regarding the  
6 project's consistency with the County general plan  
7 and zoning ordinance. This topic was further  
8 addressed in the staff report to the Planning  
9 Commission, and we can talk about that more if you'd  
10 like, as well. Wild fire, emergency response, and  
11 potential impacts to Moose Camp also were common  
12 themes.

13 Next side.

14 The Applicant proposed project revisions  
15 after the Planning Commission meeting that would  
16 reduce the maximum number of proposed turbines from  
17 71 to 48, and that would reduce the maximum height  
18 of turbines from 679 feet to 610.

19 The reduction in turbines would be  
20 achieved by eliminating all of the infrastructure  
21 proposed north of State Route 299, like  
22 Alternative 1 would do; the five turbines that had  
23 been proposed closest to Moose Camp; three of the  
24 four turbines that would be eliminated by  
25 Alternative 2; and with the proposed reduction in

1 turbine height, that fourth turbine would be outside  
2 the safety setback area.

3 Fifteen additional turbines would be  
4 eliminated. So how do these changes relate to the  
5 EIR? They would reduce the overall scale of the  
6 project, as well as, related impacts on  
7 environmental resources and areas of the community  
8 that would be particularly affected by the project.

9 The changes would reduce the project's  
10 significant unavoidable impact to visual resources,  
11 would reduce its impact to sensitive biological  
12 resources, including Rocky Mountain Maple Scrub and  
13 California Black Oak, which are California-sensitive  
14 species. And would reduce impacts that are  
15 associated with ground disturbance, such as  
16 unanticipated discovery of buried resources, such as  
17 cultural resources, tribal cultural resources, and  
18 paleontological resources.

19 As was asked earlier, the project site  
20 boundary would include no area that has not been  
21 analyzed as part of the EIR.

22 Next slide.

23 You can see the changes here. CEQA  
24 requires an EIR to be recirculated for additional  
25 agency and public review when significant new

1 information is added to an EIR before certification.  
2 New information is not significant for this purpose  
3 unless it changes the EIR in a way that deprives the  
4 public of a meaningful opportunity to comment on a  
5 substantial adverse environmental effect of the  
6 project.

7 In the case of the proposed project  
8 changes, however, no new significant impact would  
9 result from the changes. In fact, the impacts of  
10 the project as proposed would be reduced.

11 No substantial increase in the severity of  
12 a previously identified significant impact would  
13 occur either. And, in fact, severity of impacts  
14 would be reduced by the proposed changes to the  
15 project. For these reasons, the EIR preparers agree  
16 that the proposed revisions are adequately addressed  
17 in the EIR and that CEQA does not require  
18 recirculation.

19 Next slide.

20 In closing, I would like to leave you with  
21 these thoughts:

22 This EIR is supported by credible,  
23 science-based research, reference materials, and  
24 informed professional judgments of qualified  
25 scientists and EIR preparers. Technical studies and

1 analyses relied upon are cited in each section of  
2 the EIR. Additional project-specific or  
3 site-specific analyses are provided in the  
4 appendices. Materials relied upon have been  
5 published, peer-reviewed, or independently reviewed  
6 on the County's behalf. They follow applicable  
7 protocols and otherwise are believed to be  
8 appropriate for consideration in the EIR.

9 We welcome your comments and questions.

10 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Do we have  
11 any?

12 Supervisor Baugh.

13 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Yes, thank you, Chair  
14 Chimenti.

15 First, thank you to the consultants, to  
16 staff, for literally a couple years' worth of effort  
17 and especially to the Planning Commission. I did  
18 sit through, was it, a 10-hour, 10-and-a-half-hour  
19 Planning Commission meeting, I think. Probably one  
20 of the best meetings I've ever sat through; very  
21 professionally handled.

22 So two questions based upon the report I  
23 just heard. You offered a siting perspective of two  
24 windmills that have been removed. I didn't see any  
25 other siting perspectives. Why don't we have a

1 perspective of what this looks like from nearby  
2 communities or from a little farther distance?

3 JANNA SCOTT: Those visual simulations  
4 from other key observation points are provided in  
5 the draft EIR. We focused on this one in particular  
6 because it was the only viewpoint analyzed in the  
7 EIR where a significant, unavoidable impact was  
8 identified.

9 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Okay. So there are  
10 other viewpoints that are impacted but --

11 JANNA SCOTT: Absolutely.

12 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: -- not in your mind  
13 significant and unavoidable?

14 JANNA SCOTT: Not based on the scientific  
15 research and professional opinions of the experts  
16 that prepared the EIR, that's correct.

17 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Okay. And the original  
18 draft included the previous taller windmills?

19 JANNA SCOTT: Yes, they did.

20 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: But we don't have a new  
21 perspective that shows the reduction in height?

22 JANNA SCOTT: That's correct.

23 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Okay.

24 JANNA SCOTT: That's correct.

25 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Okay. Then the other

1 area I was wondering if it was included, and I just  
2 overlooked at it, is there any consideration given  
3 to the historical significance of the region?

4 JANNA SCOTT: Absolutely. Yes, the  
5 cultural resources section --

6 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Beyond cultural.

7 JANNA SCOTT: Cultural resources includes  
8 historical.

9 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Oh, it does include it,  
10 okay.

11 JANNA SCOTT: It does. And archeological,  
12 and other.

13 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Okay. Thank you.

14 JANNA SCOTT: Sure.

15 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Do we have any other?  
16 Supervisor Rickert.

17 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: Sure. I have just  
18 one question.

19 You said that the wind turbines wouldn't  
20 be quite as close to Moose Camp. Could you be more  
21 definitive and give me an exact maybe thousands of  
22 feet, quarter of a mile? I mean, some kind of idea,  
23 specifically, how far it would be from Moose Camp  
24 and the closest cabins?

25 JANNA SCOTT: I can look up the distance.

1 I don't have that information off the top of my  
2 head. I do know that the five closest were removed  
3 from the site plan. I'll look up the distance for  
4 you.

5 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: Thank you so much.

6 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Go ahead, Supervisor  
7 Baugh.

8 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: And just to follow  
9 through on Supervisor Rickert's request.

10 If you do have, even though it's not in  
11 your mind significant and unavoidable impact, I  
12 would like to see if you have a perspective anywhere  
13 that you can show us today for today's hearing what  
14 it looks like for Moose Camp, as well, too.

15 JANNA SCOTT: Under the California  
16 Environmental Quality Act, views from publicly  
17 accessible locations are analyzed. Moose Camp is a  
18 private, recreational community, and so it doesn't  
19 meet the CEQA standard for a public view.

20 Nonetheless, we heard from a lot of people  
21 during scoping that they were concerned about views  
22 from Moose Camp because, I think, something like 75  
23 families live there year around. We heard those  
24 people. And part of the reason why that Key  
25 Observation Point 1 was selected, was because it's

1 representative views from people who are traveling  
2 on Moose Camp Road.

3 So because it doesn't -- because CEQA  
4 doesn't protect private views, we couldn't do one  
5 from anybody's backyard, for example, or anybody's  
6 front yard, but we tried to address those concerns  
7 through Key Observation Point 1.

8 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Not trying to put you  
9 on the spot, but my question is really simple: Do  
10 we have anything that would show us what it looks  
11 like from Moose Camp, regardless of whether it meets  
12 your standards from CEQA review? That's my  
13 question.

14 LIO SALAZAR: Yes, to answer that  
15 question, we do not have any photo simulations taken  
16 from Moose Camp from those private properties. As  
17 Janna stated, it's common practice to, under CEQA,  
18 provide that from those public vantage points, so we  
19 do not have that for you.

20 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: I get the letter of the  
21 law, but I'm thinking there are homes there and that  
22 certainly is a question that is within our purview  
23 to ask. We don't have any?

24 LIO SALAZAR: Sure. So there were some  
25 revised photo simulations attached to the



1 Applicant's refinance memorandum that was submitted  
2 on September 24th. It's my understanding they'll be  
3 making a presentation for you as well today and they  
4 will be including presentation of some additional --

5 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Thank you. Thank you.  
6 Appreciate it.

7 LIO SALAZAR: Uh-huh. And just to answer  
8 Mary's questions, Supervisor Rickert's question. So  
9 with the removal of turbines M03 to M05, B01, it  
10 would create additional distance from the nearest  
11 turbines to residential property lines. I believe,  
12 with that, there wouldn't be a turbine within at  
13 least 2,037 feet of a residence. So residential  
14 property line. That's my understanding.

15 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Do we have any other  
16 questions from the Board to Staff? Seeing none, I  
17 will now open the public hearing, and I will ask the  
18 Applicant to make a presentation to the Board, and I  
19 will ask the Applicant to please stay within the 25  
20 minutes allocated.

21 HENRY WOLTAG: Good afternoon, Chairman  
22 Chimenti, Vice Chair Baugh, Supervisors Jones,  
23 Rickert and Moty. My name is Henry Woltag, and I'm  
24 the Director of Development for ConnectGEN. And  
25 I've been personally involved in the Fountain Wind

1 Project for about two-and-a-half years now, and I  
2 appreciate the opportunity to come and speak to you  
3 today.

4 I'd like to lead off this presentation by  
5 saying that this is an important moment in the  
6 history of Shasta County. And we fully recognize  
7 the weight of the decision that you will be making  
8 here today. We believe that the Planning Commission  
9 erred in its June 22nd decision, not truly analyzing  
10 the benefits of this project, nor recognizing the  
11 significant mitigation commitments developed through  
12 the comprehensive environmental review.

13 We stand before you today, not just asking  
14 for your approval to build a project, but asking for  
15 the opportunity as a business to become a member of  
16 your community and to contribute to the long-term  
17 health, safety, welfare, and well-being of Shasta  
18 County as a whole.

19 Next slide, please. Didn't realize it  
20 wasn't up there. Next slide, please.

21 Following the Planning Commission hearing,  
22 we have been diligently working to further address  
23 concerns, which has led to notable changes in the  
24 project. Now, I'd like to take the next few minutes  
25 to show you just exactly what the refined Fountain

1 Wind Project is, and what it will bring to Shasta  
2 County and its citizens.

3 Go ahead and play, please. There should  
4 be audio.

5 THE CLERK: Just one moment, please.

6 John, if you could stop the video really quick. We  
7 do not have audio. And until we get that figured  
8 out, could you please also pause the timer?

9 Okay. Let's go ahead and try it one more  
10 time, John. If you can go ahead and start it from  
11 the beginning.

12 HENRY WOLTAG: There we go.

13 (Video presentation.)

14 The Fountain Wind Project is a responsibly  
15 sited 216 megawatt renewable energy project located  
16 within an active private timber operation and  
17 adjacent to the existing Hatchet Ridge Wind Project  
18 in eastern Shasta County.

19 After listening to the community,  
20 ConnectGEN has reduced and refined the project in  
21 the following ways: Visually, ConnectGEN has  
22 removed the most visible turbines and reduced the  
23 maximum turbine height by 10 percent. All seven  
24 wind turbines have been removed from the project  
25 area north of Highway 299.

1           An additional 17 turbines have been  
2 removed south of 299. Further reducing visible  
3 turbines from Moose Camp, Round Mountain, Montgomery  
4 Creek, and the Fountain Fire Overlook. ConnectGEN  
5 also has reduced the project footprint by  
6 33 percent, from 713 acres to 475 acres.

7           Few issues are more important in Shasta  
8 County than wildfire. The revisions further enhance  
9 the fire safety features the project brings to the  
10 region. The project will bring over 1,600 acres of  
11 new shaded fuel breaks to the area, with 740 acres  
12 within the project and 873 acres along Big Bend Road  
13 and Highway 299.

14           With up to 38 miles of improved access  
15 roads, Fountain Wind will result in better access  
16 for emergency response crews. The addition of  
17 multiple 5,000-gallon fire suppression storage tanks  
18 strategically located around the project site will  
19 provide greater firefighting capability for the  
20 area.

21           The project also will provide \$250,000 in  
22 funding for the Big Bend and Highway 299 fuel break  
23 project, as well as, \$100,000 to update the Shasta  
24 County Community Wildfire Protection Plan.

25           In short, Fountain Wind brings major

1 improvements in fire protection to the County. As a  
2 new local business with employees living and working  
3 in Shasta County, Fountain Wind wants to be a good  
4 community partner. Our \$2.8 million community  
5 benefits program includes a \$1 million donation to  
6 the Shasta County Sheriff's Department. A  
7 \$1 million endowment for Round Mountain and  
8 Montgomery Creek community investments and donations  
9 to expand rural Internet access and Pit River Tribe  
10 workforce development.

11 Fountain Wind will bring much-needed  
12 economic investment to Shasta County. This  
13 \$350 million project will provide over \$3.5 million  
14 in new sales tax revenues, and over \$50 million of  
15 new property tax revenue over the next 30 years.

16 These new tax revenues can help close  
17 budget gaps, maintain and expand police and fire  
18 protection, and fund improvements to roads and local  
19 schools.

20 The refined Fountain Wind Project: Less  
21 visible, smaller footprint, greater fire protection,  
22 and significant long-term economic benefits for  
23 Shasta County and all its residents.

24 (End video presentation.)

25 HENRY WOLTAG: Thank you. We can go to

1 the next slide.

2 So the multiple project refinements that  
3 have been made were in response to the direct public  
4 feedback that was received during the Planning  
5 Commission hearing. We knew that in order to make  
6 this project a better fit for the community, we had  
7 to address key turbine locations and reduce the  
8 overall project footprint.

9 To summarize the refinements, we've  
10 eliminated a total of 24 turbines, including seven  
11 of the higher elevation turbines north of Highway  
12 299, close to Hatchet Ridge and Bunch Grass  
13 Mountain. Five of the turbines to the west of Moose  
14 Camp and other inholding landowners. Twelve  
15 turbines total were removed from the south side of  
16 Highway 299. This includes some of the turbines  
17 closest to the highway itself, as well as, those on  
18 the west and south side of the project area, which  
19 were the most visible from Round Mountain and  
20 Montgomery Creek.

21 To be clear, all of these reductions are  
22 fully within the project site and scope that was  
23 studied in the EIR, and we are not seeking approval  
24 of the full 72-turbine project. No new land, no new  
25 impact area, and no new infrastructure has been

1 added as part of the refinement effort.

2           These changes are summarized in greater  
3 detail along with additional visual simulations  
4 within the project refinements memo that is in your  
5 binder and was sent to staff this past September.  
6 Overall, the net result is a more compact project  
7 that is a better fit for the community.

8           Next slide, please.

9           The refined project translates to  
10 significantly reduced impacts across the Board. The  
11 most significant reduction, of course, is with  
12 regards to the visual impacts, which you saw on the  
13 video. The reduction eliminates the turbines that  
14 are visible from the Fountain Fire Overlook, Key  
15 Observation Point 1, while also greatly reducing the  
16 number of turbines that would be visible from Key  
17 Observation Points 2 and 3, Round Mountain and  
18 Montgomery Creek.

19           With a smaller project footprint, there  
20 would be less fragmentation of the landscape, and  
21 less physical disturbance to the natural and  
22 cultural environments. We have also significantly  
23 reduced the overhead collection lines, and removed  
24 turbines that represented a higher risk to avian  
25 species.

1           Next slide, please.

2           This is the CEQA process working. This  
3 project was originally sited and designed based on  
4 years of comprehensive studies and was further  
5 refined based on direct public input. All of these  
6 refinements remain in the footprint of the original  
7 project that was assessed in the EIR, and as noted  
8 by planning staff just before me, the impacts are  
9 reduced in comparison to the original project.

10           These updates do not require  
11 recirculation, rather, you as a decision-making body  
12 have the authority to approve a refined and reduced  
13 project here today. But why should you approve the  
14 project? Well, to us and many others in the  
15 community, the reasons are clear.

16           Next slide, please.

17           Over the last two-and-a-half years, the  
18 ConnectGEN team has performed extensive community  
19 outreach. This stakeholder engagement is a critical  
20 part of our development process and we have  
21 endeavored to meet and listen to as many individuals  
22 as would share their thoughts with us. I personally  
23 have had countless one-on-one meetings, and many  
24 more smaller group meetings, over the course of the  
25 last two-and-a-half years.



1           Our outreach has also included Project  
2 Open Houses at the Round Mountain Community Center,  
3 as well as, live online webinars. We've also  
4 conducted site visits with a range of stakeholders.

5           On top of all of these meetings, we've  
6 also sent information to thousands of Shasta County  
7 residents, all in an effort to improve the public's  
8 education on the project and to make sure any and  
9 all questions were answered. We have been open and  
10 transparent in our communication efforts from the  
11 start, and we remain committed to the same level of  
12 coordination throughout the life of the project.

13           Next slide, please.

14           This public outreach has resulted in  
15 significant County-wide support for the project, as  
16 is evidenced in the hundreds of letters and e-mails  
17 that you've all received over the last year.

18 Support for this project is remarkable, and it's  
19 because of all the benefits that the project will  
20 bring to Shasta County, and because of our  
21 commitment to address stakeholder concerns and  
22 answer all questions.

23           This list here is just a few of the dozens  
24 of businesses and organizations that have written  
25 their support for the project over the course of the

1 last year. And a sampling of these support letters  
2 can be found in the comment letters section of the  
3 binders that were provided. And, like I mentioned,  
4 in total over 500 letters and e-mails of support  
5 have been submitted throughout the process.

6 Next slide, please.

7 This project represents a \$350 million  
8 investment, which will be the largest investment in  
9 Shasta County since the construction of the Shasta  
10 Dam. With this level of investment comes  
11 significant economic development and job creation.  
12 Perhaps the most significant benefit is the over  
13 \$50 million in property tax revenues that will be  
14 paid over the life of the project.

15 If you were to apply the County's current  
16 property tax allocation, then this revenue would  
17 equate to over \$23 million for Shasta County  
18 schools. Over \$6 million for the County's general  
19 fund. And over \$3 million for the cities of  
20 Redding, Anderson, and Shasta Lake.

21 Property tax isn't the only revenue the  
22 County would receive during the project. During  
23 construction, it is estimated that the project will  
24 pay over three-and-a-half million dollars in sales  
25 tax revenues. And since the project is located in

1 an unincorporated part of the county, those revenues  
2 would also go to the County's general fund.

3           These tax revenues represent a significant  
4 new source of predictable revenue during a time when  
5 raising new revenue organically is becoming more and  
6 more difficult, and there are many pressing needs in  
7 the County. Over the two-year construction process,  
8 there would be 200 full-time equivalent construction  
9 jobs, and these will be Shasta County workers  
10 working on a Shasta County project.

11           Finally, during the 30-plus years of  
12 project operations, there will be up to 12 full-time  
13 employees working at the site. These will be  
14 well-paying jobs with the average annual  
15 compensation of each employee over \$125,000 per  
16 year. These individuals will not only work at the  
17 site, but they will be Shasta County residents,  
18 neighbors, and active community members.

19           Next slide, please.

20           Now, I mentioned construction jobs on the  
21 previous slide, but the economic development doesn't  
22 necessarily stop there. Many local businesses stand  
23 to gain from the project's two-year construction  
24 cycle. Just a sample of those businesses are listed  
25 here, but they will include logging operators,

1 material suppliers, heavy equipment rentals, gas  
2 stations, and restaurants, just to name a few.

3 Next slide, please.

4 With respect to wildfire risk, the bottom  
5 line is this project will enhance fire protection in  
6 and around the project -- the record shows that this  
7 project has addressed wildfire risk and will do so  
8 while contributing to the fire safety in Shasta  
9 County.

10 CAL FIRE has brought their expertise and  
11 they've recommended the appropriate mitigation  
12 measures and conditions of approval. And ConnectGEN  
13 has incorporated them into our plans for the  
14 project. These measures will not only result in a  
15 safe project, but a project that will enhance fire  
16 protection and firefighting capabilities in the area  
17 within and surrounding the project.

18 The project will provide up to 1600 acres  
19 of new shaded fuel breaks. This includes over  
20 700 acres within the project itself, around the  
21 turbines and around the access roads. Plus an  
22 additional up to 900 acres along portions of Big  
23 Bend Road and Highway 299 via fuel project that  
24 would be funded by ConnectGEN and implemented by the  
25 Fall River Resource Conversation District.

1           In addition to the shaded fuel breaks,  
2 state-of-the-art fire detection and suppression  
3 systems will be installed in each of the turbines.  
4 There will also be a network of 38 miles of approved  
5 all-weather access roads, which will enhance access  
6 for ground-based firefighting resources, and it will  
7 also improve egress routes for inholding landowners.

8           Additional fire suppression water sources  
9 consisting of 5,000-gallon water tanks will also be  
10 installed and maintained throughout the property.

11           Lastly, you know, regardless of what you  
12 might hear to the contrary, we believe Shasta County  
13 Fire when they state in the staff report that the  
14 presence of turbines would not result in the  
15 creation of a no-fly zone. We also agree with the  
16 fire mitigation experts when they say that the  
17 project will be a benefit to protection and  
18 firefighting capabilities in and around the project.

19           Next slide, please.

20           On top of the jobs, tax revenues and fire  
21 safety benefits, the project will have a robust  
22 \$2.8 million community benefit program. From the  
23 beginning, we have been transparent in saying that  
24 we want to bring as much benefit to Shasta County  
25 and the communities surrounding this project as

1 possible. And this plan solidifies that commitment.

2           If you're familiar with the Hatchet Ridge  
3 project, you may know that they made a similar  
4 financial commitment to Shasta County. However,  
5 outside of the Burney library, you might not know  
6 exactly where that funding went. Well, this is  
7 something that we heard from the community  
8 surrounding the project and we decided to take their  
9 feedback and, in turn, find local partners for local  
10 projects that directly improve this local community.

11           Our proposed community benefits program  
12 includes what you see here on the screen; a  
13 \$1 million commitment to the Shasta County Sheriff's  
14 Office to support pressing public safety priorities.  
15 Another \$1 million will go towards an endowment for  
16 the communities of Round Mountain and Montgomery  
17 Creek. This endowment will be administered by a  
18 local advisory committee, which would be made up of  
19 stakeholders including local nonprofits, the  
20 Mountain Union Elementary School District, Shasta  
21 College, the Pit River Tribe, and a few at-large  
22 community members.

23           The program also includes a \$100,000  
24 commitment to the Shasta County Fire Safe Council  
25 and the Western Shasta Resource Conservation

1 District to update the countywide Community Wildfire  
2 Protection Plan.

3           When we learned that neither Round  
4 Mountain nor Montgomery Creek had a CWPP in place,  
5 it became clear that this was a huge gap in the  
6 community's overall wildfire protection. This led  
7 us to reach out to the Shasta County Fire Safe  
8 Council and the Western Shasta RCD to discuss what  
9 could be done to address this. Well, the answer  
10 turned out to be an update to the countywide CWPP,  
11 which will be done with the help of our funding to  
12 specifically include the communities of Round  
13 Mountain, Montgomery Creek, and Big Bend, which are  
14 not part of the current plan. By having a CWPP  
15 these communities would then have access to State  
16 and Federal grant funding for wildfire mitigation  
17 projects that they don't have today.

18           There's also, of course, the funding for  
19 the Fall River RCD to implement approximately  
20 23 miles of shaded fuel breaks along portions of  
21 Highway 299 and Big Bend Road as was referenced  
22 previously. And there's a commitment to ShastaBeam  
23 for them to expand their existing Internet service  
24 from Bella Vista to the communities of Round  
25 Mountain, Montgomery Creek, and Big Bend.

1           The last benefit listed here is community  
2   access to the land itself. The fact that the  
3   property is posted and the public no longer has  
4   access to it is something that we heard early and  
5   often in our meetings with the local community as  
6   well as with members of the Pit River Tribe. We  
7   took this feedback to the landowner, and they've  
8   agreed to restore access to members of the local  
9   community for both hunting and other culturally  
10  significant activities if the project is  
11  constructed.

12           Next slide, please.

13           It's safe to say that you're going to hear  
14  from individuals today who oppose this project. And  
15  much of what you'll hear is simply not true. Listed  
16  in this presentation are the top four myths that  
17  have been circulated about the project along with  
18  their associated facts.

19           We've also provided you with the top 25  
20  myths, which you'll find in the binder that was  
21  handed in prior to the meeting. This document  
22  should be helpful to you in the event you hear one  
23  of these myths over the course of public comment.

24           Next slide.

25           One area that we'd like to set the record



1 straight is with respect to our coordination with  
2 the Pit River Tribe. ConnectGEN has indeed  
3 coordinated with the Pit River Tribe as was  
4 referenced to the letter that was sent to the Board  
5 this past Friday. We take our coordination efforts  
6 very seriously and we are sensitive to the  
7 resources, concerns, and historic injustices of the  
8 Native American community.

9 We have consistently sought feedback on  
10 how this project can proceed while avoiding,  
11 minimizing, and mitigating impacts to cultural  
12 resources. In furthering these efforts, we've also  
13 worked to develop a set of unique opportunities  
14 that, if accepted, could directly benefit the tribe.

15 Although, our more recent requests for  
16 leader-to-leader engagement has not been granted, we  
17 will remain open to all forms of collaboration  
18 should the Pit River Tribe choose to engage.

19 Next slide, please.

20 Over the past two-and-a-half years, I've  
21 spent quite a bit of time in Shasta County, and I've  
22 met with a wide range of residents. In all the  
23 meetings I've had, I think my biggest takeaway is  
24 that there is such a strong sense of community  
25 amongst the residents of this county. It's very

1 clear that these residents care deeply about Shasta  
2 County. They want to see their children, their  
3 communities, and their county, as a whole, prosper.  
4 These same people support this project because they  
5 see what tremendous benefit it brings to the county,  
6 as a whole.

7 I mentioned this at the beginning of the  
8 presentation but it bears repeating: We're not just  
9 asking for your approval of this project; we're  
10 asking for the opportunity to become a member of the  
11 community, and to help this county prosper for the  
12 decades to come.

13 I stand before you today with members of  
14 the community to respectfully ask that you approve  
15 this project based on the significant economic and  
16 community benefits, the enhancements to fire safety,  
17 the strong community support, and the comprehensive  
18 CEQA analysis that County Staff has performed.

19 Thank you for your willingness to serve  
20 and for your consideration of this project. My full  
21 team is here today with me, and we would be happy to  
22 answer any and all questions that you might have.

23 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Do you  
24 have any questions from the Board?

25 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Yes, sir.

1                   CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Go ahead, Supervisor  
2     Baugh.

3                   SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Thank you, Chairman  
4     Chimenti and Mr. Woltag. Don't go away.

5                   So, first, I'll be quick to acknowledge  
6     the potential for investment within Shasta County is  
7     huge. Obviously, the size and the scope of the  
8     project are, as you shared with us, just short of  
9     the investment of the largest financial investment  
10    ever in the county, the building of Shasta Dam.  
11    Also, you've stated your intention to support a lot  
12    of community benefit areas, as well as, the  
13    communities themselves, and the fuel breaks and the  
14    whole bit. My questions -- so I want to recognize  
15    that, but my question has more to do with your  
16    presentation.

17                  Just so everybody understands, could you  
18    define the word "coordinate" used in reference to  
19    the tribes?

20                  HENRY WOLTAG: Yeah, absolutely.

21                  SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Thanks.

22                  HENRY WOLTAG: At the beginning of this  
23    process, we recognized that AB 52 had been opened  
24    and closed by the County, but us as responsible  
25    project developers, we wanted to share the

1 information we had with the tribe, and engage in  
2 meaningful conversations surrounding the project.

3 And so we reached out to the tribe in late  
4 2019. We had a meeting and presentation and  
5 listening session with tribal council in January of  
6 2020. We had another virtual conversation with the  
7 tribe, I believe, it was in April of 2020, and we  
8 also performed a site visit throughout the entire  
9 project area in October of 2020.

10 And so our intentions were to, you know,  
11 listen to the tribe, you know, make sure that their  
12 voices were captured, and if there was constructive  
13 feedback we wanted to incorporate that into the  
14 project.

15 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: So just to be clear on  
16 it, the coordination doesn't -- or didn't result in  
17 actually endorsing the project from the tribal  
18 perspective?

19 HENRY WOLTAG: That's correct. You know,  
20 in December of 2020, the tribe's employment rights  
21 officer reached out to us to discuss, you know, what  
22 the project means from a construction perspective,  
23 an apprenticeship perspective, and explained what  
24 the tribe tries to accomplish through their TERO  
25 program.

1           And we -- we issued a letter to the tribe  
2     committing \$250,000 in funding to their workforce  
3     development, \$100,000 up front and \$10,000 a year  
4     for 15 years. And that was just it. It was an  
5     offer. It was never accepted. We never claimed the  
6     tribe accepted this, but it is a standing offer.

7           SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Okay. And this is a  
8     small question, but just curiosity. You mentioned  
9     the location of several, I'm not sure what the total  
10    number of 5,000-gallon tanks throughout the  
11    construction site.

12           What's the purpose of them?

13           HENRY WOLTAG: So those were part of our  
14    conditions of approval with CAL FIRE. And the  
15    locations on the map were indicative, the final  
16    locations will be presented to and reviewed with CAL  
17    FIRE. But the purpose is to provide, you know,  
18    perhaps quicker response if there is an event in and  
19    around the area, either during construction or if  
20    there's a lightening strike further down the road.  
21    The goal, I believe, would be to have the assets  
22    there in the event that they are needed.

23           SUPERVISOR BAUGH: The reason I'm asking  
24    is while it sounds good, 5,000 gallons is  
25    insignificant in fighting a fire. At the current

1 rates of draw, you would need a 250,000-gallon tank  
2 to sustain an actual suppression over an hour's  
3 period. So I'm just trying to figure out why -- why  
4 they even exist.

5 HENRY WOLTAG: I believe it's for initial  
6 quick response.

7 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Okay. Just right there  
8 within the initial site you can put out?

9 HENRY WOLTAG: Right.

10 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Something that sparked  
11 a blaze during the construction.

12 Okay. The last question and it's back to  
13 the question I asked our environmental friends.

14 Your proposal used the word "less  
15 significant" in terms of the view perspective, but  
16 it didn't use "less visible" that was actually on  
17 your presentation. But that's not trying to say  
18 it's invisible --

19 HENRY WOLTAG: Right.

20 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: -- is that correct?  
21 So, again, the same question to you is my house, I  
22 live in Anderson, I live on a hill view with a  
23 vantage point of looking toward Burney, California.  
24 And depending on the time of year when the sun hits  
25 the blades, if they're forced at this angle, we can

1 see the existing Hatchet Ridge.

2 So am I making the same assumption that  
3 this project will be visible to the entire valley?

4 HENRY WOLTAG: Yes, so there's key  
5 observation points within the project refinements  
6 memo that does include closer to Redding. And,  
7 like, you're absolutely right. With Hatchet, if you  
8 know where to look and on the right day, you know,  
9 you can see -- see the turbines.

10 This project, the number of turbines that  
11 would be visible are in the visual simulations, but  
12 we're a little bit lower elevation than Hatchet  
13 Ridge. We removed the higher elevation turbines  
14 from north of the highway. We're also tucked back  
15 into the property on the undulating ridge lines.

16 So I personally don't believe the project  
17 would be as visible as Hatchet from all portions of  
18 the county, but I, you know, urge you to take a look  
19 at those visual simulations.

20 It's actually the closer you get, the less  
21 visible it is, you know, and that's based on the  
22 visual simulations. I believe Key Observation  
23 Points 2 and 3, now updated to include the smaller  
24 footprint project and the smaller turbine size,  
25 there would only be portions of nine turbines total

1 visible from Round Mountain and Montgomery Creek key  
2 observation points.

3 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: So as Supervisor  
4 Rickert asked, and as correctly pointed out, the new  
5 distance from Moose Camp is equivalent to roughly  
6 half a mile distance. So just over that -- that  
7 stated defining line, but yet still -- still  
8 visible.

9 HENRY WOLTAG: Well, still close and, you  
10 know, the visibility in the area -- this -- this is  
11 in active timber operations and I know there's quite  
12 a bit of timber in and around Moose Camp. So as far  
13 as the view goes, you know, I think the distance  
14 between the Fountain Fire Overlook and Moose Camp,  
15 they're very close together, and so that's  
16 indicative. So you see the removal of those two  
17 turbines closest to Moose Camp eliminated that view,  
18 and I believe that would be the similar result  
19 within Moose Camp itself.

20 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Okay. Then last  
21 question for me and then I'll give up the floor  
22 here.

23 A lot of conversation about the shadow  
24 created from the rotation of the blade, and I know  
25 that you have a 10 percent reduction in height and a



1 little bit of distance. Do any homes in the project  
2 remain within the rotation or blade shadow?

3 HENRY WOLTAG: Yeah. So there is -- the  
4 shadow flicker report is part of the study --

5 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: It was about this big  
6 in the plans, so what does that really say?

7 HENRY WOLTAG: There are three residents,  
8 one of which -- or say residents, but three  
9 buildings. One of which is in a building that our  
10 landowner owns and manages. The one that our  
11 landowner has would actually see more shadow  
12 flicker. The other two are right on the edge of  
13 barely getting any. And there are maps in your  
14 staff report.

15 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Supervisor Jones?

17 SUPERVISOR JONES: Thank you, Chair.

18 Henry, it's good seeing you again --

19 HENRY WOLTAG: Thank you.

20 SUPERVISOR JONES: -- for the tour of the  
21 property.

22 What did you think after the Planning  
23 Commission, clearly when you had a 5-0 to deny.  
24 What was your thought -- your thinking at that time?

25 HENRY WOLTAG: Yeah. My thinking was we,

1 you know, need to make some significant changes to  
2 address the concerns that were brought up by the  
3 members of the community.

4 You know, that was a great opportunity for  
5 us to hear from the public and listen to their  
6 feedback, and we digested that. And it took, you  
7 know, a bit of time, but we knew that there needed  
8 to be a significant refinement to the project in  
9 order to make it a better fit. And so we went  
10 through, you know, almost turbine by turbine looking  
11 at, you know, the comments that were received. You  
12 know, big table of, you know, which turbines, you  
13 know, had different impacts.

14 SUPERVISOR JONES: Your appeal  
15 specifically said, "The Planning Commission's denial  
16 of the Use Permit ignored the record and Staff's  
17 analysts and failed to recognize the mitigation  
18 measures and condition of approval that would  
19 address the public's concerns. It was based on  
20 faulty premise concerning siting, inaccurate  
21 understanding of the project's risks, and a failure  
22 to appreciate the significant benefits for the  
23 environment and the economy."

24 Now, how would any of this change --  
25 obviously, by making those changes, that doesn't

1 directly relate to what your -- your --

2 HENRY WOLTAG: Well --

3 SUPERVISOR JONES: -- request was. So I'm  
4 wondering, why make any changes if they failed all  
5 five, why make any changes?

6 HENRY WOLTAG: Because we wanted to make  
7 reductions and impacts across the board. You know,  
8 that was the feedback we received from the  
9 community. We respectfully disagreed the Planning  
10 Commission's assessment --

11 SUPERVISOR JONES: That was feedback you  
12 heard from the community, that wasn't from the  
13 planning commissioners, necessarily. You've stated  
14 exactly that they ignored the record.

15 HENRY WOLTAG: Uh-huh.

16 SUPERVISOR JONES: So I just need you to  
17 help me understand, by changing the project's scope  
18 and its size, which you've done, how does that  
19 relate to the Commission's, you know, ignoring the  
20 record?

21 HENRY WOLTAG: Well, because we believe  
22 the County Staff did a great job of assessing the  
23 project, assessing the risks, applying appropriate  
24 mitigation. There was over a hundred mitigation  
25 measures, conditions of approval, and we felt like

1 there wasn't adequate discussion about, you know,  
2 what all of Staff's analysis, work, and  
3 recommendations meant to, you know, the reduction in  
4 impacts.

5 So, you know, we felt like there wasn't  
6 adequate discussion and it wasn't weighed, you know,  
7 as appropriately as it should have been.

8 SUPERVISOR JONES: So you're saying all  
9 five of the planning commissioners were not  
10 adequately instructed on your project? They did not  
11 understand your project?

12 HENRY WOLTAG: Well, so that's our  
13 personal belief, of course. We want to get this  
14 project approved.

15 SUPERVISOR JONES: I mean, I just find  
16 that hard to believe, right? I mean, you're going  
17 to have to convince me that all five of these -- and  
18 there are some pretty solid planning  
19 commissioners -- ignored and cannot understand your  
20 project.

21 HENRY WOLTAG: I don't think that it's  
22 that they cannot understand. I think we believe  
23 that they didn't weigh the project in its totality.

24 SUPERVISOR JONES: All right. And I  
25 probably have some more questions later, but that

1 will be enough for now. Thank you.

2 HENRY WOLTAG: Yep. Thank you.

3 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: Chair Chimenti, I  
4 have a quick question.

5 Hi, Henry, how are you today?

6 HENRY WOLTAG: Good. Thank you.

7 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: I just have one quick  
8 question. You mentioned about \$250,000 for fuel  
9 break work.

10 HENRY WOLTAG: Uh-huh.

11 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: Could you describe  
12 the size and scale of that? Because that doesn't  
13 seem like very much money to me for what those kinds  
14 of projects usually cost.

15 HENRY WOLTAG: No, yeah, understood. And  
16 so how that kind of project evolved, if you will,  
17 was an original conversation with Sharmie, with the  
18 Fall River RCD. We wanted, you know, to understand  
19 how they identify projects, how they implement  
20 projects. And so the initial conversation was,  
21 well, it's been discussed of a fuel reduction  
22 project along Big Bend and Highway 299, that's about  
23 23 miles.

24 In conversations with Sharmie, you know,  
25 she put together -- well, at the very beginning we

1 were discussing just kind of Highway 299 because of  
2 the amount of the private land that was in the area  
3 and the land that, you know, was part of Shasta  
4 Cascade Timberlands. And she felt like that this  
5 project could be expanded in size and scope with  
6 matching funding from CAL FIRE to include Big Bend  
7 Road and also a CWPP, I believe, for the -- or a  
8 fire safe council for the Big Bend community.

9 So her intent was to bring forward  
10 250,000. We wrote a commitment letter. I believe  
11 she did submit a grant to CAL FIRE for matching  
12 funding. We since had conversations and committed  
13 to, you know, if that project isn't approved then I  
14 think we would step forward and fund the whole  
15 thing. But that's how the project unfolded. You  
16 know, focusing on Highway 299 and then realizing  
17 that, Hey, if we're going to do that, why not expand  
18 this to go on Big Bend as well.

19 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: Did you discuss any  
20 kind of numbers of acres, or, I mean, what I'm  
21 trying to do is trying to get a feel for how much  
22 land you'd actually would be able to treat.

23 HENRY WOLTAG: Uh-huh. It was a  
24 back-of-the-envelope conversation is my  
25 understanding. It's the linear distance that we

1 measured, 150 feet on either side. And I -- and  
2 that was how we calculated the actual acres. I  
3 think in total, the vision is around 900, and that's  
4 more heavily weighted on Big Bend Road because  
5 that's about, you know, 12, 13 miles, and Highway  
6 299 was a shorter 8- or 9-mile span.

7 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: Okay. Thank you.

8 HENRY WOLTAG: You're welcome.

9 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Supervisor Baugh.

10 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Just to follow up on  
11 Supervisor Rickert's question. And thank you, Mary,  
12 that's a good question.

13 I hadn't really picked up on it that the  
14 amount that you suggested and the number of miles  
15 are roughly similar to the 19 miles in Shingletown.

16 Can we get a dollar amount? I'm sure that  
17 one of you two guys know the dollar amount that that  
18 cost us? I'm thinking significantly more than  
19 250,000. I want to say \$20 million. So I just -- I  
20 wouldn't have asked the question if you hadn't, but  
21 in a matter of perspective, \$250,000 even with a  
22 matching grant, that's about a mile.

23 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: Yeah.

24 HENRY WOLTAG: Yeah, our underlying  
25 motivation was to bring significant fire and safety,

1 you know, benefits to the area around the project.

2 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: And just for some  
3 perspective, we just had a grant approved and the  
4 work is in process in the community of Whitmore and  
5 they got, it was about, \$4 million and we're waiting  
6 for final approval on the Shingletown project for  
7 \$9 million. So that's generally what we see when it  
8 comes to fuel reduction project kind of funding, so  
9 that's why \$250,000 didn't seem like it was a very  
10 large sum to cover much ground. So thank you.

11 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Thank you for asking  
12 the question. Thank you.

13 HENRY WOLTAG: Yeah.

14 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Do we have any other  
15 questions? All right.

16 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Probably a lot.

17 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Do we have any other  
18 questions right now? All right, Henry, thank you.

19 HENRY WOLTAG: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Now we'll hear from  
21 those in support of the project.

22 And we're going to start with Ray Thomas  
23 from the Five County Central Labor Council, followed  
24 by John Vona of FWS Forestry. And you have 15  
25 minutes, please.



1           RAY THOMAS: Good afternoon, Supervisors.

2           My name is Ray Thomas. I'm the president  
3 of the Five County Central Labor Council; 53-year  
4 resident of Shasta County; and, currently, a citizen  
5 in District 3.

6           Our labor council fully supports this  
7 project. After the CEQA process was finished, we  
8 met with ConnectGEN representatives. They've  
9 answered our questions fully. We think that they're  
10 doing the same here.

11           We would ask you to consider everything  
12 that is presented today, and support this project  
13 both from the benefit of the initial start-up, the  
14 long-term tax revenue, and also consider the fact  
15 that at least in my lifetime here, these are  
16 projects and a corporation that is willing to  
17 consider the input of the communities is rare.

18           So we would appreciate your consideration  
19 and your support of this project. Thank you.

20           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, sir. John  
21 Vona, followed by Darin Quigley of Northern  
22 California Fire Co-op.

23           JOHN VONA: Good afternoon. My name is  
24 John Vona. I am the timberland manager for FWS  
25 Forestry. We manage the Shasta Cascade Timberlands.

1 I'm responsible for all aspects of that operation  
2 including the timber management conservation  
3 programs and working with ConnectGEN on this  
4 project.

5 A lot of people don't realize that the  
6 Shasta Cascade Timberlands was purchased from  
7 Roseburg by the current group of investors in 2018.  
8 The total property is 170,000 acres. FWS manages  
9 that land. We employ about 25 people during the  
10 height of the summer with contract loggers, wildlife  
11 biologists, and foresters. We have about 50 people  
12 on the property doing a variety of -- variety of  
13 work.

14 The landowners objected for this property  
15 when they purchased it from Roseburg was, of course,  
16 to ensure a sustainable flow of wood products off  
17 the property, in addition to ensuring that we  
18 protect the air, the resources, water, wildlife  
19 while harvesting that timber.

20 The other objectives of the landowners was  
21 to pursue sustainable conservation opportunities.  
22 That includes carbon projects, working conservation  
23 easements, and also wind. It was viewed at the time  
24 as a -- and still is a compatible land use. And as  
25 many of you -- well, may know, is that Roseburg

1 started this project several years earlier before  
2 the purchase.

3 So from the landowner's perspective, wind  
4 power was one of the key considerations of  
5 purchasing this property. It was part of the  
6 valuation of the purchase. Like when you buy a  
7 piece of property and you want to build a house on  
8 it. This is a significant impact for them. And to  
9 lose that would be pretty dramatic.

10 And, again, wind is seen as a compatible  
11 to land management. We have 170,000-acre property.  
12 Only 475 acres will be impacted by this wind  
13 project. It's a de minimis impact to the property  
14 in terms of forestry. The wind project will provide  
15 a clean source of energy, it will be sustainable,  
16 and it's a domestic energy source and has all the  
17 statistics you've seen; provides jobs and other  
18 benefits to the county.

19 One of the primary concerns of the land  
20 owner and me is fire. I wouldn't be standing here  
21 today nor would the landowners be supporting this  
22 if -- if they thought this would contribute to fire  
23 on the property.

24 In fact, it was of particular concern that  
25 if this project were to be completed, that -- that

1 it wouldn't just have no impact on fire, that we  
2 would see improvement on fire mitigation. And I  
3 think ConnectGEN has done -- gone above and beyond  
4 in providing that -- that mitigation.

5 Many of you realize that this project is  
6 within -- probably 90 percent of it is within the  
7 footprint of the Fountain Fire which occurred in  
8 1991, 30 years ago. And so those plantations are  
9 now 30 years old. They require thinning. They  
10 require a lot of attention.

11 This project will provide shaded fuel  
12 breaks, increased access through those plantations.  
13 And we know with the current issues with wildfire in  
14 the state, having access and having fuel breaks is a  
15 significant contributor to managing fire.

16 Henry mentioned the 5,000-gallon water  
17 tanks. A good question was asked about how do you  
18 manage these small tanks during a fire? Typically,  
19 we have -- we've installed ten tanks on the fire.  
20 They're a little bigger. Typically during a fire  
21 the reason they're installed is because there's not  
22 a water resource nearby for a helicopter to dip from  
23 to attack a fire.

24 What we do is call contractors who have  
25 water trucks to keep refilling those tanks

1 continuously, and CAL FIRE has an asset list of  
2 contractors that they also rely on. So if there was  
3 a concentrated area where we needed rapid deployment  
4 of water buckets, those tanks would be refilled  
5 continuously. So, for me, I see that as a major  
6 benefit.

7 I've also -- I rely heavily on Darin  
8 Quigley of the Northern California Fire Cooperative  
9 Association. That's an industrial cooperative that  
10 we're all members of. Darin leads that organization  
11 because of his expertise, and he's coordinated with  
12 us to review this project and he feels very positive  
13 that the mitigation provided by ConnectGEN and this  
14 project is beneficial to the property.

15 And then, finally, as Henry said, he has  
16 been in this community frequently over the past  
17 two-and-a-half years, and the community benefits of  
18 the project I think has -- is a very positive thing.  
19 Roseburg for a variety of reasons before they sold  
20 the property closed off the lands, put up gates to  
21 protect the resource. I've been working with our  
22 client, New Forest, to open up the property and  
23 encourage more recreation. And having Henry provide  
24 that access opportunity to people in Burney, Round  
25 Mountain, Moose Camp, I think is positive.

1           So I urge you to support this project. We  
2 think it's beneficial for Shasta County. Thank you.

3           SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Don't go away.

4           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Supervisor Baugh, go  
5 ahead.

6           SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Thank you. Just a  
7 quick question for you since you mentioned the water  
8 tanks again.

9           JOHN VONA: Sure, sure.

10          SUPERVISOR BAUGH: I guess I'm stuck  
11 there. On a practical basis, how is the water  
12 actually dispersed? They don't have an automated  
13 pump system, not even a jockey pump on them.

14          JOHN VONA: No, it's a great question.

15          SUPERVISOR BAUGH: They don't have a fire  
16 hose, so it requires a fire truck.

17          JOHN VONA: You might have seen those  
18 water trucks on some of these fire roads during  
19 logging jobs where they spray water out of the back  
20 of the --

21          SUPERVISOR BAUGH: I've seen the water  
22 trucks, yeah.

23          JOHN VONA: That's how they refill those  
24 tanks. You would have those deployed. They have a  
25 snorkel. They'll draw from specific areas where

1 they can draw from that we have a permit to do -- to  
2 do that work, and then they would drive to those dip  
3 tanks and fill it up. It's not the most -- I wish  
4 there was a pump that would automatically fill those  
5 tanks, but --

6 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Right.

7 JOHN VONA: -- during a fire that's the  
8 best way how we fill them up, so...

9 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: So that describes  
10 dispersal on the ground for dust and --

11 JOHN VONA: Well, they would fill those  
12 tanks up.

13 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: But it wouldn't project  
14 water onto the fire --

15 JOHN VONA: No, a helicopter --

16 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: -- how would it help  
17 with fire suppression?

18 JOHN VONA: The helicopter. I'm sorry,  
19 the helicopter would have the dip tanks and they dip  
20 into those tanks.

21 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Into a 5,000-gallon  
22 tank? That doesn't seem big enough.

23 JOHN VONA: Go ahead.

24 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Okay. I'm not trying  
25 to put you on the spot, but I've watched them dip

1 out -- from my boat on Whiskeytown Lake and those  
2 tanks are huge.

3 JIMMY ZANOTELLI: (Inaudible) Fire  
4 Marshal. So they're 5,000-gallon tanks. The tanks  
5 are designed to be a water storage for initial  
6 attack type of fire. They are usually located  
7 through the property, which obviously location  
8 hasn't been determined yet or actually how many are  
9 going to be required. They're there primarily for  
10 the initial attack fire, the fire engines will be  
11 able to grab the feed right off of those tanks to  
12 fill -- backfill the engines as needed.

13 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: So you'll pump it from  
14 the engine?

15 JIMMY ZANOTELLI: Yes. Correct. That's  
16 why they're strategically placed throughout the  
17 property for initial attack fire. Obviously, an  
18 extended attack fire we would augment with water  
19 tenders and things like that, but for an initial  
20 attack fire, it's important to have water resources  
21 up there and that's what those tanks are there for.

22 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: So just you're saying  
23 you would access it with a fire truck that doesn't  
24 have its own water storage?

25 JIMMY ZANOTELLI: No, the water truck --



1 or the water fire engine would have its own resource  
2 on board, but when they run out they would go to  
3 those tanks to refill.

4 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: So just for comparison  
5 sake, what's a fire truck hold in terms of --

6 JIMMY ZANOTELLI: 500 to 750 gallons.

7 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Okay. Thank you.

8 JIMMY ZANOTELLI: Thank you.

9 JOHN VONA: Apologies for that.

10 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: No, no, that's okay. I  
11 just wanted to --

12 JOHN VONA: No, no, it's a good  
13 clarification. Our tanks that we've installed are  
14 10,000 gallons. They can be dipped by a helicopter.

15 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Okay. Okay.

16 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: Supervisor Chimenti,  
17 I have a couple questions. John?

18 JOHN VONA: Sure.

19 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: Sorry about that.

20 JOHN VONA: No, no, it's fine.

21 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: I'm looking at the  
22 photos here, and there's quite a bit of obviously  
23 timber harvest has occurred in the surrounding  
24 areas. You have a very serious mosaic pattern  
25 there.

1           Is your company planning on doing any -- a  
2 timber harvest? Because those pine trees -- and I  
3 drive through that area all the time, they're  
4 planted fairly close together. They're not the  
5 ideal 50 percent canopy that you're kind of what we  
6 nowadays feel is the appropriate spacing.

7           Is there any kind of timber harvest plans  
8 in the near future? Are you planning to do any  
9 harvesting, any logging in that area at all, are you  
10 aware?

11           JOHN VONA: So you're referring to the  
12 denser plantations? The younger plantations?

13           SUPERVISOR RICKERT: Yes.

14           JOHN VONA: Yes, so those were planted  
15 after the Fountain Fire, and the prescription back  
16 then was a very tight spacing. Closer to 600 trees  
17 break. We're working towards thinning those  
18 plantations as fast as possible. And where we're  
19 adjacent to 299, we're doing wider spacing closer to  
20 20 feet to space those out. So we've got our work  
21 cut out for us. It's expensive to do that work and  
22 without a chip market to chip that material to bring  
23 it to a chip facility, it's been -- it's been a  
24 challenge, but we're continuing to do that work.

25           SUPERVISOR RICKERT: And that's a good

1 argument for biomass facilities, which is another  
2 day.

3 JOHN VONA: Yeah, a whole other topic.  
4 I'll stay here just in case.

5 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Any other questions?  
6 Thank you, sir.

7 JOHN VONA: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: So we've got Darin  
9 Quigley. And he's going to be followed by Chad  
10 Scott of the Shasta Builders Exchange.

11 DARIN QUIGLEY: Good afternoon. Like John  
12 said, I'm Darin Quigley. I'm the fire coordinator  
13 for the Northern California Fire Co-op. I work for  
14 Shasta Cascade Timberlands and seven other timber  
15 management companies in Shasta County. And as John  
16 was saying, you know, fire certainly is a major  
17 concern for all the companies and as you know we --  
18 we have sustained significant losses this year to a  
19 lot of the wildland fires. And they asked me to  
20 review the mitigation measures and conditions of  
21 approval submitted for consideration to the Planning  
22 Commission. And I just want to commend CAL FIRE and  
23 Shasta County for doing an excellent job at  
24 assessing the risk and requiring mitigation where  
25 appropriate.

1           With the project's fire safety  
2 requirements in place, I agree with the County's  
3 conclusion and the EIR that the threat or risk from  
4 wildfire related to the construction and operation  
5 of the project will be less than significant. The  
6 measures required for this project go above and  
7 beyond what was implemented at Hatchet Ridge, which  
8 has not had a fire event since commencing operations  
9 over ten years ago.

10           I was part of the CAL FIRE response that  
11 fought the Fountain Fire in 1992 for CAL FIRE. At  
12 the time, the Fountain Fire was the largest and most  
13 destructive of its kind in the history of wildfires  
14 in Shasta County. Since then, I've been on the  
15 front lines fighting dozens of catastrophic fires in  
16 Northern California and I've seen firsthand how  
17 wildfires can decimate communities and have learned  
18 many valuable lessons throughout my career,  
19 including my own house that was lost in one of the  
20 fires, darn it.

21           With the required wildfire risk reduction  
22 proposed, shaded fuel breaks, and other mitigation  
23 measures, the project will have a positive impact on  
24 the current and future wildfire risk. Overall, it  
25 is my professional opinion that this project will

1 enhance fire protection and firefighting  
2 capabilities in the area and within the surrounding  
3 project.

4           Regarding aerial firefighting  
5 capabilities, a significant increase in road access,  
6 implementation of strategic shaded fuel breaks. And  
7 I'm talking about those shaded fuel breaks within  
8 the project area that are a requirement of the  
9 County. And the many other wildfire risk reduction  
10 measures combined within the available air space as  
11 provided by the modified project proposal. There is  
12 a net increase in wildfire suppression capabilities.

13           As we reflect on the 2021 wildfires  
14 including the Dixie, Monument, River, Antelope,  
15 Lava, McCash and numerous others, aerial assets and  
16 air space were plenty on the start of all those  
17 fires. However, they were not affected during the  
18 initial attack due to the lack of access. Those  
19 fires were, most of them were lightning caused with  
20 no ground -- no ground access, so firefighters  
21 couldn't get to -- get to the starting locations and  
22 they escaped containment.

23           This project creates all-weather access  
24 for firefighters such as engine crews, dozers, water  
25 tenders, hand crews, et cetera. The project will

1 also provide accessible water sources in strategic  
2 locations for firefighting purposes. The Fountain  
3 Wind project will provide excellent access and  
4 opportunities in these remote timberlands along with  
5 an extensive network of shaded fuel breaks within  
6 the project as required by the County.

7 In conclusion, the Fountain Wind Project  
8 will provide the following fire protection benefits.  
9 It will increase access for ground firefighting  
10 resources and improve egress routes for occupied end  
11 holdings, increase wildfire detection capabilities,  
12 reduce hazardous fuels in strategic locations,  
13 including along key access roads and along strategic  
14 ridge lines.

15 It will break up the continuity of that  
16 homogeneous stand of young pines from the Fountain  
17 Fire that prevents its own wildfire hazard. It will  
18 increase available accessible water sources for  
19 firefighting. It will upgrade the bridges and  
20 roadways to accommodate heavy vehicles including  
21 water tenders, dozers and transports, fire engines  
22 and crew vehicles.

23 It will increase the presence of  
24 authorized personnel including during times of very  
25 high fire danger, and it provides a comprehensive

1 fire prevention plan and includes sophisticated fire  
2 protection and suppression systems in the sales.

3 And that's all I have. Thank you. And  
4 I'll take any questions if you have any.

5 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: (Inaudible.)

6 SUPERVISOR JONES: So Mr. Quigley, I take  
7 it you are Quigley Consulting, LLC; is that correct?

8 DARIN QUIGLEY: Yes, that is correct.

9 SUPERVISOR JONES: And you were paid for  
10 this presentation, is that correct, or did you do  
11 this free?

12 DARIN QUIGLEY: No, I was paid.

13 SUPERVISOR JONES: You were paid. Okay.

14 So a few of my concerns. I would agree  
15 you've written here that you agree with the County's  
16 conclusion in the EIR that the threat of risk from  
17 wildfire related to construction and the operation  
18 of the project will be less than significant. And I  
19 might agree with that. You also state that the  
20 measures are required for the project go above and  
21 beyond what was implemented for Hatchet Ridge. I  
22 might -- I might agree with you on that as well.

23 But when we get down to the area regarding  
24 aerial firefighting capabilities. Have you fought  
25 fires from the air, Mr. Quigley?

1           DARIN QUIGLEY: No. I was -- however, I  
2 was an operations section chief and the air  
3 operations worked for me for CAL FIRE.

4           SUPERVISOR JONES: Now, you realize there  
5 are people in this room today that are going to  
6 disagree with your conclusions here?

7           DARIN QUIGLEY: You know, and I would  
8 defer, just like the Planning Commission, Chief  
9 Gouvea is in the audience. The Redding Air-Attack  
10 Base is under his administration. We're fortunate  
11 here in Shasta County to have that Air-Attack base  
12 here. And I would defer -- they are the experts, so  
13 I would defer --

14           SUPERVISOR JONES: I'm reading your  
15 report. And you do state here regarding aerial  
16 firefighting capabilities the significant increase  
17 in road access implementation of the strategic  
18 shaded fuel breaks is a net increase of wildfire  
19 suppression capabilities, but you started off with  
20 aerial firefighting, and that is a concern that I  
21 have, you know. And so I may want you to come  
22 back -- I hope you stay a little bit later, and  
23 we'll ask the other experts as well.

24           But with regards to aerial firefighting, I  
25 am concerned with this project. You are aware we



1 have power lines in front of this project and behind  
2 this project. And the capability of these planes  
3 getting low to the ground, I think, is diminished.  
4 So I would like to talk to you a little bit more  
5 about that as it comes up later. Is that all right?

6           DARIN QUIGLEY: Yeah, and that's fine.  
7 And, you know, my opinion is based on improving  
8 those logging roads to graveled all-access roads, so  
9 fire engines are going to get in quicker. So my  
10 opinion is that's a mitigating measure.

11           SUPERVISOR JONES: Right, I would agree  
12 with that, but then you mentioned aerial  
13 firefighting and that's where I have a concern.  
14 Thank you.

15           DARIN QUIGLEY: Thank you.

16           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Do we have any other  
17 questions? All right. Thank you, sir.

18           DARIN QUIGLEY: You're done with me?

19           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: We're done with you  
20 now anyway.

21           We have a Chad Scott, we have a PowerPoint  
22 followed by Mary Machado of Shasta VOICES and she,  
23 too, has a PowerPoint.

24           THE CLERK: Just give us one minute to  
25 pull up your PowerPoint. John will be running the

1 timer on this one for you.

2 CHAD SCOTT: Good afternoon. My name is  
3 Chad Scott. I'm the executive director of the  
4 Shasta Builders Exchange. We represent over 500  
5 local businesses and thousands of men and women that  
6 they employ. The Exchange and its Board of  
7 Directors support this revised Fountain Wind  
8 Project.

9 Next slide, please.

10 Shasta Builders Exchange supports career  
11 opportunities, small businesses, public safety, and  
12 community development. This project satisfies each  
13 of these pillars of community vitality, and  
14 represents a significant opportunity for our county.

15 This project will create jobs and  
16 apprentices will kickstart their careers. We'll see  
17 investments in public safety and wildfire risk  
18 mitigation, and we'll see benefits for our schools,  
19 our rural communities, and the businesses that  
20 employ thousands of people here in Shasta County.

21 Next slide, please.

22 The \$362 million in economic value over  
23 the lifetime of this project is significant.  
24 Hundreds of men and women will work on this project  
25 during construction. And this is a list of some of

1 those -- some of the work that will be needed during  
2 the construction process.

3 Next slide, please.

4 In addition to some of the specialized  
5 trades we saw on the previous slide, many of our  
6 local businesses and local suppliers will provide  
7 materials during the construction phase of this  
8 project. Aggregate, anchor bolts, culverts,  
9 electrical and cable supplies, concrete. These are  
10 all things that are not coming out of Los Angeles to  
11 construct this project. This will all be sourced  
12 here locally in my hope.

13 Next slide, please.

14 In addition, we start getting not only the  
15 direct construction component and the kind of  
16 indirect material suppliers, but we have some  
17 additional opportunities. There are hundreds of  
18 workers here in Shasta County whose jobs will be to  
19 support the construction and operations of this  
20 project.

21 I've -- we've got listed here several of  
22 those opportunities. Every time somebody needs to  
23 refill their car, they're spending their money here  
24 and contributing to our economy. Some people  
25 suggested since Shasta County cannot provide

1 100 percent of the workforce needed to build this  
2 project that we should abandon the hundreds of  
3 workers that we can provide. And I think this is a  
4 terrible argument.

5 Next slide, please.

6 All right. So the economic benefits of  
7 construction is nearly \$60 million. This includes  
8 the indirect -- excuse me, the direct, the indirect,  
9 and the induced benefits of this project. That's  
10 nearly 450 years' worth of job years. This is a  
11 very significant opportunity and one that I've never  
12 seen happen in this county, or really in any  
13 community I've lived in in decades.

14 Next slide, please.

15 My goal is to keep this short. I didn't  
16 know if I was going to have three minutes.

17 \$210 million is the projected operational economic  
18 benefits of the Fountain Wind Project. That's  
19 roughly 42 construction job -- or, excuse me, 42  
20 jobs for Shasta County after construction. Those  
21 are direct employee benefits and compensations,  
22 indirect salaries, induced job benefits, and over a  
23 35-year project is calculated to be about 1,456 job  
24 years or \$210 million in economic benefit and  
25 output.

1                   Next slide, please.

2                   And I would like to remind everyone that  
3 this is an opportunity -- remind everyone that  
4 Shasta County's opportunities also include  
5 commitments to community development and public  
6 safety. That's \$2.5 million dedicated to wildfire  
7 prevention, the sheriff's office, the community  
8 endowment, and access to more reliable broadband  
9 Internet.

10                  Next slide, please.

11                  So the additional considerations are that  
12 very few projects in Shasta County have ever  
13 provided this kind of opportunity for  
14 apprenticeships and trade training. Fountain Wind  
15 complements all season energy production, day and  
16 night, in the winter and the summer, during drought  
17 and when it rains.

18                  So everyone in this room is aware of how  
19 difficult it is to run a business in California, to  
20 get much of anything done in California. Despite  
21 this challenge, this project meets or exceeds  
22 California regulations including all of its  
23 environmental regulations.

24                  Simply put, Fountain Wind Project benefits  
25 our region's economy, our workers, and the

1 businesses that invest in our county. Thank you.

2 Final slide.

3 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Supervisor Jones.

4 SUPERVISOR JONES: Thank you, Chair. Just  
5 a couple quick questions. First, you said you  
6 supported the redesign. Did you support the  
7 original design?

8 CHAD SCOTT: Yes.

9 SUPERVISOR JONES: You did. All right.  
10 And then early on I must have received 200 e-mails  
11 from people in support of the project. All from the  
12 western part of the United States, Nevada, here in  
13 California. There were a few here within Shasta  
14 County. Do you have the number -- I mean, did you  
15 see those e-mails as well?

16 CHAD SCOTT: Your e-mails?

17 SUPERVISOR JONES: Well, they were  
18 circulated through all of the Board, and I didn't  
19 know if you've seen --

20 CHAD SCOTT: I've seen some e-mails or  
21 letters of support. I've also seen letters and  
22 e-mails against.

23 SUPERVISOR JONES: Well, these were all  
24 supportive of the project and they were clearly  
25 workers that have done this type of work before.

1 But, I guess, my point was that a very small  
2 percentage of them would come from the area. They  
3 all came from far away, some here in California, but  
4 many in Western Nevada and elsewhere. So do we  
5 have -- do we know the numbers possibly? And that  
6 may be a better question to ask others, but...

7 CHAD SCOTT: Yeah, and on the actual  
8 construction of the towers and turbines themselves,  
9 that would be appropriate elsewhere. I think our  
10 county can provide a lot of labor and resource  
11 support during the construction. And, obviously,  
12 once it's operational they will be living and  
13 working here the full time. We've seen a  
14 presentation on the tax revenues and other benefits  
15 to the community. That doesn't go away when those  
16 workers who have specialized training move on to  
17 their next project.

18 SUPERVISOR JONES: Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Any other questions?

20 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: Yes, I did.

21 I just need a little clarification. You  
22 had in your PowerPoint that it was 42 jobs would be  
23 established. Are those full-time jobs?

24 CHAD SCOTT: Those are a calculation based  
25 on either directly working at the site or indirectly

1 supporting --

2 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: Okay.

3 CHAD SCOTT: -- the site.

4 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: So it's my  
5 understanding, I think I recall it was 12 jobs --

6 CHAD SCOTT: Yes. My understanding is  
7 also 8- to 12 jobs.

8 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: Sure.

9 CHAD SCOTT: Running the site.

10 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: Right. And do you --

11 CHAD SCOTT: And those men and women will  
12 need services here. They will need tire rotations,  
13 they will need gas, they will need groceries.

14 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: Right.

15 CHAD SCOTT: That money will recirculate  
16 into our community, so it's an economic benefit and  
17 not a direct payment.

18 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: By any chance, and I  
19 don't know the answer to this and maybe someone in  
20 the room does. But how many people are employed by  
21 the Hatchet Ridge Project? Because this will be a  
22 similar size if it were constructed. Does  
23 anybody --

24 CHAD SCOTT: That --

25 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: Does anybody else



1 know that answer? Lio looks like he's going to jump  
2 to the rescue and answer it.

3 LIO SALAZAR: I believe, in general,  
4 there's typically 6 to 12 employees that maintain  
5 the Hatchet Ridge Project.

6 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: I kind of remember  
7 nine. Kind of -- that was something that I remember  
8 in the community being discussed, but it -- I think  
9 it varies. It seems to me I heard somebody say  
10 there's not quite as many people as they thought  
11 they were going to have.

12 LIO SALAZAR: I think nine is sort of  
13 middle of the mark there. Their needs for labor  
14 fluctuate.

15 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: You're good at math,  
16 too.

17 LIO SALAZAR: Yeah, thank you.

18 CHAD SCOTT: Yeah, whether it's 8, 9, 12  
19 jobs pulling in six-digit salaries, I think those  
20 are great opportunities, excellent jobs for our  
21 community. And that's for 35 years. That's an  
22 investment.

23 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Any other questions  
24 for Mr. Scott? Thank you, sir.

25 CHAD SCOTT: Thank you.

1           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Mary Machado followed  
2 by Chris Snyder of IUOE3. And we also have a  
3 PowerPoint, correct, Mary?

4           MARY MACHADO: That's correct. Can you  
5 hear me?

6           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Yes.

7           MARY MACHADO: Great. Thank you.

8           THE CLERK: And John will be running your  
9 timer for you.

10          MARY MACHADO: Okay. Thank you.

11          My name is Mary Machado. I'm the  
12 executive director for Shasta VOICES.

13          Next slide, yes.

14          Shasta VOICES is a local -- thank you --  
15 local private nonprofit 501(c)(6) organization for  
16 those of you who don't know who we are. We are 15  
17 years old. We are not a PAC. We have 1,300 loyal  
18 supporters, and I am the executive director. Have  
19 been doing that for 15 years. Total amount of time  
20 of our existence. We are advocating successfully  
21 over these 15 years for a sustainable economic  
22 future in the Shasta County area.

23          We have been closely monitoring this  
24 project for the Fountain Wind for the past 20 months  
25 or so, and we've done our due diligence and

1 extensive research on the project.

2 Next slide.

3 We learned through reference checking very  
4 early on that ConnectGEN, the project Applicant, is  
5 an organization who lives up to all of their  
6 commitments, is very fair and responsive to the  
7 communities where their projects are located and/or  
8 being constructed. And that they are good corporate  
9 sponsors and citizens who have been very favorably  
10 received in their communities.

11 Next slide, please.

12 The landowners near the proposed project  
13 have expressed some concerns about their home values  
14 if this project is approved. So Shasta VOICES  
15 researched and provided a property value assessment  
16 entitled, The effect on real estate values in  
17 surrounding residential communities in northeastern  
18 Shasta County, which you all received and hopefully  
19 reviewed, along with a spreadsheet for back-up  
20 documentation in preparation of this hearing today.

21 Shasta VOICES wanted to conduct our own  
22 local, small scale, easy-to-understand study because  
23 Shasta County actually does have an actual wind farm  
24 project, Hatchet Ridge, with 10 years of history  
25 which provides us with factual real estate sales

1 data in the Burney area, as well as, Montgomery  
2 Creek and Round Mountain, relative to the  
3 residential property values there.

4 Next slide, please.

5 The public records were researched to  
6 obtain factual real estate sales data in the Burney,  
7 Round Mountain, and Montgomery Creek areas from  
8 sales occurring from 2010 through 2020 including the  
9 following:

10 Data for 245 residential properties of  
11 which 101 have multiple sales. The address of the  
12 home that was sold; the type of home; whether it was  
13 single family or a mobile or something else; the  
14 square footage of that home; the date or dates that  
15 it was sold; the sales price for each sale since  
16 2010. And then that information was entered into a  
17 spreadsheet for ease in determining the trends after  
18 evaluating that data.

19 Of those 245 properties, 101, as we said,  
20 had multiple sales. Those 101 sales were used as  
21 data points to determine the percentage of change in  
22 their value. Results of that data show that  
23 property sold in the area since 2010 have increased  
24 in value with the average increase being just over  
25 57 percent.

1           Therefore, evidence exists supporting that  
2 values for the majority of properties located near  
3 this proposed project would not be devalued  
4 regardless of the market trends. As noted in the  
5 study materials, the total -- I think it's very  
6 important to note that the population of Burney  
7 through December 2020 is 3,965 people, 157 people  
8 from Montgomery Creek, and 89 for Round Mountain.  
9 So those sales numbers are significant for that size  
10 of the community.

11           Next slide, please.

12           SB 100 mandates that all electric  
13 utilities in California acquires 60 percent of their  
14 annual unmet energy needs from renewable resources  
15 by 2030. SB 100 states that by December 31st, 2045,  
16 eligible renewable resources and zero carbon  
17 resources must provide 100 percent of electricity  
18 provided to customers.

19           The California Energy Commission developed  
20 procedures for compliance and enforcement of this  
21 mandate. Wind and solar energy meet the renewable  
22 resources and zero carbon resources mandate. Shasta  
23 County needs to meet these mandates, like every  
24 other area of California, and this project will  
25 assist in the process of obtaining compliance.

1           The Fountain Wind project has the  
2 potential to provide electricity for more than  
3 86,000 homes while using up to 48 wind turbine  
4 generators.

5           Next slide.

6           This project will provide many benefits to  
7 Shasta County. You've probably seen these figures  
8 again. I'm going to repeat them. 200 construction  
9 jobs and 12 permanent jobs. New sales tax revenues  
10 for the County totaling \$3.5 million in the first  
11 two years alone. Contributions of 2.8 million for  
12 the Sheriff's Department, Montgomery Creek, and  
13 Round Mountain advisory committee, Pit River TERO,  
14 Shasta County Fire Safe Council, and the Fall River  
15 and Western Shasta Resource Conservation Districts.  
16 \$200,000 donation to ShastaBeam to provide  
17 high-speed Internet service to the intermountain  
18 region.

19           Over the long term, Fountain Wind will  
20 generate over \$50 million in new tax revenue. The  
21 project would provide the County with an ongoing  
22 source of revenues -- ongoing source of revenues --  
23 to fund public safety and other required services.  
24 You have been trying to find a source of ongoing  
25 revenues for how long? This project will provide

1 you with that.

2 Next slide, please.

3 A report done by Economic & Planning  
4 Systems, a land economics consulting firm, is  
5 available on Fountain Wind Project's website. It  
6 shows that the project is expected to generate  
7 substantial, one-time and ongoing economic and  
8 financial benefits to Shasta County including  
9 project construction will generate 450 job years in  
10 aggregate, including direct and multiplier --  
11 indirect and induced effects. And about \$27 million  
12 in employee compensation. As well as about  
13 \$60 million in total economic output in Shasta  
14 County.

15 The project operation will provide 42  
16 ongoing jobs. Again, I think Chad just explained  
17 how those are calculated. About \$2.5 million in  
18 compensation, and just over \$6 million in economic  
19 output each year during its 35-year lifetime. Each  
20 year.

21 Cumulative over the 35 years, project  
22 operations will provide 1,456 job years,  
23 \$90.4 million in employee compensation, and  
24 210.3 million in economic output in the county.

25 Next slide, please.

1           The Fountain Wind Project is perhaps the  
2 largest private project ever brought to the County  
3 for consideration. At least in many years. The  
4 project is proposed on 100 percent private,  
5 previously disturbed timberland property in  
6 northeastern Shasta County.

7           As a large potential investor in Shasta  
8 County, ConnectGEN has followed every rule and  
9 regulation through a rigorous two-and-a-half-year  
10 process including the preparation of an EIR and  
11 subsequent public hearings. This process has  
12 worked.

13           ConnectGEN has listened and responded by  
14 reducing the footprint of the project and enhancing  
15 the economic benefits to the community. Shasta  
16 County struggles each and every year to generate  
17 revenues needed to fund public safety and other  
18 required services to the community.

19           Your vote to approve this project would  
20 demonstrate that you are serious about funding those  
21 services responsibly without the need to continually  
22 try and fail to pass local tax measures. Your vote  
23 to approve this project would also demonstrate that  
24 Shasta County really does support the property  
25 rights of private property owners who follow all the



1 rules in order to do business in Shasta County.

2 It would finally demonstrate that Shasta  
3 County is not closed for private businesses, and it  
4 would encourage other businesses to come here.

5 Next slide, please.

6 For all of the reasons stated above,  
7 Shasta VOICES and our large organization is  
8 supporting the Fountain Wind Project. Thank you  
9 very much. Do you have any questions?

10 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Do you  
11 have any questions?

12 SUPERVISOR JONES: Chair Chimenti,  
13 Supervisors.

14 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Go ahead.

15 SUPERVISOR JONES: Mary, it's good seeing  
16 you again.

17 MARY MACHADO: Yes, good to see you too.  
18 It's been a long time.

19 SUPERVISOR JONES: It has been. You  
20 mentioned housing prices and so I wanted to get a  
21 little bit in perspective.

22 What's the closest house to the Hatchet  
23 Ridge Project in miles? Do you have an idea?

24 MARY MACHADO: Maybe 5 miles.

25 SUPERVISOR JONES: And what's the closest

1 house to the Fountain Wind Project?

2 MARY MACHADO: Probably -- I'm guessing,  
3 it's going to be in the 5- to 6-mile range. I  
4 really don't know.

5 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Please, please, quiet,  
6 please.

7 MARY MACHADO: I'm no expert in Montgomery  
8 Creek.

9 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Let her talk. Thank  
10 you.

11 MARY MACHADO: I don't know the area  
12 myself. I don't really know. All I know is all you  
13 can look at is what there is, it doesn't really  
14 matter. There's so few homes up there that it's  
15 hard to --

16 SUPERVISOR JONES: I think it's relative.  
17 If we're going to judge one against the other, we  
18 would need to take a look at proximity. You are  
19 familiar with the City of Redding owning 100 wind  
20 turbines in Klickitat County, Washington. This  
21 project -- can you guarantee that this energy will  
22 be used here in Shasta County? Is there any promise  
23 of that?

24 MARY MACHADO: I'm certainly not the right  
25 person to ask that question of, I just --

1 SUPERVISOR JONES: But you brought it up  
2 in your presentation that the SB 1 -- or the Senate  
3 Bill and the requirements for renewable energies.  
4 I'm concerned with what happens here in Shasta  
5 County --

6 MARY MACHADO: Correct.

7 SUPERVISOR JONES: -- because it's a big  
8 deal if that energy was used here in Shasta County,  
9 but I'm looking for a guarantee that it would be.

10 MARY MACHADO: I don't know who you would  
11 get that from.

12 SUPERVISOR JONES: All right. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Supervisor Rickert.

14 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: Yes. Thank you for  
15 the presentation.

16 I just wanted to -- and I did read your  
17 report as far as land values. And just as a little  
18 background on myself. My husband is an accredited  
19 rural appraiser and he's also a certified general  
20 real estate appraiser, and so I'm really familiar  
21 with the appraisal process and how you come to  
22 valuing property.

23 Worked with this for 45 years of my life,  
24 so I'm pretty -- the appraisal process is -- is  
25 basically much different than what you presented to

1 us. And I did some research just so I could  
2 confirm. We know people all across the United  
3 States. We've been actively involved in an  
4 organization called the American Society of Farm  
5 Managers and Rural Appraisers. And I gathered  
6 information from friends who are professionals in  
7 the field. I talked to an MAI and he's an ARA in  
8 Bakersfield. He was surprised that there was a  
9 proposal for a wind farm in such a densely forested  
10 area. Stated in Kern County wind turbines are  
11 usually far from residences and in more rocky  
12 terrain.

13 Another person I spoke to I've known for  
14 about 30 years, he's done a lot of the work in this  
15 particular area. And in his professional opinion,  
16 and I quote: That a wind turbine project would have  
17 a significant impact on property values. He would  
18 be concerned about a company going bankrupt, leaving  
19 the turbines abandoned, and the possible  
20 consequential financial burden on the County in  
21 addition to the environmental issues. He also  
22 pointed out that there were a lot of abandoned  
23 windmill turbine projects up and down the State.

24 And according to a recent Forbes article  
25 written by Jude Clements titled, Do Wind Turbines

1 Lower Property Values? He states: In conclusion,  
2 many members of the real estate and appraisal  
3 business have been clear that wind power does impact  
4 property values, and it would seem to me that these  
5 groups have no vested interest in supporting wind  
6 power or not supporting it. And he cited several  
7 Court cases and professional opinions that there was  
8 a reduction in property values when wind turbine  
9 projects were constructed.

10 So it -- it was troubling to me because  
11 I'm real familiar with the appraisal process and  
12 what does happen with land values when there are big  
13 projects like this that might be next door or  
14 something, it does impact the land values. And  
15 that's just my personal research and comments. But  
16 I just wanted that to go on the record.

17 MARY MACHADO: And I would just like to  
18 say this was not -- this was just actual --

19 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: Sure, it's data.

20 MARY MACHADO: -- numbers from Shasta  
21 County records.

22 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: And I understand  
23 that, but I bet we've had land values increase up  
24 and down the state of California, which when you go  
25 through the appraisal process, you know, for an

1 appraiser, they take -- it takes 3,000 hours of  
2 apprenticeship and years and years of postgraduate  
3 education.

4           It takes a lot of years for these people  
5 to become professionals. And it's a very long,  
6 complicated process when you appraise property. And  
7 so I just want to clarify that because you say  
8 there's a, I think, a 57 percent increase in value,  
9 well, there could have been a 65 percent increase in  
10 value in Redding. So that really isn't pertinent.

11           But I just want to make sure that people  
12 understand that I did do some research. This is an  
13 area I'm familiar with. I went to professionals who  
14 have worked in this area and they did say it does  
15 reduce property values. So thank you.

16           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you.

17           Supervisor Baugh.

18           SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Thank you. Thank you,  
19 Mary, for the presentation. A little different  
20 perspective. I have no doubt that you're stating  
21 the accurate values based upon actual sales in  
22 Shasta County, and I think you're a hundred percent  
23 on target in terms of overall financial benefit.  
24 The whole program offers actual factual data in  
25 terms of investment in Shasta County, so I won't

1 attempt to argue any of that.

2 One thing I will question you on, though,  
3 which I think is something you can appreciate, is  
4 the basis that you used. There's no doubt that in  
5 the last ten years, last decade, we've increased in  
6 value. And especially in the last three years, the  
7 housing availability, the stock, is down and my own  
8 home has gone up 30 percent in value in the last  
9 four years.

10 MARY MACHADO: And that's why I said  
11 regardless of the market conditions. I mean, if it  
12 was that bad to live near a wind project, it  
13 wouldn't matter what the market was doing, people  
14 wouldn't do it.

15 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: But what is the basis  
16 that I question. We're missing there from your  
17 information 2008, the greatest depression in the  
18 history of Shasta County. By 2009, the entire  
19 county, the assessor's office had to devalue  
20 property by over \$1 billion in property value, and I  
21 don't think we broke even until 2017.

22 MARY MACHADO: Well, if you look at the  
23 data -- if you look at the spreadsheet, that's not  
24 exactly what it shows.

25 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Well, what does it

1 show?

2 MARY MACHADO: The spreadsheet is very  
3 large. It has the date and what the value was when  
4 they sold it, and if they resold it, and resold, and  
5 resold it. It shows you everything.

6 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: But it has the start  
7 value, right?

8 MARY MACHADO: It has the start value.

9 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Which is based upon the  
10 devaluation from the 2008 depression.

11 MARY MACHADO: Probably.

12 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Which reduced property  
13 values 40 percent in Shasta County. So we didn't  
14 gain --

15 MARY MACHADO: I would say some of them --  
16 (Talking over one another)

17 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Let me finish, Mary.

18 MARY MACHADO: Okay.

19 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: We didn't gain back to  
20 breakeven point until 2007, 2008, so if we hadn't  
21 had the depression --

22 MARY MACHADO: If you look at the  
23 spreadsheet there aren't that many.

24 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Right.

25 MARY MACHADO: Every single year it's like



1 over a period of time. So what it gives you is kind  
2 of a snapshot of ten complete years, which is what  
3 we were looking at.

4 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Right.

5 MARY MACHADO: So that you wouldn't have a  
6 discrepancy that shows, Well, here's what it was in  
7 2007. We don't know what it was in 2007, because it  
8 didn't sell until maybe 2012. So then -- then so  
9 you just -- that's the only starting point you can  
10 get from the public records. And, by the way, the  
11 public records don't go back far enough for some  
12 houses that were built in the '40s and '50s and  
13 '60s.

14 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Right.

15 MARY MACHADO: So we don't really know  
16 that data. All you can get is what's available.

17 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: So I wasn't actually  
18 trying to put you into a point of disagreeing with  
19 me, but by disagreeing with comments, you're  
20 disagreeing with actual facts based upon the  
21 depression. You can't disagree with that.

22 MARY MACHADO: I'm not disagreeing the  
23 depression. I'm just --

24 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Yeah, you are. You're  
25 saying it has no value and it has no consequence.

1 I'm just saying it's --

2 (Talking over one another)

3 MARY MACHADO: It's the facts is all it  
4 is.

5 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Yeah, and that's a  
6 fact, so...

7 MARY MACHADO: Exactly, so.

8 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Okay. So I guess I  
9 have to agree to disagree with you, and I don't put  
10 any stock in the numbers you've presented at all if  
11 you're not valuing the depression that we had in the  
12 devaluation of stock in Shasta County. A \$1 billion  
13 devaluation of stock is a \$1 devaluation of housing  
14 stock. Period. So we'll let it go. Thank you.

15 MARY MACHADO: Okay.

16 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Any other  
17 questions for Ms. Machado? Thank you, Mary. Always  
18 nice to see you.

19 Chris Snyder followed by Patrick  
20 Boileau -- I hope I said that right, sir --  
21 Operating Engineers Local 3.

22 CHRIS SNYDER: Good afternoon. My name is  
23 Chris Snyder -- or evening, Supervisors. I'm with  
24 the Operating Engineers Local 3 and we're speaking  
25 in support of the project.

1           For us, we have over 600 local residents  
2    in Shasta County and about 30 apprentices, and it  
3    takes about -- our apprentice -- much like  
4    supervisors were talking about, it takes about  
5    4,000, 5,000 hours to get through our program. It's  
6    a great opportunity to take local young men and  
7    women and train them on this wind farm.

8           And when we have a local skilled  
9    workforce, I mean, they'll be able to do that in  
10   other places. And these are really high-paying jobs  
11   with good pensions, they're career-type jobs, and  
12   we're just really excited to partner with the  
13   company and get this done, so I'm speaking in  
14   support. Thank you for your time. And have a good  
15   evening.

16           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Do we have  
17   any questions?

18           CHRIS SNYDER: Do you have any questions?

19           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, sir.

20   Patrick followed by -- and I have Mitchell Bechtel  
21   and Rustin Johnson both from the Northeastern  
22   Building and Construction Trades Council. Is it the  
23   intent of you gentlemen to speak together for 15  
24   minutes or is one going to speak for 15 minutes and  
25   another will go through the individual comment?

1 Combined? Copy that.

2 Okay. Go ahead, sir.

3 PATRICK BOILEAU: Hi, Patrick Boileau with  
4 the Operating Engineers Local 3.

5 As my colleagues said, our members are  
6 very much excited about this project. They're  
7 excited about the jobs it's bringing to the  
8 community. A lot of them are having to travel  
9 currently in order to find the work. They're  
10 traveling to Sacramento, they're traveling even to  
11 the Bay Area for the work. This is a project that's  
12 right home in their backyards that they get to work  
13 on to improve their community.

14 And I also wanted to mention the skill of  
15 our workers. These are operators who have gone  
16 through a four-year apprenticeship program, have  
17 many thousands of hours operating heavy equipment,  
18 and they're trained to safely load, unload the  
19 equipment from vehicles, operate it, operate it in  
20 and around ecological resources, in and around  
21 cultural resources. They are trained what to do if  
22 they unearth a cultural resource on the job. They  
23 are the first responders in many cases to finding a  
24 cultural resource. So these guys are some of the  
25 best in the industry.

1           As my colleague mentioned, we have over  
2   500 members who live in Shasta County, and those  
3   would be the guys who have the first call for the  
4   jobs. We have over 40,000 members across Northern  
5   California, but these are some of the best folks in  
6   the industry and we're very, very, very excited to  
7   partner with Fountain Wind on this project in order  
8   to get it done.

9           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Do we have  
10 any questions? You guys are getting off easy.  
11 Thank you, sir.

12           PATRICK BOILEAU: Thank you.

13           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: And Mitchell and  
14 Rustin, you're up.

15           RUSTIN JOHNSTON: Good afternoon,  
16 Supervisors. My name is Rustin Johnson. I'm the  
17 president of the Northeastern Building and  
18 Construction Trades Council.

19           So one of the reasons I'm here to talk to  
20 you guys about helping to improve this project is  
21 the MC3 program we do in the local area. So what we  
22 do is we work with people from all different  
23 backgrounds. We really try to serve our veterans,  
24 people who are low income or underserved, people who  
25 had their jobs phased out, anything along those

1 lines.

2                   What we do is we go through a whole  
3 program with them. So kind of cover some soft  
4 skills. It's a four-week class, which they actually  
5 graduate. We do construction math, we do OSHA, we  
6 do blueprint reading. We do everything we can, and  
7 truthfully a lot of the trades in this room. We  
8 show up and talk to them about each different craft.  
9 You know, if you're going to spend the rest of your  
10 life doing something, you might as well know what  
11 you're going to do every single day before you apply  
12 for it.

13                   And that's really what we try to do and  
14 that's what we try to push in the area. And passing  
15 this project will give us all a chance to help these  
16 individuals that we work at the Smart Center here in  
17 town with and we find in your local area to go to  
18 work, and that's really what we have today.

19                   MITCHELL BECHTEL: Gentlemen, I'm Mitchell  
20 Bechtel. I'm here on behalf of the Northeastern  
21 Building Trades, as well as, as an iron worker.

22                   You know, our guys and gals will be  
23 employed on this project if it gets approved. But  
24 really what this project represents is opportunity.  
25 It's an opportunity for the community to put forth a

1 better population that is more equipped, more  
2 trained, and higher paid.

3 Looking at this project, the 200  
4 construction jobs that would be created, a mid-level  
5 apprentice -- and an apprentice in this case is  
6 anybody that's part of a registered apprenticeship  
7 program. To be a graduate of our apprenticeship  
8 program, that's about 5,600 hours out in the field.  
9 So 5,600 hours cut that in half, you're looking at  
10 2,800 hours.

11 So that class or period would be about  
12 33.35 an hour. That's what you would get paid on  
13 the check, not including your benefit package. If  
14 you calculate that all out for a 40-hour week and  
15 put in, you know, what it would cost per year, that  
16 total is just under \$64,000 a year. By comparison,  
17 the Shasta County average household income is  
18 \$54,660.

19 So the difference here is about ten grand  
20 for every working person on that project as an  
21 apprentice -- as a second-year apprentice. And  
22 basically what -- what this job would be able to do  
23 is prime the citizenry, prime the community to -- to  
24 find a better way of life that maybe it gives them a  
25 chance to get more skills and more diversified and

1 increase their portfolio so they can be a, you  
2 know -- they can attain the goals that they want to  
3 attain, professionally.

4           You know, looking at -- looking at this  
5 project and what it means to the Northeastern  
6 Building Trades Council is that it provides those  
7 opportunities for us to go out into your guys's  
8 community, and our community, because we have  
9 residents here as well. We have over 3,600 Building  
10 and Construction Trades members that are a part of  
11 our council here.

12           It gives us the ability to go out and  
13 train, right? This -- all of the hours that would  
14 be worked on this project, there would be a portion  
15 of those hours that contribute to a training fund so  
16 that we can increase this -- this machine, if you  
17 will, so that we can provide more and more  
18 opportunities for the public; for the public  
19 benefit, for the community benefit.

20           And projects like this aren't going away  
21 anytime soon. The legislature, as you guys  
22 obviously all know, has instituted rulings where,  
23 you know, we're shifting towards green energy. And  
24 so, you know, being able to get in on the front line  
25 and being able to train our local citizenry to be



1 able to work on these projects and take that  
2 knowledge and experience and go throughout the rest  
3 of the states and the rest of the country as being  
4 journeymen, you know, iron workers in my case, or  
5 electricians or plumbers or operators, you know,  
6 laborers, as well. There are numerous opportunities  
7 that this project would provide outlets for people  
8 in the community that maybe haven't gotten involved  
9 in the building and construction trades.

10 The bit about the MC3 program that my  
11 colleague Rustin was just talking about, that is  
12 essentially a theater program that allows somebody  
13 to get primed so that they can figure out what  
14 apprenticeship program or what craft interests them  
15 the most and be able to, you know, make that  
16 connection and hopefully get into that craft.

17 And giving a project in the local area  
18 will allow them to get off the ground and really,  
19 you know, hone their skills under the supervision  
20 and training of a journeyman who is going to be on  
21 the project with them. And so I just -- I really --  
22 we are hoping that you guys will support this  
23 project because of all the things it means for your  
24 community.

25 Not just that it's going to be good for

1 the environment, not just because it increases the  
2 fire and protection plans, not just because of the  
3 million dollars to increase safety, or the  
4 additional revenues to the education system, but  
5 because it actually puts good-paying jobs -- it  
6 provides good-paying jobs for your community -- for  
7 our community.

8 And, you know, I just really want you  
9 guys, I really want to stress that to you guys that  
10 these jobs are -- are higher-than-average jobs and  
11 that they're going to provide a living wage and be  
12 able to propel our community forward.

13 So thank you. I'm open to any questions  
14 you guys have.

15 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Do we have any  
16 questions?

17 MITCHELL BECHTEL: Thank you, guys.

18 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, gentlemen.  
19 Okay. That's all the groups I have. So at this  
20 time we'd like to hear from individuals in the board  
21 chambers who support the project. Again, you have  
22 three minutes. And we're going to start with Buddy  
23 Cox followed by Doyle Radford.

24 EIHNARD DIAZ: Mr. Chairman, Buddy Cox  
25 could not be here, he had to go out. Something

1 happened work-wise, so...

2 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Okay. Is there  
3 someone who wants to speak for him? Seeing none,  
4 we'll move to Doyle Radford followed by Jason  
5 Chipley.

6 DOYLE RADFORD: Good afternoon, Respected  
7 Supervisors. I didn't think that looked like Buddy.  
8 I feel I should have --

9 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: I knew it wasn't Buddy  
10 when I saw him running up.

11 DOYLE RADFORD: I felt I should have  
12 brought a slide. I guess a good picture would be  
13 behind you is a slide of the local jobs and the tax  
14 dollars that are going to be created from not  
15 passing this project.

16 That being said, my name's Doyle Radford,  
17 Junior. I'm the business manager for Construction  
18 and General Laborers Local 185. We are the men and  
19 women in the orange building at 2210 Twin View  
20 Boulevard. You can see us off of I-5 there. We've  
21 been in the community for many, many years and it's  
22 my privilege to represent those men and women. And  
23 I'm here this afternoon to ask you to support this  
24 project.

25 We have over 5,000 members that we

1 represent throughout the north state. 530 of those  
2 members live right here in Shasta County. We've got  
3 a significant other in the surrounding counties, but  
4 right here in this county, that's a lot of local  
5 jobs that we can get them back from L.A. from the  
6 Bay Area.

7 I can tell you it's significant to have a  
8 job in your community where you're home at night to  
9 help your son's baseball team or your daughter's  
10 soccer team. And this project creates that  
11 opportunities for us, as well as, creating  
12 opportunities to bring in some of our future youth.  
13 Because at the end of the day, when we retire, we  
14 need to pass that torch on. We build your  
15 communities. You know, your bridges, roads. This  
16 is just another one of those projects that we're  
17 going to have the opportunity to build if you guys  
18 see it fit to pass.

19 I really see this as a unique project, not  
20 only to bring local jobs, local tax dollars. It  
21 doesn't have the traditional negative impacts.  
22 We're not -- we're not asking you guys to put in  
23 affordable housing up there. We're not asking you  
24 to build a correctional facility. We're looking to  
25 construct eco-friendly project that leaves the

1 northeastern part of our county majestic and  
2 beautiful. I mean, it is. I visit the Burney area  
3 quite regularly, and I'm really optimistic that  
4 we're going to do the right thing and get this  
5 passed. And I want to thank you guys for your --  
6 for your time and appreciate the consideration.

7 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Do we have  
8 any questions? Seeing none, thank you, sir.

9 DOYLE RADFORD: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Jason, followed by  
11 Marcus Partin.

12 JASON CHIPLEY: My name is Jason Chipley.  
13 I was born and raised in Shasta County. I'm a  
14 taxpayer and a registered voter and have raised my  
15 children here as well.

16 When I was a kid, my granddad taught me  
17 how to hunt and fish all over this county. We used  
18 to drive all the old logging roads sometimes just to  
19 see where they went. Now I'm about to be a  
20 grandfather myself, and I wouldn't feel safe taking  
21 my own grandkids out on those same logging roads  
22 that I used to travel with Granddad. The illegal  
23 marijuana grows, and the cartel and all the criminal  
24 elements that guard them is making this county  
25 almost unusable to the average citizen.

1           As a taxpayer, it makes me furious that I  
2     can no longer enjoy my county and pass on my family  
3     traditions to my grandchildren. I understand that  
4     it takes money and manpower to investigate and  
5     eradicate these illegal grows, and that is one of  
6     the reasons I support the Fountain Wind Project. As  
7     I understand it, \$1 million will be given directly  
8     to the Shasta County Sheriff's Office, and I would  
9     imagine that could go a long way to helping with  
10    this illegal marijuana situation.

11           I'm not sure how the taxes are split up  
12    between different municipalities, but as I see it,  
13    the County as a whole will see millions of dollars  
14    in new tax revenue over the next 30 years. And in  
15    the short term, up to three-and-a-half-million  
16    dollars in sales tax revenue.

17           This tax money that Shasta County  
18    residents like myself don't have to pay, but will  
19    see a huge benefit from in the form of road and  
20    bridge improvements, fire prevention, and school  
21    improvements, county and city worker recruitment and  
22    retention, and many other infrastructure needs that  
23    will improve our daily life.

24           In addition to the tax revenue the project  
25    will generate, there will be a huge trickle-down

1 effect from the construction of the project itself.  
2 All the local restaurants, motels, material  
3 suppliers, shipping companies, equipment dealers,  
4 parts houses, lumber yards, fuel and oil companies,  
5 et cetera, will see huge increase in sales. We have  
6 to remember this is the largest proposed  
7 construction project in Shasta County since Shasta  
8 Dam, and look what that did for the local  
9 communities.

10 In closing, I would like to thank all of  
11 you supervisors for your time and consideration of  
12 this project. I know that this is a decision that  
13 will affect this county for generations and  
14 shouldn't be taken lightly.

15 I also trust that after careful and  
16 well-thought-out consideration of all the facts, you  
17 will come to the right decision for Shasta County.  
18 Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, sir.  
20 Marcus, followed by Eihnard Diaz.

21 MARCUS PARTIN: Good afternoon, Chairman,  
22 Committee, Supervisors. My name is Marcus Partin.  
23 I'm a resident of Shasta County, as well as, a  
24 business owner over the last 20 years.

25 My interest in the Fountain Wind Project

1 comes from really a couple of different  
2 perspectives. One, looking at the economic benefits  
3 to the area as a whole and what that might do to us.  
4 And it seems like there's overwhelmingly positive  
5 evidence that from construction to operation,  
6 maintenance, employment, sales tax revenue, and  
7 financial support to both police and fire.

8           This June I attended the special Planning  
9 Commission meeting for an extended period held at  
10 Shasta College, like hundreds of others, to learn  
11 more about this project. And what really stood out  
12 was that economic development for the overall county  
13 that might take place.

14           Other than the obvious financial benefits  
15 to the community, I looked at the project based upon  
16 a kind of a unique perspective and background of the  
17 industry as I got as a member of the Redding  
18 Electric Utility Commission where I served as vice  
19 chairman between 2013 and 2015.

20           As a commissioner, the various aspects of  
21 the powers, sources of power-generation cost,  
22 planning, and especially regulation were reviewed.  
23 It was an interesting process that started with  
24 trying to get a handle on seven pages of acronyms.  
25 Very complex business.



1           But what really stuck out to me and it was  
2 what was both the current and approved being  
3 implemented, and the proposed potential regulation  
4 that was coming in to California and how that was  
5 going to affect prices in the future that we have to  
6 pay. And I saw some of that presented earlier  
7 today.

8           And what has to be included in what's  
9 called clean energy, which didn't include  
10 hydroelectric power, but what we're seeing today,  
11 and where even Redding Electric Utility would buy  
12 from other less-expensive areas for cost savings.

13           With the visual impacts that are  
14 mitigated, my final concern was insurance that the  
15 financial resources would be in place for  
16 potentially removal by bond. You know, I'm a Bay  
17 Area former transplant, some 20 years ago, and I saw  
18 some of those windmill facilities that were left and  
19 didn't have that in place. So that was important to  
20 me, and now that that's mitigated, I think that  
21 that -- that solved that problem for me.

22           I guess what it means to me is we can take  
23 advantage of the benefits, that if not in Shasta  
24 County it's going to go to some other area within  
25 the State.

1           With the proposed modifications and  
2 conditions within the application, it seems clear  
3 that it's in the best interest of the county and its  
4 residents, and I urge your support. Thank you.

5           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, sir.

6 Eihnard followed by Corkey Harmon.

7           EIHNARD DIAZ: Mr. Chairman, Members of  
8 the Board, my name is Eihnard Diaz; I'm not Buddy  
9 Cox.

10           I stand before you -- I'm going to play  
11 two roles. Originally, I was just going to speak to  
12 you as a member of this community that I lived here  
13 for 40 years. I submitted to you a letter on  
14 October 21st identifying all the benefits of the  
15 project. Heeding the chairman's direction, I'm not  
16 going to go over all the economic benefits. I think  
17 they've been spelled out by the Applicant and by  
18 other people.

19           But I do want to stress that one of the  
20 things that I identified in the letter that many of  
21 you identified issues; such as, improving,  
22 diversifying, creating a vibrant economy, improving  
23 public safety. A lot of issues you raised as issues  
24 that you wanted to address as members of the  
25 supervisors; improve County services, generate

1 revenues to address social problems. They're all in  
2 my letter to you.

3 I basically summarize my letter to you by  
4 asking you that you have the vision, that you  
5 consider the overall benefits of the project that it  
6 provides to our 180,000 county residents.

7 As supervisors, you have an opportunity  
8 with this project to translate your political  
9 foresight into concrete actions that will benefit  
10 the overall public good. So please join me and many  
11 others in supporting approval of the project.

12 Now, I'd like to put on another hat and  
13 that's as a representative for ConnectGEN as a  
14 planner.

15 And I would like to take this opportunity  
16 to address Supervisor Jones and the questions that  
17 you asked Mr. Woltag with regards to the question  
18 surrounding the appeal.

19 I am the one that raised the issue. In my  
20 40 years here as a practicing planner, interim  
21 planning director for the City of Shasta Lake  
22 regarding Knauf, working on Wheelabrator, working on  
23 various subdivisions, commercial and industrial  
24 developments, many of which raised a tremendous  
25 amount of public controversy.

1           In my 40 years, I have never been to a  
2 Planning Commission meeting where you had a Staff  
3 Report that 100 percent supported the project,  
4 identified all the issues that had been raised, and  
5 how this project addressed those issues. There were  
6 experts in the audience, Fire Chief Gouvea and his  
7 staff, there were four people from CAL FIRE, not one  
8 question was ever asked of them over that 10-hour  
9 period.

10           Yet the opponents, their opposition, their  
11 CalPilots Association got up and started talking  
12 about it. But the Planning Commission did not do  
13 what you're doing. You didn't turn and say, Can you  
14 respond to that? So I want to tell you -- I want to  
15 share with you that's one of the reasons I've never  
16 seen in my 40 years over a 10-hour period where not  
17 one question was asked of staff or the staff  
18 experts, and that is one of the reasons why part of  
19 the appeal.

20           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, sir.

21           EIHNARD DIAZ: I'd be more than happy to  
22 answer any questions.

23           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Do we have any  
24 questions?

25           EIHNARD DIAZ: Thank you.

1                   CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Corkey  
2 followed by Randall Smith.

3                   CORKEY HARMON: Good afternoon. I think  
4 most of you are familiar with me. I've met all of  
5 you and know you.

6                   The one thing I thought I would talk about  
7 just a little bit. I'm a -- I'm a business owner  
8 here in town. Stimpel-Wiebelhaus, Mountain Gate  
9 Quarry, White Rock Trucking. So we deal with  
10 reclamation with the quarry operation, and I think  
11 that it needs to be pointed out that the risk for  
12 Shasta County is -- Eihnard, am I correct saying  
13 this is being bonded just kind of like a quarry  
14 operation? Is Eihnard still in here?

15                   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You need to address  
16 your response to the chair.

17                   CORKEY HARMON: I think this is important  
18 that everybody understands that there's really no  
19 risk to the County, because they got to put up  
20 bonds.

21                   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Security bond for  
22 the decommissioning of the towers.

23                   CORKEY HARMON: Right. Just like a quarry  
24 operator does. If they go bankrupt, they disappear  
25 in 30 years, 40 years, those bonds are in place and

1 they cover the cost to reclaim. So the -- so the  
2 risk to the County is minimal. This is a huge  
3 project. I don't have -- I don't have any skin in  
4 the game other than I'm a contractor and I have  
5 provide -- we've got about 45 people work for us.

6 We're always looking for jobs. We got to  
7 bid them, competitive bid just like this one will be  
8 competitive bid. We're hoping that you approve this  
9 project, you know, based on the fact that it's --  
10 there's nothing negative about it, in my mind, for  
11 the County. It's all positive income, job  
12 producing.

13 And, like I said, the risk to the County  
14 is -- is pretty much zero in my mind. And I think  
15 that the people that live in Round Mountain that  
16 experienced the Fountain Fire, this is going to put  
17 a fire break all the way across the back of Round  
18 Mountain. Access, we all know what that's like.  
19 You got to go in there and bulldoze roads. There's  
20 going to be roads that access all this up there. If  
21 I live in Round Mountain, I would like to see this  
22 project.

23 I don't live in Round Mountain. I do have  
24 property up there, and we do provide a lot of  
25 operators, laborers, materials, and this is all

1 beneficial to the County. What is it, 50 million in  
2 income in the next 40 years or so? I don't have all  
3 them details, your guy does. I've seen them. I'm  
4 not here to repeat them, you guys have all heard it.  
5 But I hope that you consider this as a positive  
6 project and that you pass this unanimously and I  
7 appreciate the time. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, sir.

9 Dr. Smith followed by Dave Kirk.

10 DR. RANDALL SMITH: Mr. Chairman, Members  
11 of the Board, Staff and fellow citizens. Thank you  
12 for this opportunity.

13 My name is Randall Smith. I have resided  
14 in Shasta County since 1974. And I am a retired  
15 medical doctor. You have read my letter written in  
16 June after the Shasta County Planning Commission  
17 denied the Fountain Wind Project.

18 The project has my full support. Even  
19 before substantial amendments, this project deserved  
20 favorable consideration. It is the right thing to  
21 be doing for the resource, for our economy, and for  
22 the future.

23 As a bird-watching, tree-hugging,  
24 hard-working resource recovery volunteer, I am  
25 frankly dismayed by the opposition to this

1 environmentally sustainable, fire-danger reducing,  
2 access-enhancing, lightening-grounding, full-time  
3 job-making facility and tax-generating proposal,  
4 which we are so fortunate to have next to a working  
5 similar project operating without a problem for a  
6 decade.

7           Additionally, I pose this editorial query  
8 for you and your careful contribution:

9           Why is it that a county which once  
10 endorsed change, like the Central Pacific Railroad,  
11 encourage extraction industries like the now  
12 Superfund site at Iron Mountain, allowed timber  
13 harvest in amounts that made a still-existing  
14 sawdust pile the size of the Superdome, tolerated  
15 the smelter smoke wars for 20 years, was grateful  
16 for Shasta Dam, and helped build numerous highways  
17 and bridges. Why is it that that same place today  
18 has such vigorous opposition to a motherhood and  
19 apple pie project like Fountain Wind?

20           Is it possible that we're holding hostage  
21 this newcomer for sins of the past? How can it be  
22 that something so sustainable, environmentally  
23 friendly, economically rewarding, and non-carbon  
24 energy producing, can be so maligned after  
25 generations of profound and lasting negative



1 effects? Please do not allow this wonderful  
2 opportunity go the way of Wal-Mart's regional  
3 Distribution Center now located in Red Bluff after  
4 being denied here.

5 Please reject the narrow and selfish pleas  
6 which sent 3M away from a 100-year needed aggregate  
7 plan on property owned and anticipated for the  
8 project since the end of World War II.

9 We must reject the green mail and  
10 misguided interests which have delayed Costco a new  
11 home for several years, and which have doubled the  
12 cost of a wellness center and cancer outpatient  
13 building which will finally enhance public open  
14 space needing a 24/7 presence along the river in  
15 Redding.

16 By your leadership, Shasta County can  
17 counter the image of a backward and negative  
18 business climate.

19 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, sir.

20 DR. RANDALL SMITH: Thank you for your  
21 careful consideration.

22 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you.

23 SUPERVISOR JONES: Hey, Dr. Smith. I did  
24 have one question for you, Mr. Smith.

25 First, I'd like to thank you for all your

1 work that you've done inside the City of Redding on  
2 environmental issues. You have a long legacy, so I  
3 appreciate that.

4 You did talk about environmental effects.  
5 You are aware of the number of birds killed by these  
6 turbines, are you not?

7 DR. RANDALL SMITH: I'm aware that there's  
8 been a substantial reduction in the amount captured  
9 by these turbines from the original and initial  
10 small-size, fast-spinning to today's large  
11 fly-through. And the amount of damage and count to  
12 me is not substantial with regard to the benefits of  
13 the project overall and environmental sustainable  
14 fashion.

15 SUPERVISOR JONES: All right. Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, sir.

17 Dave Kirk followed by Andy Main.

18 DAVE KIRK: Good afternoon, Board. Thank  
19 you for your time. My name is Dave Kirk. I'm a  
20 life-long citizen of Shasta County.

21 My grandfather came here and worked on  
22 Shasta Dam in the early stages. And as a young man  
23 I grew up with the expectations of hopefully working  
24 on a project like that someday, and that never  
25 really happened. I grew up working on a small

1 pieces of a pie like that. Now we have an  
2 opportunity for a large project like this, not only  
3 for our -- my grandkids to look forward to something  
4 like that for the future, but also for the green  
5 energy.

6 We are coming into the green energy era  
7 and we are at the forefront of being able to  
8 potentially have the opportunity for a project to be  
9 the very first in this area for green energy. And  
10 what better project than this one.

11 Gen-Tech [sic] has done an amazing job of  
12 addressing the community's concerns. I believe  
13 they've addressed every one of them. You know, we  
14 go back to the Planning Commission. It did get  
15 voted down in the Planning Commission, but I think  
16 there was a lot of unanswered questions, and here's  
17 our opportunity to ask those questions.

18 A lot of the concerns of the community  
19 have been answered by Gen-Tech [sic] and I think you  
20 guys hold a responsibility and have the opportunity  
21 here today to ask the ones that weren't asked and  
22 get the answers to those before you move forward  
23 with voting no or yes on this project.

24 As far as the work -- I mean, we -- we  
25 have a lot of average-paying jobs in this community.

1 This is going to create several high-paying jobs  
2 with benefits. And as far as the -- what they say  
3 only 12 long-term jobs, but as many spoke before me  
4 that are better speakers, have said those long-term  
5 jobs of 12 create up to 15 or 20 long-term jobs when  
6 that economic dollar trickles down.

7           And I think that's also -- 12 long-term  
8 jobs at better than \$100,000 a year in that  
9 community, these aren't skilled jobs. These are  
10 jobs that can be taught. These are 12 people in  
11 that community that can potentially work on this  
12 project. Not only on the project, but the long-term  
13 positions in this project. And I think that's huge  
14 for Shasta County, not to mention the long-term tax  
15 revenue.

16           We haven't seen a project like this as  
17 many have spoke since Shasta Dam. Where are we  
18 going to get that kind of tax revenue going forward.  
19 And, again, it's a green energy project that we have  
20 the opportunity to be a part of. And I think us and  
21 Shasta County and you as the supervisors need to  
22 really look this project over and ask more questions  
23 if needed before, you know, considering or not  
24 considering this project. Thank you, for your time.

25           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, sir.

1           Andy Main, followed by Bill Walker.

2           ANDY MAIN: Good afternoon, Chairman,  
3 Members of the Board. My name is Andy Main, and I'm  
4 the owner of two companies that have been providing  
5 Internet service in Redding area since 1997. Prior  
6 to that, my family operated sawmills in Shasta and  
7 Lassen County that managed our forests, shipped  
8 lumber all over the nation, and generated  
9 electricity for PG&E.

10           Last year, ConnectGEN asked me to study  
11 the cost of bringing high-speed Internet to homes in  
12 the Round Mountain, Montgomery Creek and Big Bend  
13 area. I've not signed an agreement with them. They  
14 haven't paid me a dime.

15           During the 1980s, I built a  
16 seven-and-a-half-megawatt power plant that used  
17 waste products of a sawmill to generate electricity  
18 for PG&E. I spent a year with the California Energy  
19 Commission discovering ways to develop more sources  
20 of alternative energy that reduced our needs for  
21 fossil fuels that pollute our air and contribute to  
22 climate change. I remain committed to helping solve  
23 our growing energy needs responsibly. Fountain Wind  
24 does that.

25           During the pandemic more than 55 million

1 students moved to online learning. 12 million  
2 students were without Internet access altogether.  
3 There's federal money available for Internet assess,  
4 but the amount of red tape to get that money is  
5 onerous.

6 Private industry is needed to build  
7 infrastructure to the areas that are underserved.  
8 There's a federal mandate that all people have  
9 access to a hundred megabytes per second of  
10 high-speed Internet. The Round Mountain area  
11 regularly reports to us speeds less than 1.5.

12 Like electricity, Internet service has  
13 become a basic need. Like the water we drink, the  
14 phones we use, the air we breathe; access to the  
15 Internet is vital. Without it we have no access for  
16 education, knowledge, entertainment, and  
17 communication resources. At ShastaBeam, we've  
18 dedicated ourselves to providing Internet services  
19 to those people at one-third the price of comparable  
20 satellite services.

21 Rural Internet services require that we  
22 put up towers to beam services to rooftops. As some  
23 of you know, I worked for years with the County  
24 staff to develop a new zoning ordinance to allow for  
25 construction of towers that bring Internet to remote

1 areas of Shasta County.

2 Shasta County was the first county in the  
3 State of California to pass such an ordinance in  
4 support of fixed wireless Internet services. I  
5 thank you again for your support in that effort.

6 Developing Internet services in remote  
7 areas of the county is expensive. Small companies  
8 like ours need larger companies to assist in  
9 providing the capital to keep up with the  
10 ever-changing technology. Companies like Charter,  
11 AT&T and Frontier are not upgrading their Internet  
12 services in rural areas. Getting high speed to  
13 rural areas is left for companies like ShastaBeam.

14 ConnectGEN learned that one of the  
15 greatest needs in the community was access to better  
16 Internet. They decided a local company was needed  
17 to help with this. They've committed at least  
18 \$200,000 to bring in better Internet. ConnectGEN is  
19 the best hope for the community to get the necessary  
20 infrastructure built so everyone can get better  
21 Internet services.

22 As supervisors, you are called on to make  
23 difficult decisions that impact the county's future.  
24 As you did when you approved the new tower  
25 ordinance, I'm asking you to once again use your

1 wisdom, vision, and courage in deciding in favor of  
2 the Fountain Wind Project to have Shasta County do  
3 its part to bring the needed energy resources to our  
4 nation and better Internet to the Fountain Wind  
5 Project area. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, sir.

7 Bill Walker, followed by William Hultgren.

8 BILL WALKER: Chairman and Members of the  
9 Board, my name is Bill Walker. I live between Bella  
10 Vista and Palo Cedro and I worked as a planner for  
11 Shasta County for 30 years until I retired in 2018.  
12 I was the lead planner on the Hatchet Ridge Wind  
13 Project and was involved in the early stages of  
14 Fountain Wind. The views I express today are my  
15 own.

16 There are many reasons to support this  
17 project, including three-and-a-half million dollars  
18 in Shasta County sales taxes, \$50 million in County  
19 property taxes, and almost \$3 million in grants to  
20 the Sheriff's Department and other County  
21 organizations.

22 But most importantly, we need this project  
23 to prevent more destructive climate change in Shasta  
24 County and throughout the world. This past year  
25 we've seen a lot of extreme whether events



1 worldwide, including hurricanes, flooding,  
2 heatwaves, drought, and unprecedented wildfires. In  
3 our county, we've had severe drought, and last week  
4 we saw extreme local rainfall and flooding.

5           The only credible explanation for all of  
6 this is climate change, which is happening today and  
7 will continue to be very destructive unless you take  
8 action to change more of the power sources in our  
9 county to renewable energy. We need a combination  
10 of many different energy solutions to prevent more  
11 climate change, but you should know that of the 100  
12 most effective solutions for climate change, wind  
13 turbines are ranked No. 2.

14           The project opponents claim that this  
15 project isn't needed and California already meets  
16 its renewable energy needs. This is not true. We  
17 know that we currently import one-third of our  
18 electricity from out of state, and more than  
19 one-third of our electricity is nonrenewable.

20           The Pit River Tribe has opposed this  
21 project, which would be located in their ancestral  
22 homeland, and I respect their position. However,  
23 climate change is causing serious damage and  
24 destruction of the homelands of indigenous people  
25 throughout the world. For example, in Micronesia in

1 the Pacific, native islands are being flooded by sea  
2 level rise and will soon be uninhabitable. Climate  
3 change is affecting crops and food production  
4 throughout the world. Drought is already reducing  
5 our beef and grain production in the Great Plains.

6 Climate change is making our county hotter  
7 and drier with more severe wildfires and loss of  
8 lives and homes. Weeks or months of families  
9 breathing healthy -- unhealthy smoky air. Very low  
10 water levels in our streams and in Shasta Lake and  
11 water districts are running out of water. Bella  
12 Vista district told me the other day they're running  
13 out of water.

14 So I ask you, please consider the  
15 difficult world that our children and grandchildren  
16 will have to live in and the serious struggles they  
17 will face if you fail to act now.

18 Please approve the Fountain Wind Project.  
19 Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, sir.

21 William Hultgren followed by Ruth Rhodes.

22 WILLIAM HULTGREN: My name is William  
23 Hultgren. And as a California professional forester  
24 since 1995, I've had the privilege of working on the  
25 lands in question where the Fountain Wind Project is

1 going to go.

2 As you know, in 1992, the Fountain Fire  
3 destroyed 64,000 acres of land in a matter of  
4 probably two or three days. And, in addition to  
5 that, Roseburg lost about 44,000 of those acres. In  
6 the intervening time between 1992 and 1998, I had  
7 the privilege of helping to reforest all  
8 44,000 acres of those land with 5 million trees.  
9 It's a lot of work, but as you drive between Burney  
10 and Redding, you see the fruit of that labor.

11 I also noted that people are appreciative  
12 of the fact that they have a forest there, where in  
13 a lot of other areas the lands weren't replanted  
14 because in California replanting is not required  
15 after a fire.

16 So in this particular case, the land there  
17 and all those trees have been about 90 percent  
18 thinned, and they've already been thinned at least  
19 once. But, doggone it, the trees are growing so  
20 darn well, that we're going to have to go through  
21 and thin them again. I retired about two years ago  
22 as the resource manager for Roseburg, and during  
23 that time I see what it costs to manage this land.  
24 And we love to see the trees and that vacant land  
25 there in place and not being risk toward subdivision

1 or development. So in order for a landowner to be  
2 able to hold onto that land, he has to have -- has  
3 some prospect of some income during that time.

4 Now, they're not going to get another  
5 stick of wood off of the Fountain Fire until those  
6 trees mature in another 30 years. So answer me  
7 this: How are we going to encourage that landowner  
8 to hold onto that land? And by allowing this wind  
9 project, which is very well-thought-out, that's  
10 going to permit an income stream to the landowner  
11 who will allow them to keep that as forest land.  
12 This is a compatible use, it's a good idea, and I  
13 would very much encourage the supervisors to approve  
14 it. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, sir.

16 Ruth Rhodes followed by Mark Mezzano.

17 RUTH RHODES: Board of Supervisors, thank  
18 you for the opportunity to speak with you today and  
19 all of you here in attendance, for some great  
20 information presented to you today, so I'm not going  
21 to get into those details.

22 I speak to you as a resident in Shasta  
23 County since I moved here in 1986. I'm a resident  
24 of District 5, and I've worked in the timber  
25 industry, and I'm currently a postal worker. So I

1 get to see what's happening with our economy and  
2 changes, because I lost my job when the timber  
3 industry fell apart, basically, in the '90s.

4 I also was driving through that Fountain  
5 Fire area before and after the fire, and the effect  
6 on the communities of Burney, Round Mountain,  
7 Montgomery Creek and the surrounding communities  
8 that are up there in the woods, you don't really see  
9 them until you fly over at night and all the lights.

10 So I am considerate of the residents there  
11 of the impact of having more turbines there;  
12 however, considering the great geographic area that  
13 Shasta County encompasses, we're building a  
14 project -- or hopefully building a project right  
15 next to a farm that already exists, and that is an  
16 area where we're capitalizing on free resources  
17 given by nature, the wind. And it provides a  
18 tremendous resource for us to transition this county  
19 economically.

20 When the timber industry was in full  
21 swing, we had net income into this community. And  
22 we have suffered since decline in the '90s of this  
23 industry that I was involved in, and many of us had  
24 to transition to other jobs, and now, what, we're  
25 supported by retail? Really? Is that going to

1 sustain us?

2           So we need to diversify. In addition, as  
3 a county, we need to participate with the rest of  
4 the world in supplying these clean resources and  
5 doing our percentage to participate in it. So  
6 whether the energy is used here or somewhere else --  
7 I know you asked, Patrick Jones, isn't used here.  
8 Well, you can only contract with what exists, so  
9 they went to Washington and they contracted. I've  
10 watched City of Redding also trying to find these  
11 renewables, so they can meet the State mandates.

12           So we are part of the greater grid that  
13 it's going to go into where somebody's going to  
14 contract for it. Whether we pay for it or somewhere  
15 else pays for it, it all contributes to the economy  
16 of our area, and I hope that this long meeting today  
17 that this is the culmination point of the decision  
18 making for this project for future Shasta County;  
19 \$50 million over 30 years.

20           I really hope that you will support this  
21 project and move it forward, because I do believe  
22 it's in the best interest of all the residents of  
23 Shasta County. Thank you.

24           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you.

25           Mark Mezzano, followed by Michael

1 Dacquisto.

2 MARK MEZZANO: Mr. Chair, Honorable  
3 Members of the Board of Supervisors. My name is  
4 Mark Mezzano, and I'm coming before you today as a  
5 citizen of Shasta County.

6 I reviewed the Staff Report, the  
7 Environmental Impact Report prepared and approved by  
8 your staff. They're the experts, certainly not me,  
9 but they are, and they've determined the project  
10 complies with the County Planning codes and the  
11 ordinances. Without question, I see it as an  
12 opportunity to bring immense benefit to Shasta  
13 County and communities of Round Mountain, Montgomery  
14 Creek and Big Bend.

15 ConnectGEN has exercised diligence and  
16 responded to all of the concerns as they relate to  
17 road development, stream crossings, and the impacts  
18 of habitat and wildlife.

19 Now, at your direction, Mr. Chair, I've  
20 eliminated a lot of my remarks because they've  
21 already been said, but there are a couple of things  
22 I'd like to highlight. The two-year project  
23 build-out equates to 200 jobs. I think that's  
24 important during the construction, and then 12  
25 permanent jobs upon its completion.

1           ConnectGEN is well-versed in this type of  
2 industry and their field estimators come up with  
3 this \$50 million in revenue for our county for the  
4 next 30 to 35 years, and three-and-a-half million  
5 dollars in sales tax revenue. That's huge when you  
6 look at the Shasta County budget.

7           One question was asked, and I'll just  
8 touch on this. Based on my research, the question  
9 was asked if we would use the electricity or would  
10 it go somewhere else. It's my understanding that  
11 the approval process requires that the energy  
12 generated from this project be used in Shasta County  
13 before it goes somewhere else. That's my  
14 understanding.

15           They also talk a little bit about the bond  
16 project. Well, that protects us. They have -- as  
17 part of their approval process have to secure a bond  
18 by a third-party organization that's going to  
19 determine the cost of mitigating the project at the  
20 end of its term. That project has to be reevaluated  
21 every five years, according to what I've researched.  
22 And that protects us here in Shasta County.

23           ConnectGEN is offering a \$200,000 donation  
24 to the ShastaBeam to expand Internet access in that  
25 area. Given today's dependency, you've heard it



1 before, on the Internet, I view this as an  
2 opportunity to improve the quality of life in this  
3 rural area.

4 I would also like to say that as a former  
5 sergeant of the California Highway Patrol assigned  
6 to the Burney area, I learned firsthand the need for  
7 additional support for the sheriff's department. It  
8 was common practice to provide assistance to  
9 deputies on calls for general law enforcement  
10 ultimately contributing to the successful outcome of  
11 volatile situations.

12 I offer the concept of providing  
13 \$1 million to the sheriff's department to be  
14 representative of their commitment to our community.  
15 I'm confident you chose a difficult road of  
16 government service because you have a genuine desire  
17 to make life better for your constituents.

18 Why else -- I got to ask you this: Why  
19 else would you subject yourself to the  
20 dissatisfaction of those that think less of others  
21 and more of themselves?

22 As elected officials you often see the  
23 value in projects benefiting our communities and yet  
24 there are always those who disagree. As Board  
25 members, you are charged with ensuring the

1 communities you serve are the recipients of sound  
2 judgment when entertaining opportunities destined to  
3 improve the quality of life for all concerned.

4 In closing, thank you for your time. I'm  
5 confident your decision will be in the best interest  
6 of those in Shasta County and those who live and  
7 work here. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, sir.  
9 Michael Dacquisto.

10 SUPERVISOR JONES: Chairman?

11 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Go ahead.

12 SUPERVISOR JONES: I have no question for  
13 Mr. Mezzano, but I do have a question for Henry.  
14 Could I have him up?

15 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Sure.

16 SUPERVISOR JONES: Not for you,  
17 Mr. Mezzano. I don't trust your research, sorry.

18 HENRY WOLTAG: Yes, sir.

19 SUPERVISOR JONES: So do you have a  
20 contract for this power in the City of Redding or in  
21 Shasta County?

22 HENRY WOLTAG: We have submitted pricing  
23 and they have the opportunity to purchase from this  
24 project if they so choose.

25 SUPERVISOR JONES: But you have no

1 contract?

2 HENRY WOLTAG: We do have a contract for  
3 sale of the electricity.

4 SUPERVISOR JONES: For sale, but you have  
5 no contract?

6 HENRY WOLTAG: We can't sign a contract  
7 until we have a final permit.

8 SUPERVISOR JONES: Thank you.

9 HENRY WOLTAG: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Anything else, sir?  
11 All right. Michael Dacquisto.

12 MICHAEL DACQUISTO: Mr. Chairman and Board  
13 Members. Thank you for taking this opportunity to  
14 let me speak.

15 For Mr. Jones, my understanding is from  
16 Mr. Tippin that there is no contract. There may be  
17 a contract, but it's something that would have to be  
18 worked out in the future. As you know, or probably  
19 remember from being on the city council, there's a  
20 lot of renewable energy requirements that the City  
21 has to meet. And I think they're doing okay so far,  
22 but this would be just another arrow in the quiver  
23 in the event they needed to do it. And they buy and  
24 sell power all the time instantaneously, so where  
25 the power comes from could be anywhere in the

1 country, I believe, is how they do it.

2 But my name is Michael Dacquisto. We  
3 moved here in 1994. I'm elected to the city  
4 council, but I'm not here in my -- my views are my  
5 personal views, not the city council's views.

6 I understand both sides of this, and I'm  
7 glad I'm not on the Board of Supervisors at the  
8 moment to have to decide it. But as I look at the  
9 job of government can be distilled down into a  
10 relatively simple thing. It's dollars in and  
11 dollars out. And this project provides an  
12 opportunity for dollars in. Where the dollars go  
13 out has been laid out. I won't go into all that,  
14 but it provides an opportunity that the supervisors  
15 can approve.

16 And I think the other issue is, when I ran  
17 for city council and I think a lot of people in the  
18 room and I think all of you up here would agree, the  
19 job is to help the community. We have community  
20 problems; not city problems, not county problems,  
21 not -- we do have some state problems, but the city  
22 and the county.

23 And this provides an opportunity, if you  
24 approve it, to benefit a wide variety of county  
25 resources. It benefits the schools, it benefits the

1 city, it benefits the county, it benefits the  
2 construction jobs. And you can pick at it -- and  
3 there are some reasons to oppose it and I understand  
4 those, but I think at the end of the day that's  
5 really the benefit to the community and you have an  
6 opportunity to provide that and I hope you support  
7 the project and approve it. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, sir. Stan  
9 Green followed by Art Frolli.

10 STAN GREEN: Good afternoon. My name is  
11 Stan, Stan Green. And I'm a 50-year member in the  
12 community. And I -- and I'd like to invite you guys  
13 to join me in supporting this alternative energy.  
14 That's all I got. Thanks.

15 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, sir.  
16 Art Frolli.

17 ART FROLLI: Hello, my name is Art Frolli.  
18 I'm a resident of Shasta County. I'm a transplant  
19 here from the Bay Area, like so many others in the  
20 audience here. I've lived up here 15 years, love  
21 this county.

22 I think it's very important at times when  
23 we're looking at nationally we're cutting back on  
24 oil reserves, on finding our own energy through that  
25 source, that we look seriously at other sources.

1 These windmills are another source. They're going  
2 to be the wave of the future, and we need to  
3 participate in that. It brings good jobs, short  
4 term and long term into the community. It raises  
5 revenue in the community, and an additional power  
6 source in the community as well.

7 I'm just hoping that we can move forward  
8 on this, and I would ask that you strongly consider  
9 it. Especially with the changes that have been  
10 made, the compromises that have been made on the  
11 sizes of the windmills, number of the windmills.  
12 And we take a look at all and take it all into  
13 consideration and pass this project. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, sir.  
15 That's all the cards I have.

16 Do you have a comment, sir?

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

18 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: So at this time we're  
19 going to hear from people -- groups located in our  
20 overflow room. And the same rules will apply. If  
21 it's a group, they'll have 15 minutes in support.

22 Do we have anyone?

23 THE CLERK: Chair, I can make this really  
24 easy for you. We do not have any public requests to  
25 speak at our alternate site.

1           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: So we don't have any  
2 individuals to speak either?

3           THE CLERK: No.

4           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Okay. So we will now  
5 hear from groups and persons calling in on the  
6 telephone concerning the project both in support and  
7 in opposition. Each group will have up to 15  
8 minutes to make their presentation. Any  
9 individuals -- any individual speakers calling in on  
10 the telephone will each have three minutes to  
11 address the Board. All such telephonic comments  
12 shall be received during this time. After this  
13 time, the phone lines will be closed and there will  
14 be no further telephone comments to be received.

15           So anyone out there that wants to make a  
16 call, whether you're in support or in opposition,  
17 now would be the time. Thank you.

18           Stefany, I'll hand it over to you.

19           THE CLERK: Thank you, Chair. At the  
20 moment, we do have one caller. I would ask that  
21 after that caller we give maybe about 30 seconds to  
22 just make up for the delay on the livestream.

23           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Sure. Copy that.

24           THE CLERK: Okay. And those staff running  
25 the live call-ins, please feel free to go ahead.

1 TRACY: Caller ending in 4618 is in  
2 opposition and is speaking on behalf of a group.

3 You have 15 minutes. Please, go ahead.

4 (From 3:04:05 to 3:48:09 voices are  
5 inaudible and could not be transcribed.)

6 THE CLERK: Thank you. The time is up for  
7 this speaker. If we can cue up the next caller if  
8 we have another caller on the line. Please confirm  
9 if there's more callers.

10 Are there any other callers on the line at  
11 this time?

12 TRACY: No, there are no more callers at  
13 this time.

14 THE CLERK: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Okay. Keep the phone  
16 lines open because we have three more cards that  
17 showed up for -- in support, so while we're doing in  
18 chamber, we'll allow people to call in and then  
19 we'll check when we're done.

20 So we got Korey Wygal followed by Brian  
21 Sellers.

22 KOREY WYGAL: Good morning. My name is  
23 Korey Wygal. I'm here in support of the Fountain  
24 Wind Project. While I am currently not a resident  
25 of Shasta County, I was for the better part of 26



1 years. I continue to work in Shasta County. My  
2 children go to school in Shasta County. And I spend  
3 my hard-earned money in Shasta County. The reason I  
4 support this project is based on the economic impact  
5 another large construction project had on a  
6 different rural Shasta County community.

7 I was part of the Antlers Bridge project  
8 replacement in Lakehead. I oversaw all equipment  
9 and worked with the county on keeping and  
10 maintaining waste from said equipment entering the  
11 environment on site.

12 In order for that project to progress, we  
13 relied heavily on the local community for everyday  
14 needs. What I saw was local businesses booming.  
15 The project will no doubt bring a large influx of  
16 money to local businesses in the immediate vicinity.  
17 It will also trickle out all over the county as  
18 local workers take that money and spend it where  
19 they live.

20 Projects like these are happening all over  
21 the country. Workers that live in this county  
22 deserve the opportunity to work in this county and  
23 spend their hard-earned money in this county.

24 Infrastructure and renewable energy are  
25 building a better future for California families.

1 This project is a step in that direction.

2 Thank you for your time.

3 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Brian  
4 Sellars followed by Ben Scott.

5 BRIAN SELLARS: How's it going? My name  
6 is Brian Sellars. I was born and raised in Fall  
7 River and McArthur. Had to move up here for work  
8 purposes, and I work construction down here. And I  
9 know that if this project does go through, it's  
10 definitely going to help out people looking for  
11 jobs. And I just think it's a good deal for money  
12 in the community up there, and -- I don't know. I  
13 would just like to see it go through. Being from up  
14 there, I know that Burney, Fall River, McArthur,  
15 they're little towns. They need as much help as  
16 they can get. And that's all I got. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. And Ben  
18 Scott followed by our last speaker in chamber,  
19 Anthony Debem.

20 BEN SCOTT: Good evening. My name is Ben  
21 Scott. I'm a resident of this county. Also I'm  
22 here for Operating Engineers, Brothers and Sisters,  
23 on behalf of them.

24 Basically, I don't know if we're going to  
25 get any energy out of the project, we may. It's

1 probably a taxpayer-funded project most likely. And  
2 if we don't get it here in this county, it may go  
3 somewhere else and we'll get nothing. Either we get  
4 something or we get nothing. We either get the  
5 people working there, bringing home the money,  
6 paying into the communities, or we don't get  
7 nothing.

8           They did make a lot of changes though.  
9 They got fire breaks going on up there. It's going  
10 to help that ridge. There's a video somewhere you  
11 can see they scaled back the project where you can't  
12 see it from the towns and stuff. It doesn't look so  
13 bad. Check it out a little bit more.

14           My wife -- my wife's totally against it --  
15 or was. She, "I don't want to see more of that  
16 stuff up there." I said, "Look, you want me to go  
17 work in the Bay Area?" It's kind of a selfish thing  
18 for me and operating engineers, right? Because it's  
19 our work. But then, again, it's going to come back  
20 to the county. Because our paychecks stay here, you  
21 know. If people don't want the project up there,  
22 private people -- it is private property up there.  
23 If you don't want it, buy the property and don't put  
24 it up there. Other than that, put it up there.  
25 It's up to you. All right, thanks. That's it.

1           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. And the  
2 final in-chambers speaker Anthony Debem.

3           ANTHONY DEBEM: Hello, my name is Anthony  
4 Debem. I'm a resident of the county. And I am in  
5 favor of the project.

6           I think it's going to put quite a few  
7 people to work. It's going to put some money into  
8 our county, boost the economy up some. And, you  
9 know, like Ben had stated, we get clean energy and  
10 that's clean energy. And I think it would be a  
11 plus, especially for our workforce here in the  
12 county. So it's a go for me.

13           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. So staff,  
14 I'll ask do we have anybody in the overflow room  
15 that would like to speak in support?

16           THE CLERK: Just one moment, Chair, while  
17 I confirm.

18           Chair, there are no requests to speak at  
19 our alternate site and there are also no callers on  
20 the line.

21           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Okay. So with that we  
22 will close the phone calls, so no one will be able  
23 to make a call-in in opposition. This is only time  
24 we'll be doing the phone calls. I want to make sure  
25 everybody understands that, so I'm going to wait

1 about 30 seconds to see if anybody's racing to their  
2 phone right now to call in.

3 Anybody call in?

4 TRACY: Chairman, we have no additional  
5 callers.

6 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Okay. So thank you,  
7 and we are going to recess now for 30 minutes to  
8 reboot our system. And then when we come back, we  
9 will be entertaining people in opposition in kind of  
10 the same process. So thank you.

11 (Recess taken.)

12 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you all. We'll  
13 get back into session now.

14 And now we're going to hear from those in  
15 opposition to the project. And the first ones up  
16 will be groups, and I'm awaiting the list. And  
17 these will be for up to 15 minutes. Maybe she left  
18 them here for me already.

19 All right. The first group is represented  
20 by Steve Johnson and Kelly Tanner, CIOFWP. And  
21 you're up. And that will be followed by John Gable  
22 from Moose Camp, representing the Moose Camp  
23 community.

24 STEVE JOHNSON: I'm going to speak for  
25 about five minutes and then Kelly is going to take

1 the other ten. She has a visual presentation.

2 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Okay.

3 STEVE JOHNSON: My name's Steve Johnson.

4 I'm an attorney and a real estate broker and a  
5 rancher. I have a large ranch up in Montgomery  
6 Creek near the project site.

7 Citizens in Opposition to the Fountain  
8 Wind Project, also known as Fountain Wind, is a  
9 nonprofit group who live in the -- literally  
10 hundreds or thousands of people that live in the  
11 intermountain area and throughout Shasta County.

12 Earlier in this process, about a year ago,  
13 our group submitted a petition to the county in  
14 opposition to the project with over 2,300  
15 signatures. Since then the opposition to the  
16 project has only grown.

17 In addition, there have been hundreds and  
18 hundreds of letters written in opposition to the  
19 project at various stages of the proceedings that  
20 are in the record.

21 Commissioner Kerns pointed out at the  
22 Planning Commission hearing that almost everyone who  
23 spoke in opposition to the project at the Planning  
24 Commission hearing were from the area that would be  
25 negatively impacted by the project; while nearly

1 everyone who spoke in favor of the project was from  
2 outside the area. And I think that's significant  
3 given the standards in the code that govern this,  
4 this appeal.

5           The so-called refinement to the project is  
6 really not new. The range of turbine sizes and  
7 number of turbines is all in the final EIR on  
8 page 7, which has a chart there. They never could  
9 have built 71 turbines that were 679 feet tall. The  
10 maximum of megawatts for this project is 216  
11 megawatts. So for the tallest turbines, they could  
12 have only built 34 of them. For the 610 feet  
13 turbines that they've selected now, the most they  
14 can build to reach the 216 megawatts is 48, and they  
15 intend to build all 48.

16           They can't build 49 or more. This is not  
17 a case where they could have built 71 or  
18 72 610-foot-tall turbines, and that they've reduced  
19 that to only build 48 of them.

20           The 71 turbine option was to build much  
21 shorter turbines about 500 feet tall. So what  
22 they've done is just selected a turbine option with  
23 much taller turbines, which means they can only  
24 build 48, and those are taller turbines. So  
25 actually the turbine size has increased. It's now

1 taller than what would have been there if there were  
2 72 turbines.

3 Now, there's numerous substantial,  
4 unavoidable adverse impacts here. We've heard some  
5 of them mentioned tonight. The views to the east  
6 from Redding and up in that area will be ruined for  
7 the rest of our lives. Rural Shasta County will be  
8 ruined for most of us forever if there's wind  
9 turbines all over the mountains there.

10 There's unavoidable impacts to wildlife,  
11 Bald Eagles, Golden Eagles, raptors, bats necessary  
12 for pollination and to support the food chain for  
13 wildlife. We have negative impacts to air quality,  
14 and for those who live in the area flicker from the  
15 turbine, noise, incessant humming, lights on the  
16 turbine at night, and the constant eyesore when you  
17 look up at those things.

18 All of which will be a major source of  
19 depression who live there. Depressing the people  
20 themselves, depressing property values, depressing  
21 the tax base, depressing the local economy,  
22 depressing tourism. It will ruin the beautiful  
23 drive out on Highway 299 to the east enjoyed by  
24 almost every citizen of Shasta County from time to  
25 time. It should be a scenic highway. If you



1 approve the project, it never will be.

2           And then there's the unacceptable and  
3 extreme fire risk that actually puts our very lives  
4 and homes at risk. This is the highest fire danger  
5 zone in the entire county, indeed in the entire  
6 state. Since the June 22nd hearing, we've had over  
7 2 million additional acres burn in California.

8           Locally we've had the Salt Fire, the  
9 Monument Fire, the River Complex Fire, the Dixie  
10 Fire, which burned over 1,300 structures and  
11 960,000 acres. If you put that fire size up there  
12 in that part of Shasta County, it probably includes  
13 burning Redding to the ground.

14           These fires can travel great distances in  
15 relatively short periods of time. And most recently  
16 we had the Fawn Fire, which created for a time the  
17 top fire emergency in the entire country, because if  
18 it got out of control it could have burned thousands  
19 of homes in Redding. You yourselves had a special  
20 meeting about the Fawn Fire.

21           But because it was able to be fought  
22 immediately and effectively from the air with air  
23 tankers and helicopters, it was confined to less  
24 than 9,000 acres, which is much smaller than what  
25 this turbine field will be.

1           And although 40 -- over 40 homes burned,  
2     the disaster was averted all because of aerial  
3     firefighting. Now, if you approve this project and  
4     the turbine field is built, those turbines will be  
5     an impediment to aerial firefighting. There will be  
6     other experts tonight to address that.

7           But, obviously, the helicopters won't be  
8     able to fly in and among the turbines and all that  
9     smoke, and the air tankers won't be able to get low  
10    to the ground. And, therefore, it's more likely  
11    that such a fire could become a major catastrophe  
12    like the Camp Fire, like the Carr Fire, like the  
13    Dixie Fire. And then it's a disaster for this  
14    county.

15           You can have a repeat of Paradise. You  
16    can have burned cars and charred bodies up and down  
17    Highway 299. This is the reality. This is the  
18    disaster that we need to avoid. The point is that  
19    this location is totally unsuitable for this type of  
20    project, and the project should never be built there  
21    under any circumstances.

22           Now, the only way to prevent the tragedy  
23    is to not build a project there. It's that simple.  
24    If you deny the appeal, the project will still be  
25    built. It will just be built in a safer location

1 outside the county or outside the area. On bald  
2 ridges somewhere where there are no trees. 90 -- I  
3 think it's 96 percent of all wind turbine projects  
4 are not in heavily forested areas. The trend is to  
5 not build wind turbine projects in heavily forested  
6 areas.

7           So your job is to protect the health,  
8 safety, and welfare of the citizens of Shasta  
9 County. The Planning Commission made a specific  
10 finding that this project would be detrimental to  
11 the health, safety, and welfare adopting the exact  
12 language of the county code. You would have to find  
13 the exact opposite in order to approve this project.  
14 I don't see how you could do that.

15           Moreover, you would have to reject the  
16 findings of the very Planning Commissioners that you  
17 yourselves appointed, and that who voted against  
18 this five to nothing. I'm asking you to vote no and  
19 I'd like the vote to be unanimous. I'd like all  
20 five of you to vote no, just like the Planning  
21 Commission did.

22           And now I'd like to introduce Kelly  
23 Tanner, who did her thesis on the Fountain Fire and  
24 knows more about the fire danger up in that area  
25 than anyone I know. And if you think the local

1 communities up there can't burn to the ground, she's  
2 going to tell you it happened in 1992, and show you  
3 a video of it. Kelly?

4 KELLY TANNER: Okay. I'm sorry, I'm going  
5 to speak as fast as I can because there's going to  
6 be a video at the end of this. I'm Kelly Tanner.  
7 I'm not a firefighter. I have a Master's degree in  
8 disaster and emergency management. Studied the  
9 Fountain Fire, did my thesis on it.

10 Our perspective is unique and our job is  
11 to create plans, do risk analysis, look for  
12 vulnerabilities in order to help firefighters.

13 The next slide.

14 Plans never go as planned, and without  
15 these crucial steps they fail. If this is flawed or  
16 absent, like in the EIR, so is the plan. Ask PG&E.  
17 Their plans were thrown out of court this year.  
18 We've seen the devastating deadly impacts and how  
19 their poor unexecuted plans have destroyed lives.

20 Next slide.

21 Fires behave differently everywhere. You  
22 have to know what happened here. Currently, we have  
23 firefighting. But pilots and firefighters won't  
24 fight near turbines. The Applicant admits it would  
25 be fought outside the perimeter. How do the new

1 roads help if they aren't fighting near turbines?

2 The community won't have fire protection.

3 The Fountain Fire was an outlier. A  
4 firestorm. A foreshock of what we see today. Head  
5 of CDF says this is the most incredible situation  
6 they've seen. It's bizarre. Extreme. Why? Fires  
7 didn't behave like this 30 years ago. I know why.  
8 And the conditions are now worse and more ripe.

9 Next slide.

10 The fire was immediately seen, but  
11 response was too slow. It was one of the fastest  
12 fires and still is in state history. It moved  
13 9 miles per hour, sustained 6 miles an hour burning  
14 105 football fields a minute, burning 12 miles in  
15 three hours, 91 square miles and 63- out of  
16 64,000 acres burned in just 33 hours.

17 In comparison, almost half of the 1,300  
18 structures that burned in the Dixie Fire, which  
19 burned for months and over a million acres, they  
20 were burned in 33 hours.

21 Next slide.

22 CAL FIRE records said it was difficult to  
23 fight because it was remote with long travel times;  
24 wind shifted 90 degrees every 15 minutes. It almost  
25 immediately blocked 299 east. Fire tornadoes

1 spawned snapping trees 3 feet in width.

2 Firefighters dropped their hoses, ran for their  
3 lives, and slid down Hatchet Ridge.

4 The next slide.

5 The next morning, Medford radar saw this  
6 cloud hovering over Moose Camp, Montgomery Creek and  
7 Round Mountain, that's a moonscape, that's them  
8 gone. Aerial fighters had never seen anything like  
9 that.

10 Next slide.

11 Supervisor Baugh wanted to know how to  
12 mitigate a life for tank. I could answer, but don't  
13 have time. You can't for this project. I can tell  
14 you how not to mitigate a life. Don't put high-risk  
15 fire infrastructure in the highest risk fire areas  
16 of a state and make firefighting impossible where  
17 people barely got out alive. People and  
18 firefighters were trapped in meadows like that one  
19 and all around the site.

20 The others used roads behind that ridge  
21 where the turbines would be. Using roads surrounded  
22 by turbines is insane and sheltering in place you  
23 might have bus-size blades thrown at you now. They  
24 may act like flame throwers starting tens if not  
25 hundreds of spot fires. They had to make up their

1 informal plans. It saved their lives. It won't  
2 next time. They will die with turbines on that  
3 ridge.

4 Next slide and press play.

5 Planes are essential. Reductions in this  
6 plan didn't impact air attack. As a hundred feet  
7 below, if you can get that to play, where this plane  
8 was, it wouldn't have flown or been able to fly.

9 Is that going to play?

10 THE CLERK: Hold on one second.

11 KELLY TANNER: They're essential to the  
12 air attack as a hundred feet below the ridge.

13 You skipped ahead now.

14 THE CLERK: Your time is stopped. Give us  
15 just one moment.

16 KELLY TANNER: Okay.

17 THE CLERK: It says there are no videos on  
18 this PowerPoint.

19 KELLY TANNER: There are videos and we  
20 confirmed it. There should be two; one at the end  
21 and this one. We had it confirmed, correct? On  
22 Monday?

23 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Do you want to  
24 continue with your presentation and then come back?

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We're checking it,

1 or is it significant to where you are right now?

2 KELLY TANNER: Yeah, I -- the most  
3 important one is the last one, and if it's not there  
4 it's going to be a problem, and I would like to go  
5 out and send it if I have to because that needs to  
6 be seen.

7 THE CLERK: Chair, we have received  
8 confirmation from staff that there are no videos at  
9 all on this slide.

10 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Okay. Why don't we do  
11 this. Why don't you finish your presentation then  
12 if you can upload what you need to upload, then  
13 we'll let you come back up for a few minutes to do  
14 that.

15 KELLY TANNER: I appreciate that. Okay.  
16 Planes are essential. This plane is not normally  
17 here. It wouldn't have been with turbines. It  
18 doesn't matter if FAA says it's a fly zone, that's  
19 for commercials. Pilots will prioritize their  
20 safety. They will fly to other fires where there  
21 are less obstacles and risks to them.

22 Next slide.

23 Fires within a quarter mile of high  
24 transmission lines are expected to increase by 45 to  
25 75 percent in coming years. The California



1 commission encourages not building in those dark red  
2 areas.

3 Next slide.

4 In the U.S., only 4 percent of turbines  
5 are in complex forest right there at Hatchet Ridge.  
6 Our 10-year study, nice clearance there, right? And  
7 that wick you see, that is a fuel break.

8 Next slide.

9 Notice the difference in terrain? Where  
10 do you want a fire? Studies say 10 percent of  
11 turbine fires are reported. They aren't in fire  
12 databases. Applicants may say they searched and  
13 found none, but they're listed as structures just  
14 like your home. No way to tell what structure  
15 burned.

16 Next slide.

17 The County will pay for 65 percent of any  
18 fire, and whole counties' ability to get fire  
19 insurance will be affected.

20 Next slide.

21 Fuel breaks are made for small fires.  
22 They need maintenance. Who's paying? If you want  
23 to stop a fire, experts say forget fuel breaks and  
24 focus on air attack. A three-year 800-foot break  
25 won't contain fires spotting two miles ahead, but

1 planes can but not with turbines in their way.

2 Steven Pine, a wildfire expert, says the  
3 closer a route of transit, the more fires, the more  
4 people, the more starts. While roads would improve  
5 ground access to fires, they are essentially mopping  
6 up the fires the roads themselves encourage. Roads  
7 promote fire, flashy weeds along the rights of way,  
8 thus worsening the fire hazard.

9 Next slide.

10 CAL FIRE says a fire here will be worse  
11 than ever before without the turbines. How do you  
12 know what's worse if you don't know what happened?  
13 To know if you can mitigate a life, you need to know  
14 what you would see -- in this video if it doesn't  
15 work -- and a lot more. It was a miracle no one  
16 died. People will die and off record -- they will  
17 not say it on record, CAL FIRE confirmed many will  
18 die with turbines in the next fire. What's worse  
19 than that? Death. (Inaudible).

20 THE CLERK: You're seeing the PowerPoint  
21 that was submitted to the Clerk of the Board, so if  
22 it's not on that PowerPoint, it would be on this  
23 screen.

24 So if you would like, Chair, we can ask  
25 her to resubmit just the videos and we can get those

1 uploaded to our file.

2 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Yes. And you can come  
3 back and up and have five minutes.

4 KELLY TANNER: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. So we have  
6 John Gable followed by Radley Davis. Board of  
7 Director representative for the International Indian  
8 Treaty Council.

9 JOHN GABLE: Okay. Good evening,  
10 Supervisors. My name is John Gable. I am here -- I  
11 have a video too -- not a video, a PowerPoint  
12 presentation. So I guess I'll wait for that to show  
13 up.

14 THE CLERK: Give staff just one moment  
15 here.

16 JOHN GABLE: No worries.

17 THE CLERK: Okay. Go ahead.

18 JOHN GABLE: Okay. Good evening,  
19 Supervisors. My name is John Gable, and I am here  
20 to speak on behalf of Moose Camp and Montgomery  
21 Creek.

22 Next slide, please.

23 So just a little introduction for those  
24 who don't know, Moose Camp is a small community of  
25 50 cabins founded in 1929. We experienced the

1 Fountain Fire aways back. We have 146 acres. We've  
2 been around for over 90 years. Moose Camp is the  
3 largest neighborhood with planned turbines a mile to  
4 a mile and a half from our fence lines.

5 Also on the left side of that picture,  
6 that road that you see, that dirt road right there,  
7 which is about a hundred feet from our property  
8 line. That will be the main road for this entire  
9 project.

10 One other thing while we're talking about  
11 roads. The road off 299 called Moose Camp Road is a  
12 public road. It does go all the way through Moose  
13 Camp and we actually literally appreciate that the  
14 county plows that road in the wintertime for us. So  
15 it is a public road and I didn't really like the  
16 whole, It's private, we can't take pictures.  
17 Because, I'm not really sure. I don't really  
18 understand that since we do have a public road  
19 through Moose Camp.

20 Next slide, please.

21 So I'm going to break my presentation into  
22 two parts. The first part is what has changed since  
23 the June 22 meeting, and my second part is going to  
24 be what has not changed since June 22nd. So I'm  
25 going to just mention a couple things.

1           For instance, four of the largest  
2 wildfires in California history have happened in the  
3 last four months. The Fawn Fire threatened a good  
4 portion of Redding. As Steve said before, we've had  
5 two-and-a-half million acres burned as of 10/15.  
6 That's on top of -- which is the second highest  
7 total in history after the worse total in history,  
8 which was over 4 million acres.

9           Another concern, PG&E has announced that  
10 they cannot safely operate with their lines, so  
11 they're going to bury them instead. So in areas  
12 throughout Shasta County we can expect that they'll  
13 be burying our lines.

14           And last but not least, California  
15 announced plans to accelerate the development of  
16 offshore wind power. So I'm going to talk a little  
17 bit more about those things.

18           Next slide, please.

19           So here's a picture from the Dixie Fire as  
20 it was burning down the town of Greenville. And  
21 just want to mention that nine of California's 20  
22 largest fires have occurred since 2020, so there's  
23 kind of a trend here.

24           Next slide, please.

25           So this is a quote from the CAL FIRE

1 director who says, "Every acre can and will burn  
2 some day in this state." And if you look at the  
3 red, kind of lightish red color up there towards the  
4 right top area, that's actually where the Fountain  
5 Fire burned. And so this map shows all the fires  
6 that have occurred since the 1800s. And the darker  
7 the color, the newer the fire.

8 Next slide, please.

9 So on the subject of wildfire growth. All  
10 but three of the 20 largest fires on record in  
11 California have occurred within the past two decades  
12 and ten of them have come in 2018 or later. And if  
13 you just look at the colors up there, the gray kind  
14 of -- the different shades of gray, that represents  
15 like 67 years; whereas, the blue represents 20  
16 years, the orange represents 2020, and the red  
17 represents 2021. So you can see that there's been a  
18 massive acceleration in the size of these fires.

19 Next slide, please.

20 So four of the largest wildfires in  
21 California history as I mentioned before have  
22 occurred since June 22nd when the Planning  
23 Commissioners denied the Use Permit for Fountain  
24 Wind. If you look at the fires in red on this list,  
25 those are the four that have occurred since

1 June 22nd. I should also note the top three fires  
2 on this list are larger than the entire fire season  
3 of 2009.

4 And I bring that up because in 2009, that  
5 was the year Hatchet Ridge was built. And you have  
6 to wonder, would Hatchet Ridge be even built today  
7 if the fire conditions were as bad as they were back  
8 then? So, I mean, just think about that.

9 Next slide, please.

10 So here's a picture of the Dixie Fire on  
11 July 15th. Notice it's burning some transmission  
12 lines there. And just note that, you know, the  
13 fire -- all the veteran firefighters are saying the  
14 same thing. They've never seen anything like this  
15 in 20, 30 years. The behavior is truly frightening  
16 fire behavior, and we're basically in uncharted  
17 territory when it comes to wildfires.

18 Next slide, please.

19 This is a picture of the Dixie Fire at  
20 night. And CAL FIRE I think has figured out that  
21 the fires operate 24 hours a day now. They don't  
22 really slow down that much at night. In the Dixie  
23 and the Caldor fires were the first fires in  
24 California history to ever burn across the Sierra  
25 Nevada and down the other side. Like, that's never

1 happened in the history of the State.

2 So we just -- and part of the reason is  
3 that the moisture is not there anymore. The heat's  
4 increased, the moisture is not there, and the fires  
5 just burn all the time. They don't slow down at  
6 night in the past like when they had humidity and  
7 the temperatures were lowered. Those things aren't  
8 happening anymore.

9 Next slide, please.

10 So when we're talking about the Dixie  
11 Fire, there's -- part of the problem is the drought  
12 conditions. And I just want to say something about  
13 all the rain we've had recently. The rain didn't  
14 end the drought. The drought's still here. The  
15 drought's still of historic proportions. From what  
16 I understand, Lake Shasta has risen approximately  
17 3 feet since its low point. And it's still 182 feet  
18 down from its -- its top. And I also just heard the  
19 short-term forecast for the weather into November is  
20 higher temperatures and less rain so, you know,  
21 that's just the forecast, but that's what I've  
22 heard.

23 Next slide, please. We're going to skip  
24 that one. Next slide, please.

25 So on to the idea of fire spotting. This



1 is a quote, "What characterizes the mega fires of  
2 recent years, experts said, is their tendency to  
3 launch embers far ahead of the main fire front,  
4 sometimes by miles." And then the other problem  
5 with this, with the spotting, is the fact that  
6 90 percent of those embers start another fire. So  
7 those numbers are just huge.

8 Next slide, please.

9 Another problem that I discovered when  
10 doing a little research was that wildfires burn much  
11 more severely on private timber plantations than  
12 they do in public forests. So that's something to  
13 think about. Someone even mentioned already on the  
14 other side earlier tonight that -- that the Fountain  
15 Wind Project is in -- 90 percent of its land is in  
16 the area that already burned and was replanted. So  
17 that's kind of a concern.

18 Next slide, please.

19 In here it just talks about how flammable  
20 the trees are. This is actually a good map because  
21 this is the only map I have that shows the revised  
22 project that Fountain Wind put out. But the idea is  
23 that clear cutting along with plantation pine trees  
24 is just a disaster waiting to happen when it comes  
25 to fire.

1           Next slide, please.

2           So here is a picture of the -- that I blew  
3 up of that map of fires and it shows where the  
4 Fountain Fire was and where Fountain Ridge would be.  
5 And this guy Zeke, he's a wildfire analyst out of  
6 Chico, and what he's saying and a lot of people are  
7 saying is when a fire blows through an area, the  
8 worse thing you can do is plant plantation pine  
9 trees and cover the land with the same species  
10 throughout.

11           Because that's not good for fires. And  
12 the exact reasoning they talk about is plantation  
13 trees are a lower height, they have thinner bark,  
14 and they share a uniform crown, which means all the  
15 same height increasing their chances to combust and  
16 spread fire. And you don't even need winds, like,  
17 high winds. Like these fires -- these things catch  
18 on fire, they'll keep going. You don't even need  
19 the wind just because of what trees they are and the  
20 fact that they're all the same.

21           Next slide, please.

22           So moving on to CAL FIRE and their -- the  
23 largest civil aerial firefighting fleet in the  
24 world. I put a little video there that shows how  
25 low the planes fly, and then it kind of shows the

1 situation the pilot's in himself just trying to take  
2 care of those things.

3 Next slide, please -- well, there it goes  
4 again.

5 I do want to mention, though, while we're  
6 talking about aerial firefighting. There was a  
7 river fire June 5th near the Pit River Casino.  
8 There was the Nelson Fire near Big Bend northeast of  
9 Big Bend on August 7th. There was the School Fire  
10 behind the school on Montgomery Creek. Those three  
11 fires were taken care of by CAL FIRE's air tankers.  
12 And without those tankers, Lord knows how big those  
13 fires would have got. But, thankfully, CAL FIRE  
14 took care of that with their aerial support.

15 Here's a picture of what it looks like  
16 inside a helicopter that they've just started using.  
17 This is from LA. But they've just started using  
18 helicopters at night now. Like normally CAL FIRE,  
19 from what I understand, doesn't do a lot of aerial  
20 work at night, but this is -- just imagine you're in  
21 the cockpit there, you can see a mountain on fire,  
22 and you're going to swoop down to a low altitude and  
23 fly between wind turbines? I just don't see that  
24 happening. But, you know, I'm not a professional.

25 So moving on, next slide, please.

1           So here's another thing I didn't know  
2    about was that if drones are in the area, they can't  
3    do -- they can't fly. None of these planes and  
4    helicopters can fly if there's a drone in the area.

5           Next slide, please.

6           So here's a little story. When the CAL  
7    FIRE was trying to get ahold of the Dixie Fire, you  
8    know, this is a story I read online. They actually  
9    successfully painted a box of fire retardant around  
10   the fire limiting its spread. The water drop and  
11   helicopter was coming in around 5:30 taking  
12   advantage of, the fire was near the river, but then  
13   just when they were about to get this fire under  
14   control, the Dixie Fire, a drone appeared.

15           Now, there's a lot of speculation about  
16   was it PG&E's drone in the area? They don't know.  
17   But there's a lot of people FBI, FAA, all these  
18   people are investigating this drone, because the  
19   drone stopped aerial operations, and then it was too  
20   dark to start them up again.

21           So it's worth noting that the Dixie Fire  
22   was 1- to 2 acres and spreading slowly, but then  
23   without air support for the last 45 minutes of the  
24   evening -- or, you know, the early evening, the fire  
25   grew to 500 acres, and 25 days later it's half a

1 million acres. So think about that in respect to,  
2 you know, I can't imagine that a drone, you know, is  
3 more, you know, or that a -- that a wind turbine  
4 isn't as dangerous as a drone.

5 Next slide, please.

6 So just to mention on the Dixie Fire, I  
7 got a lot of facts there about fires. But one thing  
8 I want to point out is they use 21 million gallons  
9 of flame retardant mixture all coming out of air  
10 tankers.

11 Next slide, please.

12 The Dixie Fire also was, as we know, a  
13 million acres, 1,562 square miles. Redding is only  
14 60 square miles, and the Fountain Wind area isn't  
15 really that far from Redding when you think about  
16 how big these fires get.

17 Next slide, please.

18 So also on the Fawn Fire, I think this guy  
19 right here, I used his quote, It's not the main fire  
20 that got us; it's all the spot fires. The thousand  
21 spot fires landing a mile out in front of this  
22 thing. And, at the time, 90 percent of the area was  
23 drier -- or it was drier and more explosively  
24 flammable than 90 percent of all the days in  
25 recorded history.

1           Next slide, please.

2           So here's right off Oregon Trail. So when  
3 the Fawn Fire all of a sudden caught on and became  
4 the highest priority fire in the country.

5           Next slide, please.

6           And this is what happened when it became  
7 the highest priority fire in the nation. Air  
8 tankers everywhere. So I don't know if you know  
9 this website or not called Flight Radar 24, but it  
10 tracks all the planes in the sky. And here's a shot  
11 quarter of 5:00 on September 23rd when there were at  
12 least 13 to 15 air tankers working that fire.

13           Next slide, please. Running out of time.  
14 Next. Next.

15           So I just want to talk real quick about  
16 wind power. Wind power -- offshore wind power,  
17 three to four times as much energy compared to  
18 onshore. The wind is steadier, it blows in the  
19 afternoon. And two projects right now, just two  
20 projects in California could provide 4,600 megawatts  
21 of electricity compared to 200-some for Fountain  
22 Wind. 4,600.

23           Next slide, please.

24           Here's also a project in New Mexico. Very  
25 important, because it's 1050 megawatts of power, all

1 being sold to California, Los Angeles, San Jose. So  
2 we can get wind power from other states.

3 Next slide, please. Oh, my gosh, let me  
4 talk a minute more.

5 So here's a couple things that hasn't  
6 changed since the June 22nd meeting. Okay. We  
7 talked about there's no -- virtually no turbines in  
8 the forest, and Shasta County already produces more  
9 than enough green energy. Shasta County, the dam  
10 produces three times what Fountain Wind produced.  
11 Redding Electric gets 75 percent of its electricity  
12 from hydro and wind right now. 75 percent right  
13 now. And Redding Electric also is only about half  
14 of the greenhouse gases as the average utility in  
15 California, so you guys should be commended for that  
16 alone.

17 Okay. And last but not least, one more  
18 slide. If we can get one more.

19 Here's what a 610-foot building looks like  
20 in San Francisco. This project, the developer still  
21 have no simulated pictures of what this -- what a  
22 tower would look like on 299 in Moose Camp. They  
23 redid all of the shadow flicker studies, but for  
24 some reason they didn't want to get out and take  
25 pictures and simulate what these would look like --

1 what these turbines would look like from 299, from  
2 Moose Camp. They still didn't want to do that. So  
3 I'm kind of curious.

4 Okay. So next slide, next slide, and I'll  
5 wrap it up right now. So two slides over.

6 Okay. So Moose Camp is asking you to deny  
7 the appeal. The Planning Commissioners studied the  
8 Fountain Wind for three years. The Planning  
9 Commissioners figured out the EIR didn't do enough  
10 to address the fire issues. The Planning  
11 Commissioners figured out turbines don't belong in a  
12 high fire danger area. They also decided that the  
13 lives of local residents are endangered by Fountain  
14 Wind. They also voted for the citizens of Round  
15 Mountain and Montgomery Creek over out-of-state and  
16 foreign developers.

17 So your Shasta County Planning Commission  
18 made the right decision.

19 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, sir.

20 JOHN GABLE: Thank you.

21 THE CLERK: Chair Chimenti. I apologize  
22 for the interruption. Staff is going to try and  
23 load an embedded link onto those slides that  
24 Ms. Tanner was trying for. So if you don't mind  
25 maybe after this speaker we can have him test it to



1 see if it works?

2 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Yes.

3 THE CLERK: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: So, Radley, you're up.

5 And then Mandesi Band is on deck, but we will see if

6 we can't get Kelly Tanner in there.

7 Go ahead, sir.

8 RADLEY DAVIS: Hello, Supervisors. On  
9 behalf of the International Indian Treaty Council, I  
10 am providing testimony in support of Pit River Tribe  
11 and their position related to the proposed Fountain  
12 Wind Project and denying the Use Permit 16-007.

13 The International Indian Treaty Council is  
14 an indigenous people's organization with  
15 consultative status to United Nations since 1977.

16 Pit River Tribe affirms its inherent right  
17 to self-determination over its tribal lands and  
18 traditional territories according to Docket 347,  
19 which was adopted in July 29th, 1959.

20 United Nations declaration on the rights  
21 of indigenous peoples was adopted by the United  
22 Nations general assembly on September 3rd, 2007. It  
23 establishes the minimum standards for the survival,  
24 dignity, and well-being of indigenous peoples of the  
25 world.

1           On March 29th, 2012, the Pit River Tribe  
2     passed a resolution affirming the United Nations  
3     declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples and  
4     stating that all 3.5 million acres of the 100-mile  
5     square of the Pit River Tribe's ancestral territory  
6     is confirmed, in accordance with the United Nations  
7     declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples,  
8     which was also adopted by the United States in  
9     December 2010.

10           The Pit River Tribe is a long-time  
11     affiliate of the International Indian Treaty  
12     Council. And we agree with the Tribe's expressed  
13     concerns that, if approved, this project would  
14     result in significant impacts to the aesthetics,  
15     water quality, biological environment, and the  
16     tribal cultural resources in the area. The human  
17     rights of the Pit River Tribe would be particularly  
18     impacted.

19           Not only am I a board member for the  
20     International Indian Treaty Council, I am also an  
21     enrolled citizen of the Pit River Tribe belonging to  
22     the Ilmawi Band. The California Environmental  
23     Quality Act, CEQA, may not address my history nor my  
24     culture, but I will tell you my history and my  
25     culture and why it is vitally important for you to

1 hear when considering this matter and this decision  
2 that is before you.

3 My four times great-grandfather Henry  
4 Wall, who lived to be over 100 years old is a Pit  
5 River Indian from Fall River. He was born in 1833  
6 during the first encounters of white people in our  
7 homelands. In the 1850s, he fought against white  
8 militiamen and against United States soldiers during  
9 the Pit River wars in Fall River Valley. His  
10 survival is my survival.

11 The historical attempts at genocide of my  
12 people include the fur trappers who brought the  
13 Malaria outbreak in the 1830s, the gold miners, the  
14 Pit River Rangers, the militiamen, the United States  
15 Army Troops of General Kelsey and General Crook.  
16 The bloody and cold marches of our people on the  
17 Trail of Tears to San Francisco Bay and Cavallo, and  
18 by government boarding schools.

19 These attempts to not kill the whole of my  
20 people, but it did fragment us into a society and  
21 simulated and enculturated us into a world of  
22 despair. Throughout the years since we've continued  
23 to experience fragmentation of our lives and what  
24 we're connected to, the land, the nature, and each  
25 other. Making life more challenging and

1     disappointing along the way.

2                     For example, during the early '70s, my  
3     tribe fought the Pacific Gas & Electric Corporation  
4     and was robbed by crooked judicial system. In the  
5     late '80s, my tribe fought and continues to fight  
6     the United States Bureau of Land Management and the  
7     CalPine Energy Corporation over a proposed  
8     industrial geothermal development project located up  
9     in the Medicine Lake highlands next to Mount Shasta.

10                    In the late 2000s, we opposed the Hatchet  
11    Wind Project and lost to manipulation, corruption,  
12    and a distrustful system. And now our surrounding  
13    intermountain community is being challenged again by  
14    another corporation, ConnectGEN, who is proposing to  
15    build a mega wind turbine project on mountaintops  
16    and ridges, and ignoring the dangers this project  
17    proposes. A continuation of the assault on tribal  
18    culture resources, endangered species, adverse  
19    impacts on plants, animals, birds, foods, water  
20    resources, and human beings.

21                    Traditional knowledge is what my tribe  
22    says it is. The powerful and beautiful landscape in  
23    this project area are properties of religious and  
24    culture significance. According to our traditional  
25    knowledge keepers.

1           Snow Mountain, which is also called  
2   (inaudible) or Wolf Mountain, which sets between the  
3   communities of Round Mountain and Montgomery Creek.  
4   (Inaudible) and its ridges, and immediate  
5   surrounding areas are vital to the spiritual way of  
6   life for the Madesi, the Itsatawi, Atsugewi, and  
7   (inaudible) specifically, as well as, other Pit  
8   River people. As a place of power, a place of  
9   prayer, a place of vision, and a place of healing  
10   and renewal.

11           Bunch Grass Mountain has whole  
12   environments including its forests and plants. It  
13   is our responsibility as indigenous peoples given by  
14   the creator to be the caretakers of the earth.  
15   These sacred mountains and areas meet the criteria  
16   for eligibility for the National Register of  
17   Historic Places.

18           There are Pit River burials, villages,  
19   camps and trails scattered all along the area within  
20   the 30,000 acres of where this proposed wind turbine  
21   project was located. Each way we turn, our inherent  
22   lands are under siege by developers for extraction  
23   for mega water, mega geothermal, mega wind as new  
24   technology and energy addictions push corporations  
25   into more and more remote places to satisfy the

1 global consumer demand and want more money.

2 Because in the beginning and in the end,  
3 it's all about the money for these corporations.  
4 The sacred landscapes and places are alive in the  
5 hearts, in the minds of indigenous peoples around  
6 the world, and right here in Pit River country.

7 Mountains, springs, lakes, rivers, trees,  
8 groves, meadows, caves. These are sites of  
9 ceremony, peace, respect, growth, humility and  
10 learning for human cultures throughout time.

11 From Ako-Yet, which is Mount Shasta, to  
12 Mount Hoffman, to Glass Mountain, Little Fox  
13 Mountain. (Inaudible), Soldier Mountain, Saddle  
14 Mountain, (inaudible), which is Burney Mountain.  
15 (Inaudible), which is Mount Lassen and (Inaudible),  
16 are sacred lands that anchor peoples' spirits and  
17 souls to the earth.

18 These sacred places that we have been  
19 observing for time immemorial hold us together.  
20 Indigenous peoples, the world over-identified  
21 themselves by the place they come from, and the  
22 place that we will return when this world is over.  
23 That's why commemorating and having ceremonies  
24 connects us to why it's important. A sacred area is  
25 all encompassing. Many of us continue to maintain

1 these culture and traditional values that are rooted  
2 in the sacredness, and that's why they're important  
3 to us.

4 Fountain Wind Project should be denied  
5 because its extracted footprint is larger than its  
6 intended results, and it will destroy tribal culture  
7 resources forever. That is why my culture and  
8 traditions are important to me because I am  
9 connected to these mountains in places.

10 The tipping point that will signal the  
11 transitions back to honoring land is sacred, could  
12 come from the denial of the permit for the Fountain  
13 Wind Project. Not because it is the killer that  
14 threatens the bald and golden eagles, the bats, the  
15 mountain lions, the bears, the mountaintops and  
16 ridge tops, the frogs, the creeks, the conifer  
17 forests, the serenity of the night and day, but  
18 because it offers so much more value to our history  
19 as a whole.

20 A take of an eagle is a take of me. A  
21 take of a ridge is a take of me. Any take of a  
22 sacred place in this area is a take of me. The  
23 cumulative impacts you said wouldn't be here from  
24 Hatchet Ridge Project are here now.

25 We don't need that wind. The land, the

1 animals, and the people have already paid the price.  
2 Fountain Wind, ConnectGEN, offers up lies to my  
3 people and the community by claiming they've sought  
4 agreements with much of the intermountain community  
5 by throwing the talk of money at us, but we've all  
6 said no. The bottom line is that these areas cannot  
7 be mitigated, significant and unavoidable.

8 No statement of overriding considerations  
9 doesn't work here. The Shasta County Planning  
10 Commissioners took the hard look at the evidence and  
11 the considerations of human safety, fire safety,  
12 habitat safety, water safety, species protections,  
13 and tribal cultural resource protections and  
14 considered all these impeccably important. The lack  
15 of integrity by the Fountain Wind Project and  
16 ConnectGEN towards the appeal looks to tarnish the  
17 accountability and credibility of the work that your  
18 Planning Commissioners conducted.

19 The Fountain Wind appeal fails to  
20 articulate how the project would not be detrimental  
21 to the residents, nor does it suggest that  
22 alternatives were not considered by the Commission.  
23 But they know that a project of 34 to 72 turbines  
24 was considered. And, instead, Fountain Wind and  
25 ConnectGEN resorted to attacking the commissioners'



1 competency, expertise and reputation. Their  
2 marginalization of the commissioners is their way of  
3 deflecting you from the legitimate reasons of the  
4 commissioners' denial of the 34 to 72 turbine  
5 project as described in the Environmental Impact  
6 Report and the Use Permit.

7 This is a Texas corporation coming to  
8 Shasta County to tell us how to run our business,  
9 how to treat its tribal peoples for the benefit of a  
10 landowner that is out of Australia, and a project  
11 owner that is out of Spain. Furthermore, there are  
12 now part -- furthermore, they are now partnered with  
13 Pattern Energy, which is part of Hatchet Wind.

14 In closing, I tell you we have duties and  
15 responsibilities to these sacred places, and all  
16 that live within and around it. Prayers are  
17 conducted. These special activities make us who we  
18 are, and we intend to continue to be here. These  
19 places are hallowed ground. Until we find common  
20 ground with each other and become a part of a  
21 maturity of America, of California, of Shasta  
22 County, like it or not, we're not going to  
23 accomplish anything if we can't get along and  
24 communicate diplomatically.

25 If you talk and listen to the hearts of

1 the people, who by the way are the power, we can  
2 accomplish an understanding of each other and avoid  
3 a lot of litigation. We believe that indigenous  
4 people are the conscience of America, and we have --  
5 we have to as a country make things right for us or  
6 they're not right for anyone.

7 And, finally, on behalf of the  
8 International Indian Treaty Council in support of  
9 the Pit River Tribe and its citizenry, we request  
10 that you affirm your County Commissioner's decision  
11 and recognize that their professionalism did not  
12 exceed their authority, and that they held a fair  
13 hearing, and that they were not prejudiced to the  
14 Applicant. And, therefore, we ask you to deny the  
15 Fountain Wind appeal.

16 And I put the copies of what I read in  
17 support in my documents for you here.

18 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, sir.  
19 Stefany, is Kelly's video up?

20 THE CLERK: Let me have John pull that up  
21 real quick, and as soon as he's able to do that  
22 we're going to test to make sure that it plays.

23 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Okay. Thank you.

24 (Playing video.)

25 KELLY TANNER: As I mentioned, this plane

1 isn't normally here. It was diverted from the Carr  
2 Fire as a hundred feet below the ridge on a dirt  
3 logging road. That plane would not fight here. You  
4 need to drop at about 2- or 300 feet, but the aerial  
5 firefighters couldn't tell you that.

6 And then the last slide.

7 So how do you know according to the EIR  
8 what's worse if you don't know what happened.

9 (Playing video containing several mostly  
10 unintelligible news stories.)

11 KELLY TANNER: (Talking over video). It  
12 was moving 9 miles an hour. This is in Moose Camp.  
13 She's exactly right, look how low this flies. Now,  
14 part of their mitigation is fire extinguishers. Are  
15 you going to drive down that road with... The way a  
16 fire behaves here is the way it's going to behave  
17 again the (inaudible). These are all pictures from  
18 the Fountain Fire. It made national news. (End of  
19 video.)

20 And thank you for your time.

21 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you.

22 We'll now hear from the Madesi Band of the  
23 Pit River Tribe, followed by Agnes Gonzalez from the  
24 Pit River Tribe.

25 BRANDY McDANIELS: Well, before I start,

1 and I got a timer on me, but it's hard to tell about  
2 a person's history in 15 minutes. I did ask -- I  
3 did request 25 minutes, but I guess my timer has  
4 already started, so here I go.

5 My name is Brandy McDaniels, the Madesi  
6 Band cultural representative for the Pit River  
7 Nation, which is one of the 11 federally recognized  
8 autonomous bands that have lived in the Pit River  
9 ancestral homelands known as the hundred mile  
10 square since time immemorial. Our homelands are  
11 situated exactly where ConnectGEN is proposing to  
12 place the Fountain Wind Project.

13 The Madesi Band has a special duty to  
14 protect and promote the health, safety and/or  
15 general welfare of the original peoples of the Pit  
16 River. This duty includes maintaining the health  
17 and integrity of the natural world for future  
18 generations. These natural and cultural resources,  
19 which are indistinguishable from the Pit River  
20 peoples are a central element of our spirituality,  
21 traditional ceremonial practices, religious  
22 expressions, history and identity.

23 Given these facts, ConnectGEN's Fountain  
24 Wind Project would significantly disrupt the harmony  
25 between the Madesi Band and our Pit River world.

1 Therefore, the Madesi Band is in opposition of the  
2 Fountain Wind Project due to numerous negative  
3 impacts and environmental concerns that this massive  
4 project presents to our citizens, known cultural  
5 resources, watershed, plants, animals and overall  
6 ecosystem.

7           Within this proposed project area is a  
8 unique habitat and watershed which influences our  
9 distinct place-based identity and culture as Madesi  
10 people. This includes, but is not limited to  
11 (inaudible) among other sacred places. These  
12 homelands include an abundance of sacred springs, a  
13 variety of flora and fauna valleys, and sensitive  
14 medicinal and animal habitats. There are numerous  
15 books, magazines, academic writings, and other  
16 publications that have referenced and documented the  
17 unique history, culture, resources and land base of  
18 the Madesi people, and their interconnection with  
19 this land.

20           Once colonizers reached the Madesi  
21 homelands, Federal and State policies have been  
22 established to exterminate and remove and dispossess  
23 the Madesi from our homelands. Militias and  
24 government officials carried out forced removal and  
25 genocidal acts such as the events in 1859 when Pit

1 River people were rounded up and forcibly marched  
2 and removed to Round Valley Reservation, as well as,  
3 to military forts and other areas and enslaved.

4 Children torn from their mother's arms and  
5 killed in front of them. Elders who could not walk  
6 murdered on the spot. Women and children raped,  
7 assaulted, starved and abused. The Madesi people  
8 who were able to escape were only able to find their  
9 way home because of the topography of our land in  
10 which ConnectGEN is aiming to destroy.

11 Each ridge and peak contains stories upon  
12 stories from our ancestors. This is one of the  
13 important and numerous reasons why the Madesi Band  
14 opposes ConnectGEN's Fountain Wind Project in this  
15 sacred area. Changing the topography of this tribal  
16 culture landscape is equivalent to the ongoing  
17 systematic attempts to remove our people and erase  
18 us from the history of Shasta County since the first  
19 impact of colonization.

20 We still use these areas and are being  
21 informed by Fountain Wind EIR that we need  
22 permission and our trespassers to be in our own land  
23 and accessing and caretaking of aquatic and other  
24 features where we have resided since time  
25 immemorial.

1           But these same foreign interests,  
2   so-called private landowners, allow large-scale  
3   illegal marijuana grows, dangerous machine gun  
4   carrying cartel activity while missing and murdered  
5   indigenous people and homicides go unchecked. These  
6   large-scale grows are so close to Montgomery Creek  
7   School that the children can smell them from their  
8   schoolyard. As just one example of negligent and  
9   irresponsible lack of enforcement towards  
10  large-scale foreign interests, so-called private  
11  landowners whom continue to violate the law on many  
12  levels and desecrate the land.

13           This project will open up new access  
14  points for dumping, continued grave robbing,  
15  vandalism, looting, drug cartel and homicide  
16  activity that the County continues to do nothing  
17  about or hold these foreign interests private  
18  landowners accountable. This project benefits false  
19  green energy profiteers whom are known oil and gas  
20  venture capitalists known as Quantum Energy  
21  Partners, ConnectGEN. As well as, the Australian  
22  company Shasta Cascade Timberland. Yeah, that's  
23  right, they're owned by an Australian company. It  
24  does not benefit Shasta County and the public here  
25  locally.

1           The homelands of the Madesi people play a  
2   great role in our healing from the past forced  
3   removal and government-backed genocidal acts against  
4   us that caused great losses, historical trauma,  
5   dispossession from our homelands, and racially  
6   motivated acts of violence and terror in order to  
7   take possession of our ancestral lands where we have  
8   resided since time immemorial.

9           We are so connected to the land, and that  
10   our connection is tied to our identity as a people  
11   and one cannot be separated or distinguished from  
12   the other. We are the land. It is clear from  
13   information provided in the EIR for contact -- for  
14   ConnectGEN's proposed Fountain Wind Project, and the  
15   Madesi ancestral homelands, that it would create  
16   numerous adverse impacts to the environment and the  
17   tribal cultural resources of the Pit River people  
18   that cannot be mitigated. And there are no  
19   legitimate statements of overriding considerations  
20   that will change this fact.

21           In addition, there were many glaring  
22   issues, problems and errors in the EIR and the  
23   process itself; mountains incorrectly referenced,  
24   pictures inserted with wrong descriptions, massive  
25   amounts of information to review without reasonable



1 time frames to respond and address the significant  
2 adverse effects on the environment and known  
3 cultural resources.

4 The project doesn't even need to be  
5 needed. It only needs to meet its proposed  
6 objectives, which community members and outside  
7 analysts have crunched the numbers and believe the  
8 data shows that ConnectGEN's project will not meet  
9 its net objective or meet the project's list of  
10 benefits A through H listed in the Planning  
11 Department's document Exhibit A under CEQA Findings  
12 of Fact.

13 On that note, regarding the reduced number  
14 of turbines down to 48. Even if they could meet  
15 their objectives of 48, which -- with 48, which many  
16 say they can't, then why in the world were they  
17 proposing 72 in the first place?

18 Many opposition letters to the Fountain  
19 Wind Project were delegated to letters received  
20 outside the scope of CEQA, which were real and  
21 meaningful comments. These community voices are not  
22 being heard and are being marginalized. Facts are  
23 considered opinions in the EIR responses to  
24 community concerns.

25 Responses are dismissive, insulting,

1   disrespectful, and racist. For these and other  
2   confidential reasons, the Madesi Band cannot support  
3   ConnectGEN's Fountain Wind Project or EIR. Our  
4   Madesi people are still here. We still use the  
5   land. We still fast. We still dance our  
6   traditional dances. We still eat our traditional  
7   foods. We still sing our songs, and tell our  
8   stories passed down by oral traditions. We still  
9   speak our language. We are still here and our deep  
10   connection with this land, this exact land that  
11   ConnectGEN wants to develop on, and the healing  
12   properties that this land holds for us will forever  
13   be harmed if this proposed project were allowed to  
14   continue.

15           Other issues we have with ConnectGEN is  
16   their lack of integrity and their ongoing practice  
17   of spreading misinformation. We have held no  
18   consultation meetings with ConnectGEN. Only  
19   informal information-only meetings with no decision  
20   making to only learn about the project. The tribe  
21   had no idea that ConnectGEN was submitting  
22   misleading information to Shasta County, in which we  
23   don't agree capture the actual conversation or  
24   express our deep concerns.

25           Again, informational meetings do not equal

1 tribal consultation or consent to a project.  
2 Further, ConnectGEN's community benefit program is  
3 outrageous, irresponsible propaganda. It is  
4 shocking and unconscionable that ConnectGEN use the  
5 Pit River Tribe's name without our knowledge or  
6 consent to post it on Shasta County website to  
7 promote their Fountain Wind Project.

8           The Pit River Tribe never consulted,  
9 negotiated, or agreed to any terms listed in  
10 ConnectGEN's community benefit program despite their  
11 published claims. And the tribe never consented to  
12 the use of their name in allowing ConnectGEN to try  
13 to use it to fool the public and garner support from  
14 other community members for this ridiculous project.

15           Their community benefit program document  
16 is misleading, insulting, and meager at best.  
17 ConnectGEN's community benefit program is nothing in  
18 respect to what will be taken away from this  
19 community should this project be allowed. The only  
20 reason to even have a community benefit program is  
21 the fact that there is so much negative impact to  
22 the community in the first place.

23           Even if you were really considering the  
24 destruction of our community for the sake of money  
25 despite ConnectGEN's claims, many have crunched the

1 numbers and the project would not even contribute an  
2 additional 1 percent towards existing County  
3 revenue. Still, ConnectGEN has continued to spread  
4 their propaganda far and wide via direct mailers of  
5 16-page full-color booklets with inserts, TV  
6 commercials, radio commercials, computer pop-up ads,  
7 cell phone pop-up ads, while continuing to use the  
8 Pit River Tribe's name without our knowledge or  
9 consent, despite our clear message to them to stop  
10 using our name and stop their misleading lies and  
11 messaging.

12           Their direct mailers are ridiculous, and  
13 demonstrate how disconnected they are with the  
14 community. As the pictures they have in their  
15 mailers are not even from this area or county.  
16 ConnectGEN doesn't even know the difference between  
17 Siskiyou and Shasta.

18           One thing is clear, not even one of the  
19 beautiful scenic pictures they chose to place in  
20 their color booklet shows even one turbine on the  
21 pristine mountain pictures chosen for their booklet.

22           The last page of the booklet shows a hot  
23 air balloon, which is appropriate because  
24 ConnectGEN's communications, messaging, and  
25 propaganda has proven to be full of hot air. Those

1 who fail to learn from history are content -- are  
2 condemned to repeat it. Sorry.

3 On October 7th, 2008, the Shasta County  
4 Board of Supervisors recognized October 10th through  
5 19th as history week in Shasta County. Further,  
6 they presented a certificate of recognition to civil  
7 war reenactors. Less than a month later on  
8 November 4th, the same Shasta County Board of  
9 Supervisors voted to destroy history, culture, and  
10 ancestral lands of the Pit River people who have  
11 resided in Shasta County since time immemorial by  
12 approving the Hatchet Wind Project and denied all  
13 appeals against the project. This is the history,  
14 culture, and ancestral lands of the original  
15 indigenous people of that part of Shasta County.

16 Further, the minutes state a visibility  
17 study confirmed that from Main Street, Burney, the  
18 project, meaning Hatchet Wind, is mostly obstructed  
19 by geographic area and trees. This has proven to be  
20 a lie. As we all know today, the flashing turbines  
21 cannot be missed from Main Street, Burney, day or  
22 night. These same minutes further state Applicant's  
23 CEQA counsel explain that moving the project is not  
24 feasible as there is no other satisfactory area to  
25 locate the project.

1            Yet, here we are today fighting another  
2 wind project that is proposing to further destroy  
3 the history and important and known sacred sites of  
4 the early original peoples of this land.

5            The history of the Pit River people and  
6 Shasta County is just as important as the history of  
7 any other people. When do we get to heal? Why is  
8 our history and culture not as valuable as anyone  
9 else's? Why are native Americans still considered  
10 less than people of other cultures in our own  
11 homelands?

12           Another important aspect of our culture is  
13 our deep connection to the water. The aquifer and  
14 watershed is fragile and complex. ConnectGEN's  
15 proposed locations directly impact sacred water  
16 sources.

17           On that note, we already produce our fair  
18 share of renewable green energy through the damming  
19 of the Pit River, which was cut off -- which has cut  
20 us off from our native food sources, such as  
21 traditional salmon runs. This community and general  
22 area is already producing our fair share of  
23 renewable energy. And being overstretched and  
24 exploited with power-generating activities, such as  
25 the existing Hatchet Wind Farm, power lines, damming

1 of the Pit River, PG&E hydroelectric activities,  
2 which are contributing to fish species extinction  
3 and other harmful conditions such as cyanobacteria  
4 toxic algae, which puts all community members at  
5 risk.

6 Our rural community is carrying too much  
7 of the burden for the benefits of other, and to the  
8 detriment of our own health and safety. We have  
9 already sacrificed more than any other county while  
10 producing the most green energy already through  
11 hydroelectric, which is not even being calculated.  
12 And to the existing green energy contribution which  
13 is more than significant.

14 Additionally, Redding is the second  
15 sunniest city in the U.S. Why is there not a focus  
16 on solar? ConnectGEN's own information states that  
17 solar is cheaper. Solar can be put on all housing,  
18 businesses, parking structures, et cetera. There is  
19 a significant loss of power when it is transported  
20 over transmission lines.

21 The best placement for efficient power  
22 generation is in the area where the power is needed  
23 and being used. Why is there no movement into solar  
24 and energy storage, which would be the obvious  
25 choice here. Solar can be placed on existing

1 structures and avoid new impacts to the land,  
2 thereby eliminating the need for further destruction  
3 of cultural resources and carbon sequestration lands  
4 that already serve this area to reduce climate  
5 change.

6 In that respect, why is there no emphasis  
7 on individual power generation and storage deeds,  
8 and only emphasis on further foreign interest,  
9 corporate, for-profit big business and dependence on  
10 them. Have we already forgotten the Camp Fire and  
11 all the other devastating fires that occurred in our  
12 area? If this is not the time to start thinking  
13 outside the box, I don't know logically when that  
14 would be for Shasta County.

15 The EIR for this project identifies  
16 significant unavoidable impacts to cultural and  
17 tribal cultural resources. Access to and protection  
18 of traditional foods, clean water, medicinal plants,  
19 burial, sacred sites, and ceremonial areas are  
20 integral to the tribe's way of life, identity, oral  
21 traditions and history.

22 CEQA requires agency decision makers to  
23 consider these impacts to cultural and tribal  
24 resources before approving any project that could  
25 cause a significant adverse impact.



1           Again, the EIR has identified there are  
2 significant and unavoidable impacts in the proposed  
3 project area. There are no mitigation measures that  
4 can change these proposed unavoidable impacts. This  
5 project will adversely effect our tribal healing and  
6 community building and development and plans. It  
7 will create a financial and health burden to our  
8 existing and future housing plans. It is no  
9 surprise that this type of project targets, once  
10 again, a tribal rural and under-represented  
11 community. When they cannot kill us anymore, they  
12 take away our food, take away our resources;  
13 minimize, eliminate, remove, exploit in an effort to  
14 silence and oppress us.

15           These types of projects and companies  
16 comparable to the nearby Hatchet Wind Farm had  
17 demonstrated a pattern of behavior of targeting  
18 socioeconomically suppressed areas and exploiting  
19 them for personal gain. Further suppressing these  
20 communities by lowering property values in and  
21 around the surrounding project area. As the current  
22 Hatchet Wind Project can be seen from surrounding  
23 counties day and night, the Fountain Wind Project  
24 proposes even larger windmills.

25           Other areas of concern: Fire, wildlife

1 habitat, the blinking lights that calls off the  
2 wildlife, illegal take, which is the murder of  
3 protected species. Deadly conditions caused by  
4 existing turbines, which impact our traditional use.

5 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: If you could sum up,  
6 please, that would be great.

7 BRANDY McDANIELS: Sure. Deadly  
8 conditions caused by the existing turbines which  
9 impact our traditional use of the area. In summary,  
10 the Madesi Band and the Pit River Nation have never  
11 consented to PG&E to be on our land or enter  
12 agreements to allow the take of our tribal assets,  
13 natural food sources, damming of our river, and  
14 mismanagement of our forest.

15 We have not been paid a dime for timber  
16 rights while business and corporations continue to  
17 make billions of dollars off of us. While our  
18 people remain among the poorest of the poor often  
19 living in third-world conditions without running  
20 water and electricity. It took the U.S. government  
21 117 years to declare the lands of the Pit River  
22 Nation --

23 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Thank you.

24 BRANDY McDANIELS: Thank you. The Madesi  
25 Band -- as the Madesi Band cultural representative

1 for my traditional band, we direct the Shasta County  
2 Board of Supervisors to take a stand to protect the  
3 people you represent and serve by denying this  
4 appeal and affirming the Planning Commission's  
5 careful and thoughtful review of the project in  
6 their unanimous decision to reject and deny the  
7 Fountain Wind Use Permit 16-007, which was also  
8 supported --

9 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you.

10 BRANDY McDANIELS: -- and based on revised  
11 findings as recommended by the department staff  
12 which -- which was indicated in the June 22nd, 2021,  
13 minutes --

14 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, ma'am.  
15 Thank you.

16 BRANDY McDANIELS: -- as submitted by Paul  
17 Hellman, Director of Resource Management, Secretary  
18 of the Planning Commission.

19 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you.

20 BRANDY McDANIELS: (Speaking in Native  
21 American language).

22 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Agnes Gonzalez  
23 followed by Tony Yiamkis of the -- and I apologize  
24 if I do this wrong, Illmawi Band Cultural  
25 Representative.

1           AGNES GONZALEZ: Good evening, and thank  
2 you for an opportunity to speak today.

3           My name is Agnes Gonzalez. I'm the Pit  
4 River Tribe's chairwoman. I come here today on  
5 behalf of the Pit River Tribe to voice the Pit River  
6 Tribe's opposition to the Fountain Wind Project.

7           The Fountain Wind Project will have  
8 multiple significant adverse impacts on the tribe's  
9 tribal cultural resources and the environment. Wind  
10 turbines can be noisy, unappealing, and exert large  
11 disturbances into the fluid conditions of the air.

12           The speed of the blade tips can get up to  
13 approximately 200 miles per hour, which is deadly to  
14 wildlife. And, actually, any miles that the thing  
15 is spinning is deadly to wildlife.

16           As for resource consumption and  
17 environmental impacts, the direct effects of wind  
18 turbine kill birds and bats. Some are endangered.  
19 Sinking concrete foundations deep into wildlands is  
20 bad enough. Rare earth metals are mined for the  
21 magnets in the turbines. This generates toxic and  
22 radioactive waste on an epic scale.

23           Wind turbines are made mostly of steel  
24 with concrete faces. They need about 200 times of  
25 material per unit of capacity as a modern combined

1 cycle gas turbine. When the wind turbine's blades  
2 end their useful life, they go into a landfill.  
3 They do not disintegrate. You cannot recycle them.  
4 They will be there forever. So really how green are  
5 the windmills?

6 To not take refuge in the idea that wind  
7 turbines could become more efficient. There is a  
8 limit as to how much energy you can extract from a  
9 moving fluid. The best limit and wind turbines are  
10 already close to it. Their effectiveness, the load  
11 factor, to use an engineering term, is determined by  
12 the wind that is available. And that varies from  
13 day to day.

14 The problem is the wind resource itself.  
15 On this proposed project objectives and alternatives  
16 analyzed the county, identified the basic objectives  
17 of the project asked. Provide up to 216 megawatts  
18 of wind energy to PG&E's Northern California grid.  
19 Create temporary and permanent jobs in the county  
20 and contribute to the County's tax base.

21 It is unclear how and why the county  
22 selected these three objectives as the most basic of  
23 the nine total objectives of the project.

24 No explanation has been provided as to the  
25 need for 216 megawatts of wind energy. Moreover,

1 ConnectGEN has admitted to the tribe both that PG&E  
2 is not interested in purchasing the energy from the  
3 project because it has already met its renewable  
4 portfolio standard requirement and that there is no  
5 other prospective buyer at this time. It is not  
6 clear in the DEIR whether PG&E has explicitly agreed  
7 to the proposed interconnection and ownership and  
8 operation of a proposed switching station.

9           The fact that there is no identified buyer  
10 of additional power and that we are currently facing  
11 rolling blackouts in the area during times of high  
12 wind, highlights the massive public safety issue  
13 posed by this project. Relatively small  
14 contributions to the County's tax base will not be  
15 able to offset the incredible financial losses that  
16 will come with the new fire in the area.

17           What would happen if the turbines fall  
18 into disrepair or to chemicals and lubricants inside  
19 the turbines leak? Transformer fires are known to  
20 happen due to dirty electricity-generating  
21 components. Are local emergency providers  
22 knowledgeable of how to handle an emergency  
23 situation such as a collapsed windmill? Blades  
24 breaking off and large transformer fires due to  
25 dirty electricity-generating components? Do our

1 local emergency providers know what to do if a  
2 windmill collapsed, and do they have the capacity,  
3 the manpower, to handle these types of emergency  
4 situations.

5           The Pit River Tribe has been opposing this  
6 project for many years, and the threat of this  
7 project impacts our tribal members' mental health.  
8 The tribe requests this matter be finally resolved  
9 through denial of the project's Use Permit as soon  
10 as possible. The Board's delay in resolving this  
11 matter only prolongs the stress on the tribe and the  
12 community.

13           Additionally, it has recently come to the  
14 tribe's attention that ConnectGEN has approached  
15 Board members with proposals to change the project  
16 as it was presented to the public in the  
17 Environmental Impact Report and at the Planning  
18 Commission hearing.

19           The applicable municipal code makes clear  
20 that the Board of Supervisors may only review the  
21 record on appeal and any additional relevant  
22 information, which may have been received at the  
23 hearing before the Board of Supervisors. The tribe  
24 is not aware of any specific authorization of the  
25 Board to consider issues outside the scope of those

1 raised in ConnectGEN's appeal.

2 The Planning Commission's decision was  
3 based on the standards set forth in the municipal  
4 code. And ConnectGEN's appeal only raised the issue  
5 of whether the Planning Commission's decision  
6 applying to this standard was proper. ConnectGEN  
7 cannot be allowed to now present a redefined project  
8 never considered by the Planning Commission.

9 To that end, CEQA requires the Board to  
10 recirculate the Environmental Impact Report, EIR.  
11 When significant new information is added between  
12 the end of the public comment period and the EIR's  
13 certification. CEQA guidelines define significant  
14 new information as changes in the project or  
15 environmental setting that alter the EIR in a way  
16 that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity  
17 to comment.

18 Guidelines upon recirculation. The lead  
19 agency can conduct further consultation and notify  
20 the public of the opportunity to review and comment  
21 on the updated EIR guidelines. The lead agency can  
22 then evaluate and respond to pertinent comments on  
23 significant environmental issues arising from the  
24 revisions.

25 Plowing ahead with the Board's review



1 without recirculating the EIR, deprives the Pit  
2 River Tribe of its meaningful opportunity to comment  
3 on the new proposal's substantial adverse  
4 environmental and cultural impacts to the Pit River  
5 Tribe's ancestral land. ConnectGEN's September 8th  
6 letter to Board of Supervisors introduces such  
7 significant new information and considerably changes  
8 the project. Neither the public nor Pit River Tribe  
9 have been able to review or comment on the new  
10 project, which differs substantially from the  
11 original.

12           Despite claiming to have significantly  
13 reduced disturbance to the natural environment,  
14 ConnectGEN fails to address in neither the letter,  
15 nor the EIR, the substantial and adverse impacts of  
16 changes to the placement, density, and visibility of  
17 turbines, construction equipment, and operational  
18 equipment within the new project's smaller  
19 footprint.

20           The intensified construction and  
21 maintenance operations including the installation  
22 and storage of turbines and equipment would inflict  
23 significant environmental harm within the project  
24 area and to its surroundings. In turn, the Pit  
25 River Tribe would suffer significant spiritual and

1 cultural harm.

2           These changes not only merit further  
3 review, but also run counter to CEQA's preservation  
4 in place. Method of impact mitigation for sites of  
5 cultural and religious importance by now focusing  
6 the destruction within a smaller area.

7           Recirculating of the EIR would allow the  
8 tribe provide input on these issues and identify  
9 mitigation measures. The original EIR fails to  
10 consider the potential for ConnectGEN's proposed  
11 intensified use to amplify environmental, cultural,  
12 and spiritual harms within and surrounding the new  
13 footprint. It thereby fails to identify adequate  
14 mitigation measures. For the reasons stated, the  
15 proposed changes constitute significant new  
16 information and recirculation of the EIR is required  
17 under CEQA.

18           ConnectGEN cannot circumvent CEQA's notice  
19 and consultation requirements by individually  
20 contacting members of the Board of Supervisors with  
21 a fundamentally different project from the EIR  
22 available to the public.

23           The moral implications of this underhanded  
24 behavior are underscored by the letter's inclusion  
25 of a payout to the Pit River Tribe, which the tribe

1 has neither been consulted on nor accepted.

2 ConnectGEN's proposed one-time payouts for  
3 community benefits such as it could somehow  
4 compensate the Pit River Tribe and Shasta County  
5 community for the irreparable harms that the project  
6 would cause. The de facto hush money only  
7 underscores the principle that if the Board of  
8 Supervisors considers the project as amended without  
9 recirculating the EIR, ConnectGEN will have  
10 meaningfully deprived the Pit River Tribe of their  
11 voice, as it destroys the spiritual and cultural  
12 value of their ancestral lands. No amount of money  
13 can adequately compensate the tribe for the impact.

14 The tribe is adamantly opposed to  
15 ConnectGEN's tactics and discourages the Board from  
16 allowing ConnectGEN to amend the project in this  
17 way, bypassing public review, and environmental due  
18 diligence, and the County's code.

19 Say no to Fountain Wind Project, vote to  
20 deny the Use Permit. And I also just want to touch  
21 on, you know, how many times that ConnectGEN threw  
22 the Pit River Tribe's name out there. I mean,  
23 clearly if -- if they're -- if their proposal, their  
24 project was right on and meant to be, they wouldn't  
25 have to make up stories and use the tribe's name. I

1 do not appreciate them making false statements  
2 against the Pit River Tribe. And I -- I pray that  
3 all of you take the facts into consideration, vote  
4 no. Vote no, all of you. And thank you very much  
5 and I appreciate your time. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Supervisor Rickert or  
7 Supervisor Moty?

8 SUPERVISOR MOTY: Yeah, not in response to  
9 what the speaker talked about but more the issue,  
10 again, which we talked at the beginning of the  
11 meeting, but I don't know if it was heard by the  
12 speaker, but I think it's important that the County  
13 Counsel speak again that the action we are doing  
14 today is in no way in violation of any of the codes  
15 or whatever things that were quoted. I just want to  
16 make sure people understand that we're not violating  
17 anything, I would ask --

18 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Please, sir.

19 MR. CRUSE: If I may. Thank you.

20 In response to Supervisor Moty's comments  
21 and, yes, as indicated earlier on, the reduction in  
22 size of the project as has been modified does not  
23 pose any significant new environmental impacts,  
24 according to the information from staff and our  
25 consultants, and, as such, then there is no legal

1 requirement to do a recirculation of the EIR.

2 This matter is currently before the Board  
3 of Supervisors for its consideration. The Board  
4 will conduct a de novo review, and the Board can act  
5 to certify the EIR if it decides to for the reduced  
6 project and also either approve or deny the project  
7 as modified.

8 SUPERVISOR MOTY: And also there was an  
9 indication which was true that at least, I think,  
10 all the Board received individual -- or received an  
11 e-mail with information from the proponents on their  
12 project, but the fact of just sending the  
13 information to the supervisors does not violate any  
14 law.

15 MR. CRUSE: No, just simply sending the  
16 information to the supervisors is not in violation.  
17 I believe it's all part of the record and the --  
18 each of these Board members, I believe, has already  
19 made comments and disclosures in connection with  
20 that. I'll defer, but as far as I know all the  
21 documents that came to all the Board members are  
22 part of the public record.

23 SUPERVISOR MOTY: I believe so, and also I  
24 believe that that was -- that was also mentioned in  
25 public comments on September 14th here at a Board

1 meeting.

2 MR. CRUSE: I believe that's correct, but  
3 I can't independently verify.

4 SUPERVISOR MOTY: Okay. Thank you.

5 MR. CRUSE: Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Supervisor Rickert,  
7 your name is up here. Do you want to?

8 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: My screen's blank.

9 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Well, then, we'll  
10 consider that a no.

11 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: Yeah, I have no  
12 screen.

13 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Tony, you're up  
14 followed by Gregory Wolfin of the Illmawi. I hope I  
15 said that right.

16 TONY YIAMKIS: How many minutes do I have?

17 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: You have 15.

18 TONY YIAMKIS: Fifteen minutes. I don't  
19 think I'm going to need that long. Thank you,  
20 Supervisors, for hearing us.

21 (Speaking Native American language).

22 My name is Tony Illmawi Band of the  
23 Illmawi Tribe. I'm a cultural resources  
24 representative and -- for those of you not aware,  
25 NEPA and CEQA was created in -- or the thought

1 process started in and around the Vietnam War, civil  
2 rights, unrest, concern for environment throughout  
3 the United States.

4 So, you know, I just hear comments about  
5 CEQA, and just kind of like just throwing it around,  
6 but it's a big deal. At first NEPA was created  
7 national and then California copied NEPA. And it  
8 was instituted for a reason, because before that,  
9 you know, before Vietnam War, it was a free-for-all  
10 for development.

11 As brought up Shasta Dam quite a bit  
12 tonight, and, you know, since the Commissioners  
13 hearing in June, I did some online research and I  
14 forget the gal's name, but she did a master's thesis  
15 on building the Shasta Dam, and some of the adverse  
16 effects since then. So if the Shasta Dam was to be  
17 built today, there would be a huge consideration  
18 for, you know, the fish, salmon, trout, because  
19 there's no way for the salmon, fish, to travel  
20 upstream to the Pit River to our ancestral  
21 homelands, which the fish provided subsistence to  
22 our tribe for thousands of years.

23 One other thing, a Commissioners'  
24 hearing -- or since then I've been hearing  
25 ConnectGEN mentioned that they listened to the

1 concerns of the community. And the ten hours that I  
2 spent at the Commissioners' hearing, I was -- I was  
3 just hearing more, like, community residents of  
4 Round Mountain, Montgomery Creek, Burney, they were  
5 talking about they're more terrified rather than  
6 concerned. And the voicing was no for no project.  
7 So I just wanted to get that off my chest that I  
8 didn't hear concerns.

9 Oh, in addition to that, the reason that  
10 they were terrified is because -- of additional  
11 runaway wildfires due to global warming, fire  
12 tornadoes, and the such. Towards the last of the  
13 Commissioners' hearing last June, the Fountain Wind  
14 Project the, you know, there was -- there was  
15 concerned citizens that brought up building the  
16 project. There also -- somewhere where it was  
17 safer, there would be less chance of a wildfire --  
18 or wildfire due to having a wind turbine project  
19 built in the middle of the forest on top or near a  
20 ridge line where the wind sheer can just, you know,  
21 multiply maybe, you know, 40, 50, 60, 80 miles an  
22 hour.

23 I once lived in San Bernardino for a few  
24 months and, luckily, I got out of there. I was near  
25 Victorville and there was a pass called Cajon Pass,



1 and I witnessed myself driving behind a big rig  
2 truck and trailer, just lifted up and was thrown off  
3 the side of the freeway in front of me. And there  
4 was -- the sand was -- the blowing lifted off the  
5 air and was blowing so hard the visibility was like  
6 zero. And we tried -- had to pull away on the side  
7 of the road. So I can just imagine what a forest  
8 wildfire would be with 80-mile-an-hour winds up  
9 there.

10 As the cultural representative, I just  
11 kind of share a little bit about what we do. We  
12 have 11 bands within the Pit River Tribe and we have  
13 cultural representatives. Each band is responsible  
14 for if there's any projects in our area. Anytime  
15 the soil is going to be disturbed or a waterway,  
16 anything with plant, animal life, we get called in.  
17 As an example, say, Caltrans wants to widen a road  
18 or build a bridge or like what we have currently  
19 going on, PG&E is proposing to dig up one of their  
20 gas pipelines in Illmawi area. By the way, Illmawi  
21 area, we're -- I don't know, say, we're in the  
22 center of the an ancestral Pit River area, but that  
23 include -- includes Burney Falls, which almost  
24 everybody knows where Burney Falls is because it's a  
25 pretty widely known tourist spot.

1           So we get called in and we -- you know,  
2     the -- like a project or agency or private company  
3     wants to know if there's any sacred sites in our  
4     area or burial sites, you know, cemeteries. And I  
5     don't know, I don't have a percentage down, but  
6     sometimes we have -- you know, no project happens or  
7     it's a mitigated and, you know, any, you know,  
8     cultural areas we bypass.

9           We've been speaking about -- or I've been  
10    hearing tonight about private land, timberland, I  
11    guess, its own overseas company, I'm not sure what  
12    the name is right here, but recently we've had --  
13    PG&E has returned hundreds of acres, I think, our  
14    Illmawi Council person is going to talk about that  
15    later, hundreds of acres back to the tribe. And I  
16    wrote to Lio, and I just kind of referenced. I  
17    said, Hey, if some other agencies, private owners  
18    returning the land, why not this Australian  
19    timberland company just return all -- return all  
20    their timberland to us, Pit River Tribe, and we'll  
21    take care of it.

22           Because what's happening now, as you guys  
23    are probably kind of seen, you're hearing some  
24    things now, that there's our cultural burning is  
25    being revived. Like at least throughout California,

1 there's lots of cultural resources meetings going  
2 on. Firefighting, CAL FIRE is involved, other  
3 agencies. So cultural burning.

4           What that is, is it's more of a -- we  
5 tribes, we would burn in the wintertime and maybe  
6 early spring, and this would go on, you know,  
7 hundreds of years, thousands of years. And so  
8 what's happened is across the state and further out  
9 that environment would be chaparral, you just have  
10 trees, plants, you wouldn't have bushes and timber.

11           It's easy to gravel the -- we would trade  
12 from the coast, you know, deep into the great basin  
13 and we covered every square inch of our ancestral  
14 area trails and trails and trails. So and that --  
15 the State got away from that, of course, a hundred  
16 years ago as to preserve timber; just preserve,  
17 preserve, preserve, don't burn anything, put the  
18 fires out as fast as you can.

19           So if you give it back to us, we'll turn  
20 it back into, you know, that chaparral-looking place  
21 where there's no little trees growing up around the  
22 big trees, no bushes growing around the big trees,  
23 so the fire just ignites and can shoot up high.  
24 There would be none of that around these trees if we  
25 could, you know, manage it again and preserve it.

1           So, yeah, I'll call it one last time if  
2 the Australian timber owners are here and do the  
3 right thing and give it back to us. I got three  
4 minutes.

5           Attorney Steve Johnson, you mentioned  
6 earlier about depression. You know, we really -- we  
7 really feel that. All our tribal people really feel  
8 it. I still see it, you know. Many generation  
9 depression, trauma, forced upon us. Brandy talked a  
10 lot about that earlier. You know, we've had our  
11 extra share of mental health issues. And, you know,  
12 I'm depressed looking from Main Street, Burney, you  
13 can count 13 and a half wind turbines. And I've  
14 pulled a lot of tribal members and non-Indians in  
15 Burney area and they said they had no idea they were  
16 going to be able to see any turbines at all from the  
17 Hatchet Wind Project.

18           And I've had children ask me -- tribal  
19 children ask me, "When are the windmills going to go  
20 away?"

21           And I tell them, "I don't know, we're  
22 working on it. Maybe we'll get them to go away."

23           So, like I said, at the Commissioners'  
24 hearing, enough is enough. I ask for you to vote  
25 for a no use project, and we don't need any more

1 depression. We're looking at those things.

2 So what I'll do is kind of close out here.

3 Actually, I think I covered it all, so I'm going to

4 end it all. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Next up is Gregory

6 followed by Connor Yiamkis, a member of PRT.

7 GREGORY WOLFIN: Good morning. My name is

8 Gregory Feather Wolfin. I am a Illmawi

9 representative, a band representative, one of two.

10 So as Tony and others has really explained, is the

11 Pit River Nation is composed of 11 autonomous bands,

12 Illmawi being one of them. With that, I have do

13 have ties to the impacted area -- or the projected

14 impact area.

15 And so what wasn't explained is this is

16 not only the Madesi Band area, but it's also the

17 Atsugewi Band area. It's also the Itsatawi Band

18 area. This area also was homeland to the Yana as

19 well. And so, you know, there's a reason to why the

20 Yana, as a collective tribal government, isn't here.

21 But I'm here to represent my band stand in solidarity

22 with Atsugewi Band, Madesi Band and Itsatawi Band,

23 as well as, standing in solidarity with Pit River

24 Nation, with our chairperson's statement or

25 testimony to you all.

1           So I have contributed -- help contribute  
2 to some of the fact-finding and some of the  
3 information as well. But, regardless, we are here  
4 to oppose the project and urge you all to oppose --  
5 we have a 16-007. And so even with the Hatchet  
6 Ridge, the tribe was really opposed to it for  
7 numerous reasons. And so there was, out of  
8 abundance of information provided in opposition to  
9 that project, including raptors and also migratory  
10 birds. So that plays, as well as, the Fountain  
11 Ridge holds an immense amount of travel, cultural  
12 history, heritage, as well as -- as being -- hosting  
13 sacred sites.

14           So sacred sites has been tossed around, so  
15 I don't know if it's really been explained or really  
16 just, I guess, understood. So some of these places  
17 hold a special significance to people. Preferably  
18 the Pit River people as well as others. So these  
19 places have a type of reverence where it is held  
20 within a collective memory of a people to an  
21 understanding of these areas as pinpoints of power,  
22 and so these places have a purpose.

23           And so this purpose was so significantly  
24 important to Pit River people where as bestowed in  
25 name. And usually with a name, it accompanies a

1 story or an oral narrative. That's a part of Pit  
2 River base epistemologies. And so with those  
3 epistemologies becomes these original instructions  
4 on how to approach these areas, the significance of  
5 these areas, as well as, the power to be revered.

6 So these places were not for everybody.  
7 And so some of these places were for young boys to  
8 become men, girls become women, as well as, people  
9 try to find some type of prowess or special power.  
10 So there's stories that circulate within Pit River  
11 where people spend their lifetimes looking for that  
12 power. A lot of them don't.

13 And so, with that, that's why some of  
14 these places are revered. That's why a lot of these  
15 people are here right now to provide to you some  
16 type of piece of information of a collective Pit  
17 River world view to the importance of these areas  
18 and why they ought to get protected.

19 Sacred sites are also places where people  
20 are laid to rest. They are the final resting  
21 grounds, or whatever else. So back then, you know,  
22 hundreds of years ago, rocks signified these  
23 locations and these burial sites and whatever else.  
24 And so -- also, a lot of these places are lost. You  
25 know, we were fortunate enough to be born and from a

1 beautiful area, but it also attracted other peoples  
2 who, you know, were there to colonize and take over  
3 and whatever else. And so we were blessed, but also  
4 we were cursed to be from these areas.

5 So through the processes of conquest and  
6 colonization, there have been laws that normalize  
7 genocide. And, you know, genocide shouldn't be  
8 tossed around as loosely, but that's what -- when  
9 you look into the facts, that's what it was. Then  
10 you have later subrogation and assimilation through  
11 Federal policy. So if you guys are interested, you  
12 guys can look into the processes of assimilation,  
13 but now we're in the era of self-incrimination, so  
14 that's why we're here collectively as a tribal  
15 government to represent our homelands, as well as,  
16 our ancestors. So, yeah, we are here to convey our  
17 history, our knowledge, as well as, our purpose and  
18 inalienable opportunity to be here to express our  
19 concern to this project.

20 And concerns of public safety. We've all  
21 listened to the concerns of fire. We've had all  
22 these fires that have popped up throughout the  
23 years. We just saw, you know, Hatchet, that was --  
24 or Fountain Fire, that was terrible. And there was  
25 other fires that were brought up, the most recent



1 ones. So there's another fire that was not brought  
2 up and so that was the Hat Fire, and so that was  
3 back in 2018. So that was spurred up from a stray  
4 bullet out at the Fall River Gun Range.

5 And so that blew up to 1,900 acres within,  
6 you know, a small amount of time. And so that one  
7 was attributed to the dryness of the area. Dryness  
8 of the soil, as well as, some invasive grasses that  
9 triggered the fire. And so there was some ravines  
10 that were kind of steep where a lot of the fire  
11 built up and got really hot and spread.

12 And so that drew a concern to the Fall  
13 River community, as well as, Burney. But it was  
14 subdued by aerial -- aerial means, fire retardant,  
15 and whatever else. And so that fire was -- that --  
16 it jumped over 299 and it moved rapidly. And I  
17 think it was stopped outside the boundary of Fall  
18 River. And so that caused great concern for the  
19 tribe just because of the cultural resources that  
20 are found in that area as well.

21 And so while listening to some of the  
22 project details, and when I heard that the windmills  
23 would be pushed to the interior of the area, that  
24 caused a great concern because there are steep  
25 ridges, there are deep ravines and everything else

1 where the fire can spread faster. Just like with  
2 some of these other fires that were not controlled.  
3 So that's where we have a concern with the windmills  
4 because of their height, as well as, the need for  
5 the aerial retardants and everything else for the  
6 firefighters, and so that's one issue that the tribe  
7 has expressed.

8           And so Tony, he did bring up the burning  
9 gardens. And so the tribal will be receiving  
10 1,600 acres of land. And so this land is within the  
11 Atsuge Band, as well as, the outside perimeter of  
12 the Yana. So with this area, it is gated to be  
13 7,000 years old of human usage. And so that's a  
14 gate people use this as a migratory corridor to  
15 capture elk, capture bear, deer, and other species.

16           This area has a series of meadows and  
17 springs that go subsurface. And it's also the  
18 headwaters to the Green Burney Creek, as well as  
19 Burney Creek. So with that you have migratory birds  
20 that enter and exit this area. And so the wind  
21 turbines will actually be around the Burney Gardens,  
22 which draws great concern for potential habitat  
23 obstruction, as well as, the possibility of  
24 infiltrating the groundwater system.

25           And so it is kind of a trickle effect when

1 you have development on the upper -- on the mountain  
2 ridges, and it comes down and it causes great  
3 concern to our habitats that we will soon be  
4 managing. So also found along the project -- or the  
5 Burney Gardens boundaries were projectile tips, some  
6 points, some blinds, some rock cairns to trap some  
7 of the mega fauna.

8 And so we view it as potentially harming  
9 the area as well as -- as well as, blocking or  
10 hindering spiritual connection to the area as well  
11 as the mountain ridges and the lines along the  
12 Burney Gardens.

13 So through the -- I think that will be it  
14 for me. Thanks.

15 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Supervisor Moty?

16 SUPERVISOR MOTY: Could I have the speaker  
17 come back? Sir?

18 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Speaker, could you  
19 come back for just one second? Thank you.

20 SUPERVISOR MOTY: Sorry, I didn't mean for  
21 you to get away so quickly.

22 GREGORY WOLFEN: No, it's okay.

23 SUPERVISOR MOTY: I just wanted to thank  
24 you for talking about the sacred sites a little bit  
25 and explaining it. I always wondered. You hear the

1 words a lot, but thank you for taking the time to  
2 put some more information behind it, so I have a  
3 better understanding what you're referring to.

4 My question is: Are there sacred sites --  
5 or at least that you consider -- on the property  
6 where the projected wind turbines might be?

7 GREGORY WOLFIN: Yes, there are. And so  
8 Brandy and Radley Davis, actually, they didn't  
9 mention them by name, so they're kind of hard  
10 because they're spoken in our language, but there  
11 are an abundance of sacred sites. A lot of them  
12 identified as high ridge lines, as well as,  
13 mountaintops where these people do seek their power  
14 and figure out their placement of time, you know,  
15 power and place.

16 SUPERVISOR MOTY: And do people have  
17 access to those today?

18 GREGORY WOLFIN: Not that I know of. We  
19 did have a site visit, and we went to several  
20 places. And so what we did notice there was an  
21 abundance of, like, medicinals, as well as, natural  
22 foods. But other than that site visit, there's --  
23 the gates are locked and the access is limited.

24 SUPERVISOR MOTY: Okay. Great. Thank you  
25 very much.

1 GREGORY WOLFEN: Yep. Any other  
2 questions?

3 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Any other questions?  
4 Thank you, sir.

5 GREGORY WOLFEN: Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Connor Yiamkis is  
7 next. And, Michelle LaPena, the attorney for the  
8 Pit River Tribe is on deck.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Connor is not here.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Connor is not going  
11 to make it.

12 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Okay. Then we'll go  
13 to Michelle, please. And that will be followed by  
14 Gill Wright of the Private Pilots Association.

15 MICHELLE LAPENA: Hi, good evening,  
16 Supervisors. My name is Michelle LaPena and I'm an  
17 attorney for the tribe, but I'm also a tribal  
18 member. I'm a member of the Hammawi Band of the Pit  
19 River Tribe. My band is not located in this project  
20 area, but I am a part and an ally, of course, of my  
21 other sister bands. My band location is -- our  
22 territory is near Alturas. So our aboriginal  
23 territory is a hundred mile square, what we call  
24 today. So there's 11 bands, as was stated earlier,  
25 and we all share in the concern for this project.

1           This reduced project will result in  
2 similar impacts to the Pit River Tribe. Forty-eight  
3 turbine sites will result in impacts to 48 sites.  
4 There was some discussion about whether CEQA  
5 requires us to recirculate. And, you know, those  
6 are legal issues that may not be answered here,  
7 because we have different views about what is  
8 significant new information and, you know, the case  
9 law may say that a reduction is appropriate in  
10 this -- in this instance that it could maybe move  
11 forward.

12           But we've raised the issue that this is --  
13 the change does not fall into those kinds of  
14 decisions that -- those line of cases. We would  
15 argue that they -- in fact, this is a different  
16 argument. We're saying that these sites -- the  
17 sites are specific, and those 48 turbine locations  
18 would need to be evaluated, because the footprint  
19 has changed.

20           And so when we're talking about cultural  
21 sites, where each turbine is located and the size of  
22 it and the interaction of each of them, that will  
23 require a different analysis. And we don't think  
24 it's possible to mitigate the impacts to the tribal  
25 cultural resources that are impacted by this project

1 to below the level of significant.

2 Today, ConnectGEN presented that there  
3 were 11 alternatives at one point in time. But we  
4 saw two. So we have the reduced size alternative,  
5 which we haven't really fully studied through an  
6 EIR. And we have a no project alternative. And,  
7 obviously, the no project alternative is preferred  
8 by the tribe for all the reasons that are in our  
9 comment letter and as outlined in the testimony  
10 tonight. You know, there are cumulative impacts of  
11 colonization that have impacted our tribe and  
12 affected our resources that lead us to these  
13 conclusions that we're raising here today. So I'm  
14 not going to repeat all of those things, but they  
15 are there in your record.

16 My concern today is that if there was a  
17 legitimate reduced impact alternative, why didn't  
18 they propose it to the Planning Commission? And I  
19 think another person spoke to that that there was --  
20 they had an idea that why it wasn't proposed because  
21 there was changes. And this -- this proposal  
22 requires a new analysis.

23 Bringing a reduced impact alternative here  
24 on appeal might be legal, but we don't really know  
25 that for sure tonight. But it undermines the spirit

1 and intent of CEQA, which is to allow for public  
2 review of certain proposed projects and to allow us  
3 time to digest and provide a real detailed analysis.

4 The fact that the timeline for this appeal  
5 hearing was extended was not something that we could  
6 have predicted. So under the reading, the strict  
7 reading of your municipal code, we would have had a  
8 much shorter time frame within which to, you know,  
9 conduct an analysis. And that's where our rights  
10 under CEQA and that ability to provide meaningful  
11 impact -- or information into the analysis was  
12 prevented.

13 You know, some projects just are not  
14 suitable for construction. Some places cannot be  
15 developed properly on because the impacts outweigh  
16 the benefits. ConnectGEN touts proposed benefits to  
17 the community. But I hate to say it, from my  
18 perspective, we can't trust them. They've continued  
19 to provide misleading information to the County,  
20 private entities, local groups, and individuals  
21 through mailers or other direct marketing and in  
22 their materials on their website.

23 Their presentation today, again, included  
24 that false information. There has never been a  
25 meeting between ConnectGEN and the Pit River Tribal



1 Council; today they said there were two. The tribe  
2 has been consistent in its opposition to the  
3 Fountain Wind Project because of the severe impacts  
4 to the tribe's ancestral resources and aboriginal  
5 lands. In our view, there is no benefit to the  
6 tribe that will come out of this project. Just as  
7 there was no benefit from the Hatchet Ridge Project.

8 They also promised funding and benefits to  
9 the tribe and the tribe has seen nothing. We see a  
10 pattern here. We've been here before. The tribe's  
11 TERO officer also did not contact ConnectGEN to  
12 inquire about proposed benefits to the tribe. A  
13 ConnectGEN employee cold-called that representative.

14 There was calls going around to tribal  
15 folks from ConnectGEN representatives and he just  
16 happened to answer the phone that day and answered  
17 some questions. But he did make it clear -- and he  
18 spoke to me about this -- that he told them that the  
19 tribal council was the governing body of the tribe  
20 and only they could represent the tribe, not him.

21 But rather than respect that, ConnectGEN  
22 has used the conversation for the past year to  
23 promote an idea that the tribe has agreed to a  
24 payment of 250,000, and an insinuation that the  
25 tribe was supportive of the project.

1           For many months, we've objected to the use  
2 of the tribe's name on their literature and on their  
3 website. And they did issue an apology to me  
4 privately last week through an e-mail from their  
5 attorney. But it was after months of propaganda  
6 being disseminated across the county, which was  
7 addressed a little bit earlier in Brandy's  
8 testimony.

9           On October 14th, the attorney wrote, and  
10 I'm just going to quote it: I spoke briefly on the  
11 subject to your colleague, my colleague, in June and  
12 we were objecting to them using the tribe's name,  
13 and explained that in ConnectGEN's view its  
14 promotional materials are clear that the commitments  
15 it has made are voluntary proposals and the offers  
16 have not been accepted. ConnectGEN also articulated  
17 this story in their Planning Commission. Again,  
18 these are her words. Nonetheless, ConnectGEN  
19 regrets any miscommunication on this topic and will  
20 remove all public references to proposed  
21 contributions by ConnectGEN to the Pit River Tribe  
22 until further discussions may be had between the  
23 parties.

24           But today I'm looking at their website  
25 just while I was sitting here waiting, listening to

1 others and the alleged contribution is still in  
2 their community benefits page. References to the  
3 Pit River TERO office has been made throughout the  
4 presentations today as you've heard. They have not  
5 been open and transparent. They unfortunately, in  
6 my opinion, perpetuate these lies because they know  
7 that there's no legal basis to enforce these  
8 financial, quote, promises that they're making on  
9 their website. They can say whatever they want to  
10 get this project passed, but it's not a binding  
11 agreement.

12           It's a common strategy to throw money to  
13 local governments to get approval for controversial  
14 projects that will impact the community. But these  
15 promises are not legally binding agreements, they're  
16 only ideas. And with regard to any payment to the  
17 Pit River Tribe, we can honestly say there's no  
18 amount of payoff that ConnectGEN could offer to the  
19 tribe that would change our position. The idea that  
20 \$250,000 would somehow offset the impacts to the  
21 tribe is just offensive.

22           With regard to the project itself, the  
23 road construction for the updated project alone will  
24 result in changes to the land that will limit future  
25 uses of the area and create additional impacts to

1 the tribe's aboriginal territory. While they want  
2 to use this land and build new roads that they're  
3 now classifying as fire protection, the EIR states  
4 that the roads will be vacated at the end of the  
5 40-year term of the lease for the project.

6 The plan then is to let the forest reclaim  
7 the road after 40 years. I'm not sure why the road  
8 is now being proposed as making this project fire  
9 safe. If the road is such a good thing, why would  
10 they abandon it? The EIR does not legally obligate  
11 ConnectGEN to remove the broken down turbines at the  
12 end of the lease. They will likely just abandon the  
13 project altogether. And I know there was comments  
14 about this earlier, but is this what the community  
15 needs? Bonds might be issued, but the problem, at  
16 the end of the day, in 40 years will fall on the  
17 County and the local community to clean it up.

18 And I just want to tell the story again,  
19 I've told it at the Commission. If you've ever  
20 driven from Ontario to Palm Springs, maybe had a  
21 vacation, you may have seen wind turbines along the  
22 way. When I was a little girl, my family on my  
23 grandfather's side is tribal from Southern  
24 California, and we would drive down to his  
25 reservation in Indio to attend tribal council

1 meetings.

2           And back then when I was a little girl,  
3 and I'm not very young right now, back then the  
4 scattered white turbines were kind of whimsical.  
5 They were kind of cute against the sky. And that  
6 pass leading to Palm Springs, they were sort of like  
7 you're entering Palm Springs and it was very cool.

8           But once those turbines were built, more  
9 were sited and approved there, because the damage  
10 had already been done. The San Geronio Pass is now  
11 full of working and decommissioned turbines. It's  
12 also a dead zone. The beautiful range of the pass,  
13 which once included flowering cactus and a mesquite  
14 forest is deadened and dry.

15           This past July I drove through this pass  
16 and those plants are gone now, and the pass is  
17 devoid of life. Don't let anyone fool you, wind  
18 turbines will change an ecosystem quickly and  
19 without regard for the people who loved it before  
20 the turbines were built.

21           The impacts are not just visual. The  
22 impacts will change the quality of all life in the  
23 Round Mountain and Montgomery Creek area forever.  
24 The reduction of the footprint removes those  
25 turbines that were more scattered anyway, so there's

1 an emphasis on the amount of the size. But it  
2 creates an intensely impacted area.

3 We know from our experience with other  
4 states, areas of the state, like such as down south  
5 that this project, while reduced, is only the  
6 beginning. It is essentially Phase 1 of the  
7 Fountain Wind Project. We know that once a second  
8 turbine project is approved in our tribal  
9 homelands -- and this will be the second one --  
10 there will be more. Like Hatchet Ridge, we will not  
11 benefit from a single watt of energy from the  
12 Fountain Wind Project. It will be exported. This  
13 project will not reduce carbon in our area.

14 It will sacrifice our homeland to put  
15 power into the western area power authority grid  
16 that will power homes in other western states. If  
17 this project is approved, we can guarantee there  
18 will be another proposal for the portion of this  
19 project that was removed since the last Planning  
20 Commission hearing.

21 Let's just stop it all now. We all know  
22 that this project is not suitable for that area.  
23 There is no mitigation that could make this project  
24 feasible to the people including the Pit River  
25 Tribal membership. If we seriously want to address

1 climate change, let's work together to build a  
2 sustainable working grid that would actually provide  
3 affordable energy to citizens of Shasta County and  
4 the Pit River Tribe.

5 We ask you to deny this application and  
6 just end this project once and for all. Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Supervisor Baugh?

8 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Yes, I do have a  
9 question for you before you get away there. Were  
10 you here earlier when the hearing started?

11 MICHELLE LAPENA: Yes.

12 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: So I had asked the  
13 question of the ConnectGEN folks whether or not  
14 coordination was, in effect, a Norseman of the  
15 project. So are you familiar with the legal term  
16 coordination? I'm going to assume that you are.

17 MICHELLE LAPENA: Sure.

18 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: And does their contact  
19 in your mind affect coordination between government  
20 or business and government?

21 MICHELLE LAPENA: No. And I'm really more  
22 familiar with the word consultation, but I'm going  
23 to use consultation --

24 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Okay. That works for  
25 me.

1 MICHELLE LAPENA: -- to be kind of  
2 equivalent.

3 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: I've only used the word  
4 coordination because they used it.

5 MICHELLE LAPENA: Yeah. In the law, in  
6 the government code, California government code,  
7 consultation is the meaningful discussion and  
8 analyzing an issue to create a common goal, you  
9 know, to come to an agreement. And it's meaningful  
10 and it's mutual. It's a mutual conversation. And  
11 no, you know, they have reached out to us, I will  
12 give them that credit, of course, they have, they  
13 tried.

14 But we already know what the project is  
15 and we already know what the impacts are and we've  
16 already explored that with Hatchet Ridge and regret  
17 that we were not able to get in front of that  
18 project and keep that first project from happening.  
19 Because what happens is you have the second project,  
20 and then you have the next project. And it will  
21 become a place that is more suitable for wind  
22 turbines than other places because they're already  
23 there. And we don't want that to happen.

24 But in terms of the coordination, they  
25 have reached out. We have -- there was discussion



1 among the tribal counsel to see if there was an  
2 interest in having conversations with them. But,  
3 frankly, with all of the misleading statements and  
4 propaganda out there stating -- using the tribe's  
5 name, we just didn't feel we could trust meeting  
6 with them because we felt that whatever was said  
7 might be taken out of context and misused. So we  
8 did not want to be taken advantage of in that way.

9 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: That clarifies it very  
10 nicely. Thank you for responding.

11 MICHELLE LAPENA: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Do we have  
13 any other questions? Then I'll call up Gill Wright  
14 and followed by Jim Chapin of the Shasta County  
15 Planning Commission.

16 GILL WRIGHT: Good evening,  
17 Commissioners -- or Supervisors.

18 Ma'am, did you give them the materials I  
19 had handed -- Okay.

20 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Uh-huh.

21 GILL WRIGHT: I'm Gill Wright. I'm the  
22 vice president of District 2 of the California  
23 Pilots Association. We look to help protect  
24 airports in the State of California, but also safe  
25 airmanship and air transportation.

1           One of the things I was first asked to  
2 look at when I was first asked to look at this  
3 project almost a year ago, was I got a copy -- well,  
4 a current sectional chart, which I believe you all  
5 have a copy of. And how can I present this?

6           THE CLERK: If you want you can just hold  
7 it up.

8           GILL WRIGHT: Okay. I'll hold it here for  
9 the public to see. Because what we have here is --

10          UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I can hold that.

11          GILL WRIGHT: Okay. Great. Hold that one  
12 side.

13          This is the national air space, and what  
14 I've done here is highlight --

15          CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Gill, it would help if  
16 we can see it as well.

17          GILL WRIGHT: Okay, well, you actually  
18 have a copy of it in your hands right here.

19          CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Okay.

20          GILL WRIGHT: Right there.

21          CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Okay. Thank you.

22          GILL WRIGHT: What this is, is I  
23 highlighted -- here is Red Bluff, here's Redding.  
24 And there's these blue lines. Those are power  
25 transmission lines. Those are kind of the arteries

1 of modernity for all the electricity that we need.  
2 And one thing I looked at, Okay, well, here's  
3 Hatchet Ridge. But what caught my attention was  
4 these three red dots. And those three red dots are  
5 meteorological towers that the FAA had registered in  
6 October -- in August of 2010.

7           So for the last 13 years, these  
8 meteorological towers have been gathering  
9 information about the wind and it's economic  
10 viability. Somebody has that. I talked with one of  
11 the pilots -- I can -- thank you very much. I  
12 talked with one of the pilots in the local community  
13 in the last six months, he had flown over that area.  
14 There was a truck there. They have maintained it.  
15 There's a company -- you supervisors have a copy of  
16 the FAA document. There's a firm called Enel Green  
17 Power North America, and this was received by the  
18 FAA on August 24th, 2010.

19           My guess, there's three of these. The  
20 papers that I have submitted to you are the two  
21 towers that the FAA gave me the information. I  
22 presume the third is also by the Enel Green Power of  
23 North America. And that somebody had to make an  
24 investment, an engineering protocol, roads, permits,  
25 to put in these three towers. My guess is that that

1 was probably a million dollars per tower. So that's  
2 \$3 million probably 12 years ago that was put in to  
3 measure the wind of this area.

4 And what I think is highly critical about  
5 that is if you look at where the Hatchet Ridge site  
6 is, it's in orange, and those three dots are like  
7 tears falling from Hatchet Ridge heading to the  
8 south. That's about 15 miles. And if you look to  
9 the east and to the west of those three  
10 meteorological towers, there's power transmission  
11 lines.

12 And if you look to the north of Hatchet  
13 Ridge, there's also major power transmission lines.  
14 Whoever made the investment to put in these  
15 meteorological towers 15 years ago has not a 20-year  
16 plan, but a 50-year plan.

17 I grew up and watched what happened with  
18 Altamont Pass as a child. I've seen what happened  
19 with Tehachapi. What is here with Hatchet Ridge and  
20 now the Fountain Project is prelude of having a wall  
21 probably 20 to 40 miles long north-south. It will  
22 take time, but I think that is the part of the plan.

23 Now, maybe that's taking this too far, but  
24 this is aviation. We have to look at simple truth  
25 in aviation; is it air worthy? Pilots have a term.

1 I'm a pilot, an aircraft mechanic, and a  
2 certificated aircraft dispatcher. Take-offs are  
3 optional, landings are mandatory.

4 Think about it.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good observation.

6 GILL WRIGHT: Yeah, it's truth. Simple  
7 truth. And that's the truth that we have here.  
8 Yes, we need power; our society, modernity of  
9 electrical power. But when I was at the Planning  
10 Commission hearing in June, I was astounded at the  
11 full history of what's gone on here with resource  
12 extraction, and the cost that the peoples have had  
13 to endure. There's huge costs.

14 If the city folks want power, maybe they  
15 should generate power in their own backyard. If  
16 NASA can do that, generating power; if the United  
17 States Navy can do that, we have the technology. We  
18 have a political issue.

19 The reason I bring up that comment about  
20 the U.S. Navy and NASA, is that Enel, that's a  
21 Sumerian name. That's the Sumerian God of wind.  
22 And I first learned about Enel when NASA launched  
23 the New Horizons probe, which went to Pluto. It  
24 took about 14 years, but they've got a plutonium  
25 battery that's still generating energy.

1           And the Enel, they have actually what's  
2   called an Enel spiral from the sun as it rotates and  
3   chrono mass ejections or the solar wind comes off,  
4   it starts to spiral. And those solar winds actually  
5   change the telemetry of that space craft. But  
6   that's one of the issues about climate is what's  
7   going on with the sun and its solar cycle. Those  
8   are factors that we need to look at. Those are  
9   much, much broader than what is here.

10           But the point I was getting to is about  
11   nuclear power. We have the technology of small  
12   batteries that are about the size of a semi truck  
13   that can be plugged in, generate power and unplug it  
14   in 15 years. It has internal salts to do a thermal  
15   transfer. We have clean power. But this wind  
16   generation project right now, especially with what's  
17   being presented, I personally think that ConnectGEN  
18   may not even know who is the financial backers of  
19   Enel Green Power North America.

20           What I found fascinating on this document  
21   that the sponsor was part of the Burney Wind  
22   Project. And that it has the same person, a Anicia  
23   Soares down in La Jolla, California. Two different  
24   addresses, the same phone number to contact the same  
25   person.

1           What does this company have to do with the  
2 basic research of the wind power? Because I think  
3 that there's a significant lack of clarity of what's  
4 going on. One of the things that I noticed before  
5 in preparation for this evening, the -- you know,  
6 ConnectGEN had submitted the -- an FAA's  
7 determination of, quote-unquote, no hazard for the  
8 aerial navigation.

9           And I read through this because this was  
10 dated the 7th of July. And the one thing that's  
11 very interesting on page 2 of this, because there's  
12 been so many changes and this is something that is  
13 per the FAA. This is a federal document. And this  
14 is the one, two, three, four, five, six, seventh  
15 paragraph on page 2 of this document which for -- if  
16 you're curious, it's aerial study  
17 No. 2020-WTW-520-OE. And it has something here  
18 that's quite curious, and it says in capital letters  
19 "Any change to the height, location, or number of  
20 turbines within this project will require a  
21 reanalysis of the marking and lighting  
22 recommendations for the entire project. In  
23 particular, removal of previously planned or built  
24 turbines, turbine locations from this project will  
25 often result in change in the marking and lighting

1 recommendations for other turbines within the  
2 project. It is the proponent's responsibility to  
3 contact the FAA to discuss the process of these  
4 changes."

5 But yet they presented this document as it  
6 is currently approved by the FAA. They changed the  
7 project. I don't see any resubmission to the FAA  
8 that there's been changes.

9 When we do work on aircraft and if we  
10 modify the air frame, we have to submit what's known  
11 as a 337. That is a permanent record of that air  
12 frame in-perpetuity. And it has to be approved by  
13 the FAA.

14 The point that I'm trying to get across is  
15 that there's a lot of things that of this project  
16 raises serious concerns. The biggest concern is the  
17 fire hazard. The bigger concern is that I think  
18 that what is being proposed here is something far,  
19 far larger than what's being presented. At least  
20 that's my opinion from what I've seen with the FAA  
21 aeronautical charts and the document that I had  
22 pointed out with where these meteorological towers  
23 had been put in.

24 One of the things that Kelly Tanner passed  
25 on to me when we spoke earlier is that there's



1 another firm in Colorado that is looking to put  
2 another meteorological tower somewhere here in  
3 Shasta County for a prospective wind farm.

4           So it's beginning. Other wind companies  
5 are looking that they would like to do that, but  
6 this forest is not a place for a wind farm. It's a  
7 potential fire hazard, and I am very concerned about  
8 that. Plus to say nothing of some of the hazards to  
9 navigation. Where these wind turbines are  
10 currently, it's a small spread horizontally, a very  
11 narrow -- pilots can fly over it or fly around it.  
12 But if you get a much, much larger program or  
13 project, those turbines in the slipstream as the  
14 wind comes up and over the hill will be mixing the  
15 air in ways that is not fully predicted and is not  
16 known.

17           There's also a question of if there's a  
18 large enough array of wind turbines, because in this  
19 letter that the FAA pointed out that says, Currently  
20 there is no known interference with the radar  
21 station for navigation down in Red Bluff. I'm of  
22 the opinion that if they buildout more wind  
23 turbines, it will interfere with both the radar  
24 which manages the air space and air traffic control  
25 between both Redding, Red Bluff as well as up to

1 Klamath Falls, as well as, all the way up to  
2 northeast part of the state, could interfere with  
3 air traffic control monitoring of aircraft. Plus  
4 also could interfere with the ground navigational  
5 system, the VORs.

6 Those are being reduced due to a new  
7 system which ties into the satellites, but also has  
8 to have a cross reference to ground stations.  
9 Because the satellite is above, but the ground  
10 station gives a triangulation for any pilot in the  
11 equipped aircraft with what's known as ADSB, or  
12 Automatic Dependent Broadcasting System, it's part  
13 of the national air space.

14 There's evolutions going on in our  
15 national air space system where our piston aircraft  
16 are going to be changing to battery-powered electric  
17 aircraft. They will need the electrical energy.  
18 But you also have to keep in mind that between  
19 Redding and the cities to the northeast of here,  
20 there's many times that there are air ambulance  
21 travels where people need to be able to transit over  
22 what is the Hatchet Ridge area and the potential  
23 Fountain Wind Project, or a much larger wind  
24 project.

25 And that turbulence and potential

1 interference could be hazardous to air ambulance  
2 operations, to say nothing of what would be piloting  
3 traveling over that area. I want to be brief and  
4 leave a little bit of time if there's any questions,  
5 but that's how I see things.

6 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Any questions from the  
7 Board? Supervisor Rickert?

8 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: Yes. Could you  
9 expand a little bit more in your opinion in terms of  
10 fighting fires in the area if there was another  
11 catastrophic fire in basically the footprint of this  
12 project?

13 GILL WRIGHT: It's a no-fly zone.  
14 Unmitigated no-fly zone. And I think as what has  
15 been articulated, it was really, I think,  
16 disingenuous in the June meeting where they said,  
17 Well, we could have helicopters fly in.

18 Well, if you've got a major fire going on  
19 and you want to compare a helicopter's ability to  
20 fight a fire, compared to CAL FIRE's S2s, the C130s  
21 which also can be Air National Guards, or the DC10s  
22 that they have. You've got a thimble and you got a  
23 bucket. What do you want to fight a fire? We have  
24 a bucket brigade term for a very, very good reason.  
25 You grab buckets, you get in the line and that's

1 what CAL FIRE does with wings. But they are not  
2 going to fly around 600-foot tall wind farms.  
3 That's a no-fly zone. They might be able to stop  
4 something quickly, but I doubt it.

5 Any other questions?

6 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Any other questions?  
7 Thank you, sir. Appreciate it.

8 GILL WRIGHT: You're welcome.

9 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: And Jim Chapin is up  
10 follow by Caleen Sisk of the Winnemem Wintu Tribe.

11 JIM CHAPIN: Good evening, Gentlemen,  
12 Members of the Board. My name is Jim Chapin. I  
13 think some of you know me. I'm a registered  
14 professional forester in California. I have been  
15 since 1973 when they passed the registration  
16 requirements.

17 I'm -- as you know, I'm on the Shasta  
18 County Planning Commission, and I served on the City  
19 of Redding Planning Commission for 16 years before  
20 that.

21 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: So, question, we have a  
22 timer on here for a group amount of time.

23 JIM CHAPIN: I'm not a group.

24 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: How much time do you  
25 think you'll need, sir?

1 JIM CHAPIN: Three or four minutes.

2 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Then go. Thank you.

3 JIM CHAPIN: I'm going to keep it short.  
4 I take a little exception as the Planning  
5 Commissioner to the Applicant's assertion that we  
6 didn't do our job or that we didn't consider the  
7 Staff's recommendations. I assure you that all  
8 members of Planning Commission are very  
9 professional, serious about their job. We spent  
10 two-and-a-half years studying this project proposal.  
11 We studied the draft EIR. The final EIR. We had  
12 several people come to the Planning Commission in  
13 open time to give us information.

14 And we did study the Staff's Report in  
15 great detail. So I don't think that's -- I don't  
16 think that's the case. If you weren't at the  
17 meeting, I hope that you read the minutes of  
18 June 22nd Special Planning Commission Meeting where  
19 we voted no unanimously on the project.

20 The reasons we voted no are well-covered  
21 in that June 22nd Planning Commission -- Planning  
22 Commission meeting agenda. I hope that you've all  
23 had a chance to see it.

24 So since I don't have much time, I just  
25 want to say that there's just two or three key

1 issues in this -- in this project that make it  
2 not -- not a good project for the county. The first  
3 one is you heard a lot about is the fire hazard and  
4 risk, the lack of ability to be active in aircraft  
5 suppression.

6 The second one is the more important one,  
7 and that's the fact that it has a negative impact on  
8 the local communities and the Native American  
9 tribes, the Pit River Tribe and all of their  
10 affiliates that use the area and have lived there  
11 for many, many years, many centuries, maybe  
12 thousands of years in some cases.

13 That's -- to me, it's unconscionable to  
14 allow a project like this that's just going to make  
15 a lot of money for somebody that doesn't live in  
16 Shasta County or doesn't intend to have any interest  
17 in Shasta County that would have such a negative  
18 impact on the local citizens and local community and  
19 the Native American tribes.

20 The third thing is the negative impact on  
21 the environment; the forest, the wildlife, the water  
22 quality, the native -- the natural environment of  
23 the forested area. As I said in the Planning  
24 Commission meeting, I don't believe that a wind  
25 project of this size belongs in a forested

1 environment. It belongs out in -- out on the ocean  
2 or in the desert or down in the Tehachapi Pass, high  
3 mountains with no vegetation. Not in Shasta County.  
4 And as has been said before, the -- this won't be  
5 the last one. If you allow this one, it's going to  
6 continue to happen. And I hope that you will vote  
7 to not allow this project because it's going to be  
8 just the beginning and we're never going to see the  
9 end of it. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, sir.  
11 Caleen, you're up, followed by Jessie Ruse  
12 (inaudible) of the Ilmawi cultural representative.

13 THE CLERK: And, Chair, can I confirm?  
14 Are you an individual speaker or group?

15 CALEEN SISK: Tribe.

16 THE CLERK: Let me just change this. Go  
17 ahead.

18 CALEEN SISK: Okay. I'm chief of the  
19 Winnemem Wintu Tribe, which is on the McCloud River  
20 and coming down from Mt. Shasta. The Pit River  
21 Tribe are our neighbors. And the belief is that  
22 whatever happens to one of our mountains happens to  
23 all of our mountains. Whatever happens to our water  
24 systems happens to all of them.

25 And so the CEQA is a concern. Right now,

1 you know, there are lots of projects going on in  
2 Shasta County, which include the FERC relicensing of  
3 the McCloud and the CEQA AB 52 being violated by  
4 PG&E. And they're asking for a waiver so they don't  
5 even have to do that. So there are many loopholes  
6 for projects to continue to thrive off of this  
7 County.

8 Now, I just want to say that the McCloud  
9 River flowed at a thousand CSFs, it is now a 200.  
10 And right now I think it's less than that because  
11 it's warmer and it's got moss in it, and we're  
12 paying a very high PG&E bill. And I don't think  
13 that that was contemplated in allowing that.

14 Our fish have stopped running, they're not  
15 coming up anymore. And that in itself affects every  
16 water vendor around. It's, like, when the fish are  
17 not coming up, it doesn't mean that we just don't  
18 eat fish. It means that the river doesn't get the  
19 fish. The river doesn't get aerated by them digging  
20 in their nest, letting that sediments go down river  
21 and cleaning the river all the way up.

22 So everybody is impacted by that lack of a  
23 resource that comes up the river.

24 Now, there are people fighting against the  
25 Shasta Dam and the Shasta Dam says it's going to be



1 for the salmon, but it really is not. And I kind of  
2 think about the ridge -- fountain -- not the  
3 fountain, but the ridge windmills on Hatchet. You  
4 know, you look up there and you can see them from  
5 here. And we are in climate change, and those  
6 things do change the wind direction. And it also  
7 impacts our cloud systems.

8           And if we're in a drought situation right  
9 now, we have to count on the birds. Did you know  
10 that bird -- like the hummingbird will take a bath  
11 in a curled up maple leaf that has been filled with  
12 water by the dew of this area, not by rain? And now  
13 that's not happening because these fires, you know,  
14 we're replanting plantations instead of really  
15 trying to do our best to bring back a natural forest  
16 with all of its oak trees and hazelnuts and all of  
17 those things that mean something to the birds.

18           And I did hear that somebody said that  
19 only a few birds will probably get caught in those  
20 turbines, and it's not really a big deal. But, you  
21 know, we have to look at the situation. We have had  
22 major forest fires here in Shasta County. So when  
23 the birds -- and we're a major flyway. This is a  
24 fly zone for birds coming from even from South  
25 America. And the ladybugs and everything else that

1 migrates through this territory.

2           Now, we're going to have to try to make it  
3 on what's left out there. And these turbines are  
4 only going to add to the problems that exist  
5 already. It's not going to help us as far as the  
6 climate. You know, there's so many things and so  
7 many projects that are too scary. It's just like,  
8 you know, the Shasta Dam. When you go out to  
9 visitor center, it's like, Oh, yeah, it's the empire  
10 of California, you know, it brought riches to the  
11 State. It's the fifth largest economy in the world.  
12 Yet, we can't afford to take care of our forest. We  
13 can't spend it on saving the salmon, even though  
14 those impacts are critical.

15           Like right now, there's a slide out at  
16 Shasta Lake, right? Cutoff the water for the Jones  
17 Valley area. They put a corrugated fix on it. But  
18 it is still sliding. Why is it sliding? Did  
19 anybody say why it's sliding? They said, It's dry.  
20 And so does that mean all around the lake is going  
21 to slide? Because it's all dry. But we are also in  
22 an earthquake zone. So when you look at all of  
23 those things that are going on, as far as, you know,  
24 we're fighting Nestle's water bottling company,  
25 which will send water out of the state more so than

1 they're going to sell water in the state. Why do we  
2 do that when we're in drought? We should have  
3 restrictions. We should have subsidies to those  
4 smaller cities that are struggling to find economy  
5 for themselves.

6 And that's what out-of-state businesses  
7 come in and they sell the 12 jobs and the start up,  
8 like Shasta Dam, and then it's sitting there. It's  
9 80 years old now, and what's going to happen?  
10 They're going to build on top of it if nobody stops  
11 them. And then if that doesn't break because of the  
12 old cement and the new cement on top, then this town  
13 is already in flood danger in a drought -- drought  
14 time of year, right?

15 And so all of the issues that the tribe  
16 has brought up about sacred places and culture, and  
17 I have to say, you know, like the tribe's talking  
18 about -- or cultural burns, which are way different  
19 than forest services prescribed burns. You know,  
20 they kind of got the idea, but they're not looking  
21 at the whole cultural impact of why they had burned  
22 in the first place. So the shortcuts on indigenous  
23 knowledge, you know, is a problem as well.

24 But in a few days, COP26 on climate change  
25 is going to be happening in Scotland, and they're

1 going to be talking about all these. And California  
2 is going to be represented there as its own economy;  
3 the fifth largest in the world.

4 And while we say that, we're not acting  
5 like we have any kind of money at all. You know,  
6 why can't we generate power that is -- what is it  
7 called? It's called unrenewables -- oh, it's  
8 standalone renewables to get off the grid. Instead  
9 of setting up these mega systems. Mega solar plants  
10 kill the birds. Mega wind towers kill the birds.  
11 The birds seed our forest. The birds provide all  
12 kind of hydrology to the forest. Wonder why our  
13 forests are dry? Pine needles do not allow  
14 hummingbirds to take a bath.

15 And so it -- and there's so many issues  
16 that are not studied. Your science falls short of  
17 what this environment actually is and needs as to  
18 the tribes that live there for thousands of years  
19 would know about that area and how to do that.

20 But there are technologies out there that  
21 suggest that people can get off of -- off of this  
22 grid. Like I always say there's three pipelines,  
23 you know, the water pipe, the electric pipelines and  
24 the sewer pipe. And at the end of those pipes are a  
25 few handful of people who are billionaires who get

1 that. You know, we store -- you know, they capture  
2 our river, our rivers, we shared rivers in Shasta  
3 Lake. We don't see anything of that. There was  
4 never ever a benefit aimed at the tribes. But  
5 neither does Shasta County in reality. It's like  
6 only when it hits Fresno it becomes so high priced  
7 that hardly any little towns can even buy water.

8 So this wind power, it's like they said  
9 earlier that there would be 86,000 homes would be  
10 able to be powered. How many of those homes -- like  
11 he said he couldn't say about how many would be in  
12 Shasta County.

13 Because, you know, I want my home powered  
14 for cheaper than PG&E. If that would be -- come  
15 back to the communities. But I see only that as  
16 what they're calling a disconnected microgrids,  
17 where in Australia, they are actually getting  
18 communities off of the power systems like wind  
19 power.

20 And it's based on renewables, and it's  
21 cleaner, and it's more reliable, and they don't have  
22 the rolling blackouts and it's better for the  
23 environment. So the -- the salmon are our main  
24 issue. And these waterways that bring water down to  
25 the rivers are the important parts. And every time

1 we allow projects to contaminate those areas, we're  
2 only doing something against all of the people who  
3 live here. You know, because everybody needs water.  
4 Everything needs water. And it all comes down to  
5 that.

6           When the winds are not going to bring the  
7 rains, then we have a problem. If they're going to  
8 shift the rain clouds -- and, you know, one of the  
9 things that we had talked about is that now that  
10 we've had all these fires and they've burned all  
11 this and Mt. Shasta was free of any snow, right, it  
12 was down to the glaciers and they were melting, now  
13 it has snow again. So I say, Let's not let them  
14 make snow. That's part of the problem with the snow  
15 pack is fake snow melts faster than the snow that  
16 should be there. But we always try to take  
17 shortcuts and create jobs and create a faster way of  
18 life instead of really figuring something out.

19           I mean, isn't it cheaper to take care of  
20 the forest now than to try to fight a wildfire? I  
21 mean, there are so many things that are not done in  
22 the forest that could be done, could be jobs, and it  
23 could be beneficial for all wildlife and the people.

24           So we are in support of the tribe's  
25 position that -- and I do believe that it is the

1 gateway to more wind towers -- windmills up here.  
2 And I think about that when they first built the  
3 first telescope on Mauna Kea, and then another one,  
4 and then another one, and then another one, until  
5 they have 13 on Mauna Kea. Now they want another  
6 one. Right? The largest of all, the mother load of  
7 all telescopes. And they've been fighting it for  
8 six years, the Hawaiians.

9           That's how I feel the tribes and the  
10 indigenous people are like the blinkers of  
11 destruction. It's, like, don't let them destroy us  
12 for money. We have a home here. Everybody has a  
13 home here. Let's try to learn how to take care of  
14 it a little bit better, and take care of our future  
15 generations, you know.

16           We -- we were almost wiped out by the  
17 newcomers coming in to Shasta, to this area before  
18 it was Shasta County, but we're still here. Like  
19 one of my Pit River friends said, We're still here  
20 after all of that, and we're still trying to save  
21 it. Because, you know what, we don't own anything  
22 on the McCloud River anymore, but we're still  
23 fighting for the salmon to come back.

24           And who will that benefit? It will  
25 benefit the river. Because, you know, they're

1 probably not going to let us be comanagers of the  
2 salmon just because we're, you know, asking New  
3 Zealand to help us out and bring the salmon back so  
4 that our river will feel better all the way down. I  
5 mean, it's connected to the ground systems --  
6 groundwater systems, it's connected to the springs,  
7 it's connected to everything.

8           And for us not to really look at the  
9 bigger pictures of things rather than a fast, quick  
10 money, it's like -- these things are no better than  
11 drug dealers, you know. The marijuana farms that  
12 were illegal were using all kind of stuff poisoning  
13 the water systems, poisoning the salmon, all the way  
14 out.

15           So we have -- we have an obligation to  
16 stand by the -- the Pit River Tribe and the  
17 communities that are in support of no -- not  
18 destroying their place. And I think that the  
19 commissioners really -- really have made a good call  
20 this time. So thank you very much.

21           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. We have  
22 Jessie followed by Buzz Ward of the Pit River Tribe.

23           UNKNOWN FEMALE: I believe Jessie's gone.

24           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Jessie's gone. How  
25 about Buzz Ward?



1           THE CLERK: And, Chair, is this an  
2 individual speaker?

3           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: No, these are the last  
4 two groups.

5           THE CLERK: Okay.

6           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Last group now.

7           BUZZ WARD: Hello. Thank you for this  
8 opportunity to address the Board of Supervisors. My  
9 name is Buzz Ward, I'm a member of the Madesi Band,  
10 Pit River Tribe, and life-long resident of  
11 Montgomery Creek. There isn't a whole lot I can add  
12 to what all of these great folks who have been in  
13 opposition of this project have presented in great  
14 detail.

15           All I can say that as a member of having  
16 lived there all of my life, lost my house to the  
17 Fawn Fire when I was young, lost my house once  
18 before to a fire that was not a wildfire. But every  
19 year there are fires that spring up in the local  
20 community, whether it be on the rancheria or in the  
21 surrounding areas that it does cause a great deal of  
22 distress when you have to watch those areas burn.  
23 And the tens and hundreds of thousands of acres just  
24 surrounding multiple spots, you know, an area that's  
25 highly flammable.

1 I've always been concerned ever since I  
2 learned about the severity of droughts and what it's  
3 done to the salmon, and the detriment that a project  
4 that we have stated here numerous times is that this  
5 would be a project that would be the scale of  
6 constructing the Shasta Dam, which the Shasta Dam,  
7 which Ms. Sisk talked about, has ultimately ended up  
8 with no salmon going up, you know, into the Pit  
9 River which has caused a detriment to not only just  
10 her people, but our people, and the ecosystem up  
11 there.

12 And so to listen to all of the information  
13 provided here today about the dangers that it would  
14 pose to aerial combatants for fires I would hope  
15 that you greatly consider denying this project  
16 because it doesn't make any sense to me to allow  
17 corporations, and not only that, foreign-owned  
18 corporations to come in and try to sell us on jobs  
19 and money that is only for a short amount of time.

20 Like I listened to the folks in here who  
21 were in support of it and they just want to work,  
22 which there should be other projects out there that  
23 they can work for that don't end up with the  
24 continued mismanagement and extraction and  
25 degradation of our lands as we've seen here before

1 with PG&E, the dams, other projects that are going  
2 on in the history.

3 They encroach more and more on Pit River  
4 Tribe, and those species that depend on that  
5 ecosystem, you know, for their livelihood as well as  
6 those people. It just continues to get worse and  
7 worse project by project that ultimately compounds  
8 on that environment and, you know, the well-being of  
9 those people.

10 And I don't support this project just  
11 because it seems like it's more for capital gain for  
12 a few, which they touted 200 jobs, which does not  
13 sound like a whole lot for longevity for, you know,  
14 workers of this -- of this county. And that's not  
15 even guaranteed that those, you know, workers from  
16 this county would be getting those contracts and  
17 those jobs. And, you know, I implore you to,  
18 please, you know, vote this project down. Thank  
19 you.

20 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Okay. Now  
21 we will move in the chamber into individual speakers  
22 who will have three minutes to comment in opposition  
23 to the Fountain Wind Project. The first one is  
24 Beverly Wakefield followed by Ed Baier.

25 BEVERLY WAKEFIELD: Is it okay? My name

1 is Beverly Wakefield. I have a master's degree in  
2 public health. I'm a resident of Round Mountain. I  
3 live on the top of the hill, and below me is 299.  
4 Behind me is Terry Mill Road. And if a windmill  
5 were to be placed where I believe it is going to be  
6 placed, two or six of them, you will be able to see  
7 the flicker effect in our yard. And as I -- no,  
8 we're not 5-, 6 miles away, we're about half a mile  
9 away.

10 That said, I set my husband down who  
11 happens to be a general contractor. He's worked in  
12 Napa area. We moved up into this area 12 years ago  
13 and he is a general contractor, he did commercial  
14 buildings. He worked on a protonic accelerator in  
15 the St. Helena Hospital, and I asked him about that  
16 job when he was doing it, and I was, like, shocked  
17 how deep they had to go with the concrete to hold  
18 and to allow for that protonic accelerator to  
19 happen. So his understanding, high-end kind of  
20 commercial building.

21 So I sat him down and I said, What do you  
22 think of these windmills? He looked at me and he  
23 said, Well, you got this 600-foot tall windmill  
24 about the size of Shasta Dam in height, and you've  
25 got propeller blades coming off. And the length of

1 those propeller blades will greatly enhance the  
2 lever action. In other words, if you have a lever,  
3 you know, it helps probably something, I'm not a  
4 construction person.

5           But the idea he gave me was this thing  
6 could easily topple over unless you have a very  
7 deep, deep footprint in the ground. And one of the  
8 things that I've noticed when I've studied public  
9 health in many other areas, that the concrete issue  
10 right now, I don't know if you realize this, but it  
11 takes a lot of concrete to put in that many  
12 windmills that deep in the ground, and concrete  
13 right now is rare. It's actually going to the point  
14 where it's being short -- it's under shortage.  
15 The -- being able to get concrete is an issue. You  
16 might think that's strange, but it's actually true.

17           So when you put a windmill in the ground,  
18 you have these high winds coming through and an  
19 increased leverage it isn't very hard to see this  
20 thing could be just yanked out of the ground. I'm  
21 not being funny when I'm saying that. I'm just  
22 being clear with what he told me. And he said that,  
23 he says, Very interesting that that is going to need  
24 some architect -- what do you call it, engineering  
25 to understand what are these things being put in the

1 ground. They did put 300-foot ones in, but these  
2 are 600 feet, and do you know whether these are  
3 going to stay upright?

4           Pollution is a big deal when you put that  
5 deep of a footprint in the ground. You also notice  
6 that the water aquifers, the water aquifers, the  
7 tunnels of water in the ground may have -- also have  
8 effect.

9           I'm going to move into one other thought.  
10 My brother works for IEEE. My brother is in  
11 Portland, Oregon. He works on the IEEE, that's the  
12 Institute of Electronics and Electrical Engineers.  
13 He writes standards for electricity. He has members  
14 of his committee coming from all over the world. I  
15 sat him on the phone yesterday, we talked for three  
16 hours and I will give you the highlights.

17           He basically said to me, the electricity  
18 generated by a windmill is renewable energy. It has  
19 an enormous scale. The amount of energy produced by  
20 windmill is very -- excuse me, what's the word?  
21 It's basically a utility scale. It's not your  
22 normal amount of energy, it's a lot of energy. And  
23 the problem of it is is it's intermittent, because  
24 it can happen at night. The wind comes when it  
25 wants.

1           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, ma'am. If  
2 you can close up that would be great.

3           BEVERLY WAKEFIELD: Okay. Sorry. So  
4 basically it can't be stored. You have to have a  
5 high load in order to take up the high generation of  
6 the energy produced, so that high load is a city.  
7 It could do half of San Francisco, but you can't  
8 have that energy that's there come and effect Shasta  
9 County because it's not possible, there's no high  
10 load here. Thank you.

11           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you.

12           ED BAIER: Okay. Ed Baier here again.  
13 First, I would like to start out with this pamphlet  
14 that ConnectGEN so generously sent out to so many  
15 people. Considering it doesn't show -- well, it  
16 does, it doesn't show Montgomery Creek, which Moose  
17 Camp and Montgomery Creek are not included in this  
18 brochure. I'm not sure why, but, evidently, we  
19 pitched a bitch.

20           Good afternoon, almost evening. Ed Baier  
21 here again trying to inform this Board about the  
22 harm this project will do to Shasta County. For the  
23 last three years, the community formed to stop this  
24 project has submitted countless papers to this  
25 Board. Fox News did a whole segment on the problems

1 with wind turbines on 10/21/21 at 10:00 p.m. Anyone  
2 wanting the facts about wind turbines only needs to  
3 go Google it and ask the questions. Get the facts.

4 I have given you the facts. No lies. No  
5 bribes. And I can only hope you heard and do what  
6 the people of the county ask of the planning board.  
7 They did the research, checked the facts, and heard  
8 the many objections to this project. Then they  
9 voted it down. If you believe the members from  
10 ConnectGEN and think 43 turbines will be the end of  
11 this interest in Shasta County, you will surely be  
12 disappointed.

13 Now, my question for each Board member.  
14 There is only one of you that represents my area and  
15 will be directly affected by driving through it. If  
16 a private company decided to build something in your  
17 community that would directly affect your way of  
18 life, would you just let it happen or would you  
19 fight it?

20 How would you feel if five people that had  
21 the power to stop it and didn't seem to be listening  
22 to you or considering all of the paperwork you've  
23 handed in. I've seen the flood of ads they have put  
24 on TV, radio, and newspapers, and the mailings to  
25 people here in Redding. But I would bet money none



1 of them live in the area affected by this project.

2 I'm going to ask a question. Anybody on  
3 this side of the room live in the immediate area  
4 that this project is in? Raise your hand. I got  
5 two. Oh, I got three. Now, three people. If you  
6 look at the other side of the room, those are the  
7 people that are living in this area. We're going to  
8 be affected. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. The next  
10 speaker is Charlie Palatino, followed by Beth  
11 Messick Lattin.

12 CHARLIE PALATINO: Hi, I just wanted to  
13 throw out a few financial numbers at you. Big money  
14 to the County, but when do we get it? Some people  
15 in Redding I've talked to think that the money is up  
16 front and don't do the 30 year math. Schools are  
17 going to get \$23,495,000 divided by 30 years is  
18 700 -- 783,166 a year. Redevelopment property tax  
19 6,660,000, 30 years, 222,000 a year. Education  
20 augmentation is 7,545,000, 30 years is \$251,000 a  
21 year. Nothing.

22 County of Shasta. They keep saying County  
23 of Shasta is going to get 50 millions, right?  
24 Wrong. County of Shasta is there, but according to  
25 the paper is going to get \$6,230,000 over 30 years,

1 is \$210,667 a year.

2 Okay. Cities. 3,280,000. Over 30 years  
3 is \$109,333 per year. How many cities? Special  
4 districts, 2,790,000, 30 years, \$90,000 per year.

5 Are we willing to give up the scenic  
6 beauty of our mountains, possibility of losing our  
7 underground water, wildlife habitat, sacred Indian  
8 land, and raise the possibility of fires so a few  
9 individuals can get rich off of government  
10 subsidized nongreen energy that Shasta County will  
11 receive none of.

12 By the way, this is -- this is only going  
13 to give 12 full-time jobs at the end of  
14 construction, and only the company -- and only  
15 the -- and only if the company like some at Altamont  
16 and Tehachapi doesn't go bankrupt.

17 From reading statistics over former wind  
18 farms, output is -- God. Output, it is my belief,  
19 okay, that this wind farm will not be able to derive  
20 the promised funds in its 20- to 25-year life span  
21 and will not generate enough power to pay for  
22 themselves. These wind farms are approximately  
23 78 percent government subsidized and, therefore, not  
24 only not green energy but a drain on the American  
25 taxpayer. Please do the research.

1           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, sir. Beth  
2 followed by Mark Baird.

3           BETH MESSICK LATTIN: Chairman Chimenti,  
4 Lady and Gentlemen of the Board, I'm jumping with  
5 joy. This is the end. Green party, Republicans and  
6 Democrats, the indigenous people, environmentalists,  
7 cattle women and vegetarians, climate deniers,  
8 Christians and pagans, all ages, healthy and deathly  
9 ill, wealthy and poor, illiterate to well-educated,  
10 foresters and farmers. And what do they all have in  
11 common other than humanity? An opposition to the  
12 Hatchet Wind II called Fountain Wind.

13           When this many diverse group of people  
14 agree in opposition, it must be the wrong project  
15 for this area. Why? Well, there's a possible loss  
16 due to traffic. There's possible loss to air  
17 quality. There's possible loss to birds and bats.  
18 There's loss of cultural sites for gathering, vision  
19 questing and prayers. There's loss of property  
20 value. Loss of air attack and probably ground  
21 attack because the ground -- boots don't generally  
22 go in without the air attack. Evacuation routes,  
23 tourist trade, water supply, landslides, clear  
24 vistas, peace and quiet, health, tank, chemistry in  
25 the soil. I could add a few more if that's not

1 enough.

2 But, lastly, in gratitude to all of you on  
3 the side of the room in opposition to this, thank  
4 you for joining me and us in this fight.

5 To you all, thank you. You've heard us  
6 for two-and-a-half years. You've at least glanced  
7 at the binders of literature and information we have  
8 provided you. You were patient when some were not  
9 polite and respectful. For your due diligence that  
10 you have engaged ConnectGEN. You have reviewed the  
11 Staff Report and listened to your commissioners, and  
12 now the public hearing.

13 Thank you for your time, research, and  
14 attention in regards to not necessarily CEQA, but  
15 our safety, peace, comfort and morals. Now take a  
16 deep breath and be courageous and be done with it.

17 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Mark  
18 followed by Steve Kerns.

19 MARK BAIRD: Good evening, everybody. I  
20 was asked to come here because I am a VLAT pilot.  
21 I've been a pilot for over 50 years. I have 23,000  
22 hours; 15,000 in the DC10. I have typewritings in  
23 three heavy airplanes. I've been an instructor in  
24 three heavy airplanes. I've fought fires on three  
25 continents in airplanes, including North America, of

1 course.

2 I've flown the Fawn Fire, the Carr Fire,  
3 Monument and McFarland. In addition to these fires,  
4 my airplane and one of my sister airplanes put a  
5 line around Dalt (phonetic) Station, and to hear  
6 later basically saved the town.

7 I have also fought fires caused by wind  
8 generators; two in Australia and one in the grass  
9 lands of Wyoming. These projects are typically  
10 never built in heavy fuels. They're never built in  
11 moderate fuels. They're usually built in light  
12 flashy fuels, grass lands, rolling hills, desert  
13 environments where if there is a fire that affects  
14 these facilities, we stand off or stay on the ground  
15 until after the fire has burned through and a  
16 significant distance away from them, and then at  
17 that point we can attack whatever fire is still --  
18 still in progress.

19 But the light flashy fuels are different  
20 than heavy fuels. They're different than having  
21 these generators on ridge tops where fire lines are  
22 naturally anchored. You have to have an anchor  
23 point for a fire line to be effective. It's a  
24 geographic prominent point, usually rocks or a wide  
25 fire line or some place that does not have any fuel,

1 and that's where we would typically anchor the fire  
2 line in order to have it be effective at all.

3           With these towers being in excess of  
4 600 feet, it would -- this -- in fact, I'm just  
5 going to cut to the end right now. This ground  
6 would be indefensible by air. There is so much  
7 infrastructure out there that in this infrastructure  
8 are also ignition sources of their own and PG&E can  
9 testify to that. They're bankrupt over it. Over  
10 their ignition source type infrastructure causing  
11 fire and causing the spread of fire, and these wind  
12 generators are no different. They are ignition  
13 sources. The sales can generate significant amounts  
14 of heat when they malfunction, and when they destroy  
15 themselves, burning bits of material can be cast  
16 several hundred yards from the (inaudible) itself  
17 initiating fire if there wasn't one already that  
18 caused that.

19           If you have a significant fire and heavy  
20 fuel, wind driven, that overburns the top of the  
21 ridge where the project is, you will not only lose  
22 the project itself, but that will contribute  
23 significantly to fire.

24           And so I just want to say in closing: I  
25 looked at the project. I went out and visited the

1 project site. I read the project proposal. And in  
2 my opinion after 23,000 hours of flying all over the  
3 world and on wildfires on three continents, this  
4 ground with this project would be indefensible by  
5 air. Period.

6 If you have any questions, I'd be happy to  
7 answer.

8 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Do you have any  
9 questions? Thank you, sir.

10 Steve followed by Stephen Fitch.

11 STEVE KERNS: Good evening, Supervisors.

12 I'm Steve Kerns, I'm one of the Planning  
13 Commissioners from District 3. And you've heard a  
14 lot about the Planning Commission this evening from  
15 some you would think we're the sharpest tool in the  
16 shed, from others we're probably the dullest.

17 But it's interesting, I think, what  
18 ConnectGEN said about us. They said we ignored the  
19 record of staff, failed to recognize the mitigation  
20 measures, based our decision on faulty premise  
21 concerning the siting and citing inaccurate  
22 understanding of the project's risk and failure to  
23 appreciate the significant benefits for the  
24 environment and the economy.

25 As Mr. Chapin, also my fellow

1 commissioner, pointed out to you, we have looked at  
2 this project through the draft EIR, through hundreds  
3 of hours of testimony before us, hundreds of  
4 thousands probably, I don't know, so many letters  
5 that came to us from the public, and the majority of  
6 those were in opposition to this project.

7           Then we went through the final EIR and  
8 looked at all that. And then we had a 10-hour  
9 meeting similar to what you're enduring tonight, and  
10 then we came to the conclusion, wrong project --  
11 wrong project in the wrong place.

12           One of the points I want to make to you in  
13 the limited time I have is there's been a discussion  
14 tonight if the EIR should be revised or whatever  
15 like that. We knew going into this project this was  
16 up to 72 turbines. Up to 72; not 71, but 72. And  
17 the key is "up to." In the draft EIR it says very  
18 plainly: Up to 72. Up to 51 miles of road. Up to  
19 12 miles of hundred foot wide corridors, up to  
20 24 miles of new roads, up to 33 miles of existing  
21 roads that may be widened. We knew going into it  
22 that there was a possibility that the location and  
23 the number of the towers would be determined at  
24 another date.

25           When ConnectGEN says this is a complete



1 revised fountain project, it's not. It's just  
2 bringing up what was already covered in the EIR and  
3 that we looked at as a Planning Commission and  
4 denied 5-0. This evening in some of the testimony  
5 opening statements from ConnectGEN, they said  
6 basically that the scope of this new project has all  
7 been within the scope of the EIR.

8 The scope of that EIR is what we  
9 completely understand, as your commissioners, going  
10 into that meeting where we denied it. Thank you  
11 very much.

12 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Stephen  
13 followed by Joseph Osa. Stephen Fitch? Followed by  
14 Joseph Osa.

15 STEPHEN FITCH: I'm Steve Fitch, retired  
16 forest supervisor of the Shasta-Trinity National  
17 Forest. And I spent a good part of my career making  
18 sure that the national forest adjacent to this  
19 project was safe from wildfire, and it's beauty  
20 preserved as part of the Shasta Cascade wonderland,  
21 so important to this county's economy.

22 This proposal seriously violates both. I  
23 tell you in the strongest terms -- and you've heard  
24 more of that today, this proposal is a design for  
25 disaster for the four adjacent communities in the

1 adjacent forest. Listen carefully on the phone to  
2 the associated fire -- aerial firefighters.

3 That was the president of the over the  
4 whole United States Fire -- aerial firefighters.  
5 CAL FIRE's former deputy chief of air tanker  
6 operations was on the phone also. He's a pilot,  
7 right here. A pilot that last month this man helped  
8 save Old Station in his DC10. He helped on the  
9 Dixie Fire. He helped save north Redding in the  
10 Fawn Fire. And they tell you that aerial attack is  
11 an absolute key to containing wildfires, and they  
12 cannot fly among these whirling giants.

13 Then read ConnectGEN's own fire expert.  
14 I've got the letter here. Saying aerial attack both  
15 fixed wing and rotary, interesting, will be excluded  
16 from the area. They say, ground forces only.

17 Do you folks understand how ineffective  
18 and at risk ground forces are on -- how ground  
19 forces are on today's wildfires without -- without  
20 air support? How would you like to be out there  
21 without air support?

22 Our county fire chief was right. He said,  
23 I quote, turbines -- and I'm quoting him, "Turbines  
24 would create a physical change in the environment  
25 that would have to be accounted for when incident

1 managers plan air attack operations. No-fly zones  
2 are determined by the individual -- they're  
3 determined -- the no-fly zones are determined by the  
4 individual command team on each fire."

5 So he's right in saying that. You make  
6 that decision on a fire. As a type 1 planning  
7 section chief on command teams on numerous fires  
8 throughout the nation -- and I was an instructor at  
9 the National Advanced Fire School. I can assure you  
10 that no incident commander or plans chief would  
11 assign fixed wing planes within this project. It  
12 just won't happen.

13 Now, would anyone in their right mind  
14 approve a proposal that would put 15- to 20,000  
15 forested acres and four adjacent mountain  
16 communities -- and four adjacent mountain  
17 communities at risk of annihilation, Greenville. As  
18 a World War II general, (inaudible) said, It's nuts.

19 Oh, you say, Well, look at the -- but look  
20 at the money it will bring in to the county for  
21 schools, for fire, for sheriff each year.  
22 \$1.8 million is what I figured.

23 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, sir. Thank  
24 you, sir.

25 STEPHEN FITCH: Okay. I say look at well

1 over 2 billion in damage and suppression just in the  
2 last three years in this county. 2 billion. I'm  
3 going to wrap up.

4 The economy. Who is going to come here if  
5 we incrementally destroy our beautiful area? This  
6 is one of the two remaining scenic routes. Don't  
7 listen to the, Well, we've hidden them behind the  
8 trees. The 600 foot -- 610-foot monsters are two  
9 times as tall as the Statute of Liberty and seven  
10 times the height of the trees in Shasta County. The  
11 views there in Shasta County will be trashed in our  
12 county.

13 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, sir.

14 STEPHEN FITCH: Okay. How will you  
15 feel -- how will that affect the long-term economy  
16 of this county? Again, I say it's just plain nuts.

17 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Joseph Osa  
18 followed by Maggie Osa.

19 JOSEPH OSA: Good evening, Supervisors.  
20 Hopefully this will be the last time I have to come  
21 in front of you on this issue. I know we've been up  
22 here, my wife and I, in particular, for the last  
23 three years, essentially.

24 I wanted to clarify the nature of the  
25 threat caused by lightening and wind turbines

1 because it's related to the wildfire threat.  
2 ConnectGEN assures us that the lightening isn't a  
3 problem because the turbines would be well-grounded.  
4 But the grounding system is also part of the  
5 problem. No one seems to really talk about this  
6 phenomena. But the better the grounding system, the  
7 bigger the problem. The grounding system that  
8 ConnectGEN touts is meant to protect the turbines,  
9 not the surrounding area.

10 Even with good grounding, 80 percent of  
11 the insurance claims are -- excuse me. 80 percent  
12 of the insurance claims for turbine damage are due  
13 to lightening and the No. 1 cause of turbine failure  
14 is lightening.

15 A North Sea wind development off the coast  
16 of Germany was shut down after only 15 years because  
17 of the cost of frequent repairs due to lightening  
18 strikes. Hatchet Ridge had a turbine down for about  
19 two months after the lightening storms last July,  
20 which may have been due to lightening damage.

21 Because of their grounding system,  
22 turbines become giant lightening rods. The blades  
23 have grounded conductors attached so they act like  
24 the wired rockets you see used to trigger  
25 lightening. You might have seen that on Discovery

1 Channel or some other science channel, for instance.

2 Fast moving conductors, like the blade  
3 tips, moving through a strong electric field will  
4 trigger lightening strikes. Turbines are also often  
5 grounded or bonded together to improve the  
6 conductivity of the grounding system.

7 Unfortunately, it networks them as lightening rods  
8 as well.

9 Networked and singular turbines will  
10 generate upward lightening that connects with  
11 charges in the cloud, and then causes powerful  
12 downward strikes that can splitter off, usually at  
13 discontinuities, and strike nearby objects or the  
14 ground.

15 The increased frequency of lightening  
16 strikes increases the ambient electric field, which  
17 in turn increases the frequency of lightening  
18 strikes in the general area. Sometimes the strikes  
19 will occur 5- to 10 miles away from the actual  
20 turbines.

21 Also, because the blades are usually made  
22 of fiberglass or other nonconductive material, they  
23 can build up electrical static charges as they move  
24 through an elevated electric field as exists during  
25 dry lightening events. The blades behave like

1 running a glass rod across silk or rubbing your feet  
2 on a carpet and creating discharges that can  
3 initiate lightening strikes.

4 The increase in lightening strikes is  
5 worsened by the very grounding system that protects  
6 the turbines and can't be mitigated. It is also  
7 much more likely to occur in mountainous terrain and  
8 is another reason why wind investments are not  
9 typically located in forested mountainous areas like  
10 ours. Where there are three to five more times  
11 likely to be damaged by lightening than in low land  
12 or coastal areas.

13 Remember, according to the U.S.D.A., only  
14 .1 percent of wind turbines within the U.S. in 2017  
15 were installed in mixed forests like ours, deciduous  
16 and coniferous, 55. A significant increase in the  
17 threat of lightening caused wildfires will occur for  
18 this area if you add the Fountain Wind turbines to  
19 those that already exist on Hatchet Ridge, and you  
20 won't be able to fight them from the air, so please  
21 deny this project.

22 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, sir.  
23 Maggie Osa followed by Bob Kloeppe.

24 MAGGIE OSA: Good evening, Supervisors,  
25 Chair.

1           Everybody has said pretty much what I'm  
2    about to -- had wrote this about 18 times. So the  
3    residents you heard today are reiterating the  
4    numerous substantial and detrimental impacts found  
5    by the Planning Commission. You'll also hear from  
6    the proponents who have not even read the Fountain  
7    Wind EIR nor the appeal.

8           They know nothing about the transmission  
9    grid in the area, the issues with the Round Mountain  
10   substation with thermo and over voltage issues that  
11   affect all the 230 KB lines that are going to be for  
12   the project to tie into that actually go to  
13   Cottonwood. And some of the areas from PG&E, again,  
14   where all of the time dealing with PSPS events,  
15   we're the first to go out and first to get power  
16   back.

17           Nobody has also even mentioned SB 901,  
18   which was passed in July of this year that restricts  
19   ridge top developments to save lives in communities.  
20   And this is totally a ridge top development. It  
21   actually affects some of the housing areas that  
22   we're finding in Southern California that housing is  
23   much more needed.

24           What I've heard from the proponents is  
25   money, money, money. 50 million here, 3.5 million



1 there, a million here, 250,000 there, a million  
2 here. This really is part of the David versus the  
3 Goliath. These are small rural communities fighting  
4 billionaires. This is a billion dollar company who  
5 also invests in oil, coal and other power sources.

6 They tried to justify their ill-sited  
7 project in their appeal by marginalizing the decades  
8 of your commissioners. What they're now proposing  
9 is one of many possible configurations, so they're  
10 down to 48 turbines, as though it's a revision at  
11 all trying to confuse the unknown public.

12 They continue to offer more and more money  
13 to sway anyone they can to support the project. And  
14 nowhere in their appeal language or anywhere --  
15 anything they presented today provides any evidence  
16 to support their allegations against the  
17 commissioners. Mr. Kerns synopsis how they  
18 degraded the commissioners.

19 We told you two years ago this would come  
20 down to the money, and it has. Money is being  
21 thrown everywhere. But it's not up to the rural  
22 communities to fund all the money issues for Shasta  
23 County. That landowner has 170,000 acres. And as  
24 you were told by the forester for that land acre,  
25 they want the wind development. You're going to see

1 Fountain Wind II, III, IV, VIII and 20 over a  
2 50-year plan. Thank you for your time.

3 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Bob  
4 followed by Fred Ryness.

5 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Chairman?

6 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: I'm sorry, go ahead.

7 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: That's okay. Over the  
8 last two-and-a-half years you wanted to engage on  
9 this project, so tonight's the night. I'll just ask  
10 you the question that you've wanted to point out for  
11 the last two-and-a-half years.

12 You make continued reference to the  
13 Cottonwood transmission lines, a route through  
14 Cottonwood. Would you expand on that, please?

15 And just in case anybody wonders, yes, we  
16 have worked together in opposition to the tank  
17 project in 2007. It's no secret, it's public  
18 record. It has no bearing on this project, but I  
19 state it out loud so no one has that ah-hah moment,  
20 where they say, Wow, he never disclosed that. I  
21 don't have to, but I am doing that voluntarily.

22 MAGGIE OSA: Thank you. So actually in  
23 the scoping meeting in 2019, Beth started our group  
24 and -- in March, and we actually had community  
25 members approach us about developers coming to them

1 and wanting to buy their property, they didn't  
2 understand what it was about. So the Round Mountain  
3 substation through the 2018/'19 transmission plan  
4 upgrade identified the Round Mountain substation  
5 with thermal overload and overvoltage issues.

6 And the bids went out to determine how  
7 they were going to correct that thermal overload and  
8 overvoltage issue. And so companies were coming in  
9 to make bids to get that work and it was a  
10 \$200 million project. And it affects not only the  
11 500 KB lines, but all the 230 KB lines and on down.

12 So it will affect all the transmission  
13 lines that make the intertie or come off and it  
14 actually is affecting the transmission lines that  
15 Hatchet is currently tied to.

16 And part of the issue is that they found,  
17 and you can look at the transmission plan, we  
18 provided the information on what those overvoltage  
19 issues were, is it's renewable energies. And so we  
20 indicate that Fountain Wind will only exacerbate the  
21 problem. We brought it up in the EIR, the DEIR, and  
22 we asked the county to reach out to the CPUC because  
23 the feedback we got it was just another project lead  
24 and it was in somebody else's swim lane.

25 And so they thought, yeah, we hear you,

1 but, you know, they're over there doing their  
2 business and it won't affect this project. And  
3 that's not true. And so we asked the County to  
4 reach out to the CPUC to make a determination what  
5 impact this would have and there was no answer.  
6 They just said that's a separate project and they're  
7 going on with their business. That upgrade will not  
8 be done to that -- those lines until 2024.

9 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: I just wanted to make  
10 sure you had your moment in the sun, because you  
11 have waited very patiently to get that out and I  
12 know the three minutes didn't allow you to do that  
13 so. Thank you.

14 MAGGIE OSA: Thank you, sir.

15 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Bob, you're up; Fred  
16 you're on deck.

17 BOB KLOEPPEL: Chairman and fellow  
18 supervisors. I'm a resident of Montgomery Creek. I  
19 moved here 21 years ago and built my permanent  
20 residence and forested my 192 acres with over 30,000  
21 trees. So I have an interest in the community.

22 I chose this location because it's beauty  
23 encapsulated by its views and the wildlife that  
24 passes through my land.

25 In my view, the Applicant in its revisions

1 fails to justify issuing a Use Permit because the  
2 project will still kill birds and ruin views, which  
3 will continually interfere with the enjoyment of the  
4 homeowners' land.

5           It will seriously change the character of  
6 not just the neighboring communities, but of any  
7 other parts of the county because of their height.  
8 The Applicant admits this in his revision, which  
9 states, and I quote, "Potential impacts to the  
10 scenic vistas and views from publicly accessible  
11 vantage points would remain significant and  
12 unavoidable. The project will insert structures  
13 hundreds of feet above the natural beauty of the  
14 mountains and trees."

15           They are just flat out incompatible with  
16 the natural beauty and wildlife, which drew me and  
17 others to the county.

18           In my judgment, there is no long-term  
19 benefit to Shasta County from this project unless  
20 you, of course, count the money flow that has been  
21 so well set forth. But we must remember that this  
22 can be potentially offset by reduced home value and  
23 in turn its property value -- property tax revenue,  
24 rather.

25           In fact, Shasta County will have more

1 pollution due to the permanent removal of trees on  
2 475 acres, and the temporary removal of trees and  
3 brush on an additional 868 acres in temporary use.

4           Why? Because their removal will eliminate  
5 the carbon sequestration that would otherwise be  
6 available to mitigation pollution. And there will  
7 be a temporary rise in pollution, of course, during  
8 construction. Additionally, these windmills will  
9 have red lights required by AFAA to produce  
10 nighttime aviation warnings. Shasta County can then  
11 boast of it's own red light district.

12           As Hatchet Wind Farm has proved, this  
13 project will send out a message that Shasta County  
14 permits windmills and cares less about its major  
15 asset; it's natural beauty. For these reasons, I  
16 urge you to not grant the permit. By doing so, the  
17 county will eliminate the -- any reduction in carbon  
18 sequestration, eliminate extreme permanent assaults  
19 on its natural beauty, which draws you and others to  
20 our county.

21           Eliminates the creation of a red light  
22 district. And just one more point, eliminates 48  
23 propellers, each having a 558-foot diameter which  
24 when all rotated at the same time will cover an area  
25 of 11,738,160 square feet available to kill birds of

1 any and all kinds. Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Fred,  
3 you're up, and then unfortunately we have to take  
4 about a ten-minute break because we have to reboot  
5 the system again. So thank you for your patience.  
6 We still have numerous speakers, so don't go  
7 anywhere.

8 FRED RYNESS: I'm Fred Ryness, and I'm a  
9 forestry instructor. I'm also Burney Mountain  
10 Lookout for the U.S. Forest Service for the last  
11 couple summers. And I'm a rover, I'm a patrolman in  
12 between. But I also do West Prospect Lookout. My  
13 wife's over there five days a week, and I'm just  
14 over there her two days off, and I'm Jim Cusick's  
15 also Burney Mountain Lookout. He's up there five  
16 days. So I do two -- I do their two days off and  
17 I'm a rover in between and I'm a -- I'm a patrolman.

18 But, anyway, I want you to see this sign  
19 that was given to me by one of my former employees  
20 who lives right there on Big Bend Road. And,  
21 anyway, you had two commissioners here tonight that  
22 spoke on the fact that they took everything into  
23 consideration and all five voted against it. And  
24 somebody suggested here that they hoped that you  
25 guys would do the same, and I concur with that.

1           And because it's after 9:00 o'clock and I  
2 live in Burney and I'm ready to go home, and I'm  
3 sure a lot of these folks are, I'll conclude. Thank  
4 you.

5           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. And as I  
6 said, we're going to take ten minutes, get the  
7 system rebooted. So thank you for your patience.

8           (Recess taken.)

9           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Okay. Ladies and  
10 Gentlemen, I think we can get back to it. We are  
11 technologically sound as far as we know.

12           Okay. So our next speaker is John Lammers  
13 followed by Monique Waylene (phonetic).

14           JOHN LAMMERS: Good evening, Board. I'm  
15 John Lammers. I'm here representing the Lammers  
16 family. I appreciate the time tonight. I did bring  
17 a PowerPoint presentation. Unfortunately, it is not  
18 loaded on your servers, it was late in submittal.  
19 So I did bring some handouts. If that's okay, I'd  
20 like to pass them out. And if you could restart the  
21 clock.

22           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Sure. We'll get you  
23 back up to three minutes.

24           JOHN LAMMERS: It is going to be a little  
25 challenging for me. I also wrongly assumed that I



1 would have more time here tonight as a group member,  
2 since my family is quite large. Unfortunately, they  
3 couldn't be here tonight. Most of them are on the  
4 phone or online and probably a good thing because if  
5 they did all show up, we would have been in that  
6 overflow area.

7 But anyways, again, I'm John Lammers. I'm  
8 here representing the Lammers family. And basically  
9 today I have just a few objectives. And, one, is I  
10 want to illustrate clearly the devastating impacts  
11 to the Lammers properties. And, two, if there is  
12 time permitting, I would like to counter some of  
13 ConnectGEN's overstated project benefits to Shasta  
14 County. And, of course, my desired result here  
15 today is to convince you guys to reject the Use  
16 Permit on the revised Fountain Wind Project.

17 So if you could just flip to the first  
18 page. I have the first photo. And the reason why I  
19 put this photo in this is the actual GPS coordinates  
20 on a Google Earth map of the proposed turbines. The  
21 blue dots are the proposed turbines; the red ones  
22 are, I believe, the turbines that are no longer in  
23 the project.

24 But I want to highlight the red boxes  
25 because those are the properties we have interest

1 in. The ownership of -- on the top part of the  
2 photograph is the Fuller property that we own. It  
3 straddles 299 there. The little box in the center,  
4 the little red box in the center is Moose Camp,  
5 which I am a member of Moose Camp community and my  
6 family owns multiple buildable construction-ready  
7 lots there, as well existing homes. And then,  
8 lastly, I want to mention the box that's closest  
9 to -- that's south of Moose Camp or just below it in  
10 the picture is the Lammers Ranch.

11 Next.

12 This next photo I took from ConnectGEN's  
13 promotional video. I just thought it showed, you  
14 know, kind of a nice aerial view of the footprint of  
15 this project before the reduction. And those red  
16 arrows, again, are marking those same properties  
17 that I just mentioned previously.

18 Next.

19 This is my own aerial photograph of the  
20 Lammers Ranch. Just a little history. My family  
21 has been in the Montgomery Creek area since the  
22 early 1900s. This ranch was purchased in about  
23 1930. It was purchased actually from a  
24 distressed -- financially distressed lumber company  
25 at the time that was liquidating their assets.

1           We've seen multiple owners of this  
2 timberland. In my lifetime, I think it's been  
3 Kimberly-Clark, Roseburg and now ConnectGEN, or New  
4 Forest Products out of Australia. Not ConnectGEN,  
5 excuse me, Shasta-Cascade.

6           So, anyways, I think history has a, you  
7 know, it's a -- repeats itself, and I'm pretty sure  
8 the owner of this timberland will change again. I  
9 will say, however, the Lammers have been there for  
10 over a hundred years. We have put a lot of -- one  
11 thing I'm very proud of my family, currently, is we  
12 put a lot of financial mechanisms in place so that  
13 this ranch can remain in the family for at least  
14 another hundred years through the generations. And  
15 so I do think we'll be there a lot longer than  
16 anyone else.

17           The next set of pictures I just really  
18 wanted to show you that this is a much more than  
19 just an active cattle ranch as it has been for  
20 almost a hundred years. It's also been a place for  
21 my family to have great recreation. You know, we  
22 frequently get together with reunions and whatnot.  
23 Personally, I was married -- I chose the property to  
24 have my wedding ceremony on there in 1990, I guess,  
25 about 32 years ago. And my daughter has just

1 announced this year that she plans her wedding  
2 ceremony there this June, as well as, one of my  
3 nieces.

4 I just wanted to go through the seasons.  
5 If you flip through the pictures -- and I apologize  
6 to the audience that you just got to bear with me,  
7 they're gorgeous pictures of the ranch during the  
8 different seasons, spring, winter. And the last  
9 kind of aerial shot there, the one thing I wanted to  
10 point out in the earlier picture that I didn't is  
11 the ranch geographically is a meadow with tall  
12 mountain ridges around all sides.

13 To the east we have Fuller Mountain, and  
14 what I learned as a kid is Carberry Mountain to the  
15 south, we have Fauries Peak, and then there's an  
16 unknown range to the west.

17 Those ranges rise above the meadow about  
18 800 feet, 700- to 800 feet. And then on the other  
19 ranging about 300 feet. That's kind of important as  
20 I get to later on in the presentation.

21 The next slide is just another screenshot  
22 from ConnectGEN's revised project. You know the  
23 only reason why I mention it is there's this  
24 475-acre thing and it's a little misleading to me  
25 because if you look at that footprint of the

1 project, it's way more than 475 acres. I didn't  
2 quite understand where that came from.

3 The next picture is kind of a nice  
4 rendering of -- again, this is ConnectGEN's video,  
5 screenshot, rendering of the project. That -- that  
6 area of no trees there, you see in that picture with  
7 the windmills above it, that is our ranch.

8 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: John, if you can start  
9 bringing it to a close, please.

10 JOHN LAMMERS: Yeah, that's fine.  
11 Anyways, I went to Google Earth, I was -- since I  
12 had the coordinates given to me this time from John  
13 Gable, who by the way give a great presentation  
14 earlier, I was able to go to Google Earth and draw a  
15 line to these turbines and get an elevation view,  
16 and it's in front of you there.

17 And what I really wanted to do was kind of  
18 explain when you put a 600-foot turbine on top of an  
19 800-foot hill, and then you get down in a nice  
20 meadow where the ranch is and you look up at these  
21 things. And I have some illustrations there of what  
22 it is.

23 And the last thing I also wanted to --  
24 there was a consultant done, shadow flicker model, I  
25 think it was extremely shortsighted, because

1 basically what they did was they put a receptor  
2 point on the barn in the house and ran their model  
3 and said, Oh, well, the shadows don't quite reach  
4 there, so it's not a problem.

5           Given the fact that you look out onto the  
6 meadow from this property, and if you look at the  
7 shadow flicker report, the entire meadow, the entire  
8 hillside will be in that shadow flicker zone. So a  
9 little shortsighted to me because, you know, to me,  
10 to be honest, if you're familiar working on a ranch,  
11 you're not really inside the house during the  
12 daylight.

13           You know, flip to the last page and I'll  
14 wrap this up. All I got to say is that this is, I  
15 think, it's been stated before, you know, wrong  
16 project, wrong location, negative benefits. Please  
17 do the right thing and deny the permit. Thank you.

18           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you, sir.

19           SUPERVISOR BAUGH: I have a question.

20           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: We have a question  
21 from Supervisor Baugh.

22           SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Yeah, just two  
23 questions. You have one page that shows a view of  
24 your meadow and three varied heights, turbines.  
25 What direction are we facing there is that --

1 JOHN LAMMERS: We are looking south.

2 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Okay. We're looking  
3 south.

4 JOHN LAMMERS: And that line -- I think  
5 it's the L line. Anyways, not that that matters to  
6 you. But why they're varying is because that line  
7 is kind of going away from us.

8 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Okay. So it's  
9 perspective?

10 JOHN LAMMERS: Yeah.

11 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: And then the other one  
12 that shows four fairly similar in height, which  
13 direction is that facing?

14 JOHN LAMMERS: That would be looking kind  
15 of southwest.

16 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Oh, southwest. I'm  
17 backwards here.

18 JOHN LAMMERS: Yeah, yeah. And that ridge  
19 is -- from Google Earth is about 300 feet above the  
20 meadow, so I kind of drew those turbines in at  
21 600 feet, just --

22 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Okay.

23 JOHN LAMMERS: -- to get a perspective.

24 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Thank you. Appreciate  
25 it.

1 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Monique  
2 Waylene. Is Monique in chamber?

3 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: I don't think -- I  
4 think she's gone.

5 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Lisa McDonald followed  
6 by Thomas Hildebrand. Thomas is here.

7 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Yes, and I think Lisa  
8 is coming.

9 LISA MACDONALD: Good evening. I'm Lisa  
10 McDonald. I'm a real estate agent in Shasta County.  
11 I'm a realtor -- member of the Board of Shasta  
12 Association of Realtors. I've been selling real  
13 estate in Shasta County for 18 years. And I can  
14 guarantee you that these turbines will cause  
15 property (inaudible) into the value of properties.

16 All the cities that I've read from  
17 independent -- as Mary was mentioning, the forensic  
18 appraisers, have shown a significant detriment to  
19 property values. They can range anywhere from  
20 10 percent to somebody who can barely see a turbine,  
21 to a property who is totally unsaleable because the  
22 turbines are there.

23 Also, it's going to give our area a whole  
24 reputation of having these turbines. We're not  
25 going to attract people to want to buy any of our



1 properties. They are a health hazard. We have a  
2 shadow flicker issue. There's all kind of  
3 infrasound issues. It will make some properties  
4 totally unsaleable, and you're going to devastate an  
5 entire community, as well as, an indigenious  
6 population that they can't move. I can move. I can  
7 take a hit and move or whatever; they can't. So I  
8 ask you to deny this project and don't sell our  
9 Native American neighbors for 30 pieces of silver.  
10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Thomas,  
12 followed by Kenyon Mason.

13 THOMAS HILDEBRAND: Actually -- Tom  
14 Hildebrand. I'm in Mary's district.

15 Actually, I was requested to speak, which  
16 is unusual. It was by my good friend Nick Gardner.  
17 And he wanted to talk about -- he can't be here  
18 because he's got to go to a doctor in Oregon,  
19 because we don't have that many doctors here. I  
20 actually go to Chico. We have a lot of homeless and  
21 mental health here, but we don't seem to attract  
22 other people.

23 So, anyway, Nick's out of town and he  
24 asked he to speak a little bit. I've heard him on  
25 the radio twice about this. And I've been coming

1 here about two-and-a-half years hearing this stuff,  
2 and nobody's recognized anything.

3 But, anyway, what Nick wanted to talk  
4 about was, is it contributions or is it a bribe?  
5 You know, to me, it's -- if you're going to give  
6 something, give it and get on. To me, these people  
7 had their A game going, and it surprised me that  
8 County planners turned them down. It was -- it was  
9 a pleasant surprise. I didn't expect it. I've seen  
10 decisions here in this people -- we got three people  
11 here, you don't know -- I could bet on the decisions  
12 they're making, though.

13 But, actually, two months ago Mary come  
14 over and talked to me, and I told her that we have a  
15 nice radio program -- there ain't a lot of them, but  
16 there's one on Sunday at 12:00 o'clock, We The  
17 People. And they had an extra two hours about the  
18 windmills. They had professional people with no  
19 ties to anything come in and talk about.

20 They said this area is a second-rated area  
21 as far as wind as far as they're concerned. And I  
22 don't know -- and they talked, you know, about the  
23 better ones over near the coast and stuff like that.  
24 And, again, I seen the fire -- I live off 299 over  
25 by Bella Vista, and I seen a year before in the

1 fires. And this last year, if we didn't have the  
2 planes those things would have gone and kept going.

3 And I've lived up at Oak Run for a while,  
4 and if you can't get airplanes in there at the  
5 start, it's gone. Especially in that terrain. So  
6 why -- why even bring that onto people into our  
7 society? Is it -- is it a contribution or is it a  
8 bribe?

9 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Kenyon Mason followed  
10 by Donn Walgamath. Is Kenyon here? Going once?  
11 Going twice? Don, you're up. And that will be  
12 followed by Robert Simonis.

13 DONN WALGAMATH: Thank you, Supervisors,  
14 Chairman. I felt it was important to come up and  
15 speak tonight. I am the newest commissioner and was  
16 lucky enough to have my first public meeting be the  
17 June 22nd meeting, so...

18 SUPERVISOR JONES: Welcome aboard.

19 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Yeah, really.

20 DONN WALGAMATH: Been a business owner in  
21 the community. Been on the Board of Directors,  
22 President of the Builders Exchange. And for 27  
23 years I think I've supported every single building  
24 project that came before this community. I think  
25 it's very important, we need growth, we need

1 development and we need tax revenue.

2           When I went to the meeting, I was  
3 completely on the fence. I was 50/50. I was very  
4 open-minded, listened to both sides, and really  
5 wanted to listen and make my own independent  
6 judgment call. It really came down to the air  
7 attack. It is a completely indefensible space.

8           A month ago that decision was reaffirmed  
9 when the Fawn Fire came through our property. My  
10 wife and I chose to stay instead of evacuate. It  
11 burned just about every inch of our property, our  
12 house was saved. We watched three of our neighbors  
13 houses go down. We pulled off to the bottom of our  
14 driveway when the fire got really hot and we watched  
15 the DC-10, the pilot that I did not know, had not  
16 met him until tonight, hit three of our neighbors  
17 house with one direct hit and stopped the fire.

18           What this decision tonight means is money  
19 over the lives and the property of those in that --  
20 in those communities up there; the Moose Camp,  
21 Montgomery Creek, Round Mountain. Without air  
22 attack -- we know these fires are getting worse and  
23 worse, they're getting harder and harder to fight.  
24 If we cannot hit them by the air, these little  
25 communities do not stand a chance, and I think it's

1 very, very pertinent that you guys turn this project  
2 down.

3 It is the wrong project in the wrong  
4 place. We need development. We need lots of great  
5 projects in Shasta County, and they will come. But  
6 not this project. Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Robert  
8 followed by Angela Simonis.

9 ROBERT SIMONIS: She had to go home.

10 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: She went home?

11 ROBERT SIMONIS: Yeah, the kids were  
12 home --

13 (Talking over one another)

14 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: You can speak for her.

15 ROBERT SIMONIS: Thank you for letting  
16 us -- this opportunity to give our opinion and hope  
17 that you can side with us and oppose this project.

18 We live directly under the one observation  
19 tower at the top of Terry Mill. So my biggest  
20 concern is readily available equipment if something  
21 did erupt, which we've seen numerous times. And the  
22 airplanes have been our savior. I mean, we've got a  
23 little water truck, we've got a little dozer. But  
24 without help, we're pretty limited to what we can  
25 do. Even as a community, we have neighbors here,

1 and, you know, a lot of times my daughter's home  
2 alone, my son's home alone, wife's home alone. But,  
3 you know, what this project does to our safety is  
4 that it makes us less secure to be there in a  
5 moment's notice, you know, where you would feel safe  
6 to be at your house, like others have said, to stay  
7 and try and defend it. You know, it's -- it's  
8 tough. And I don't think it's the right choice, so  
9 I appreciate.

10 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you.

11 ROBERT SIMONIS: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Jack  
13 Potter, followed by Gary Cadd. Is Jack still here?

14 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: No, I don't see him.

15 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Gary Cadd, followed  
16 by -- before you sit down, you're up. You filled  
17 one of these out. Unless you don't want to.  
18 Followed by Michael Tauscher.

19 GARY CADD: Mr. Chairman, thank you for me  
20 being able to come up. Actually, I thought I gave  
21 my time to someone else so they could speak, but now  
22 that you got me up here.

23 You know, there's so much disingenuous  
24 coming from -- and I hate to -- ConnectGEN people  
25 were -- we're all God's people. ConnectGEN people

1 are good people. It seems like some of their  
2 message is a little expounded upon when people from  
3 the other side are not agreeing with it, and don't  
4 want to listen to it.

5           There was a gentleman that came to this  
6 microphone podium and, darn, I can't remember the --  
7 the last time that ConnectGEN was here in the room  
8 and speaking, one of the gentlemen here came up and  
9 made the comment that Shasta County loves windmills,  
10 and that they're here to be able to put windmills  
11 up. That was probably a really true statement from  
12 this gentleman, because if this project is  
13 completed, started and completed, this will be the  
14 start of windmills in Shasta County. More and more  
15 and more as has been mentioned throughout the  
16 evening.

17           Now, one thing that we're talking about,  
18 and it's been talked about through this evening, is  
19 all of the windmills are going to be in the east.  
20 Well, that's not really a truthful statement.  
21 Because they can just as easy be on the west, be in  
22 District 2 of Shasta County.

23           So when we look at this, are we going to  
24 build this project with a very good possibility of  
25 having more and more projects built, or are we going

1 to listen to the folks that live up there and not  
2 build the project? Because in the long run, you're  
3 going to -- they're going to give money and the  
4 money will turn around to help the community, but if  
5 there's a fire up there, who's going to be on the  
6 cuff for the fire? The Zogg Fire and other fires  
7 that have been here -- am I done already?

8 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: No, you got 30  
9 seconds.

10 GARY CADD: All right. Let me speed  
11 through here.

12 The other fires cost a lot of money that  
13 PG&E paid for it. If there's a fire up there,  
14 there's not going to be a PG&E., there's going to be  
15 a Shasta County to pick up the tab, and that's  
16 something you really need to think about too.  
17 Seven, six -- thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you.

19 Michael followed by Irene Behr (phonetic).

20 MICHAEL TAUSCHER: Thank you for your time  
21 tonight. It's running late, I'll be as brief as  
22 possible.

23 I would just ask the council to please  
24 consider beyond construction, beyond the  
25 infrastructure dollars, the long-term revenue that



1 this project can create for Shasta County. Shasta  
2 County needs continuous revenue for the services  
3 that we cannot provide. We need tax dollars. We  
4 need revenue. We need jobs. And this project will  
5 provide that, and please consider that. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Is Irene  
7 still here? I don't see Ed, so I figure they run  
8 together.

9 UNKNOWN FEMALE: No, they left.

10 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Okay. Louis  
11 Gustafson, followed by and I -- the writing is not  
12 real clear, but I'm going to go with Shaleesha Ward.

13 LOUIS GUSTAFSON: (Inaudible). My name is  
14 Louis Gustafson, I am Itsatawi, which is the name of  
15 the tribe. It's our traditional area where this is  
16 proposed. I am Ajumawi Madesi, Madesi is one of the  
17 bands directly there.

18 I certainly appreciate everything that I'm  
19 hearing. Fire issues, major thing. They will shut  
20 down fire air attacks from a drone, so big giant  
21 windmills are going to be an issue. If you have  
22 homeowners association rights, that's -- that's  
23 something I don't think about as much, that is not  
24 fair. That is not fair at all to hear about the  
25 fellow with the ranch, fellow trying to keep his

1 family safe with one dozer and all that.

2           We have -- these fires are out of control  
3 here, so I'm glad that's out and also being brought  
4 up. They're going to talk about money because  
5 that's the language they know, a big corporation  
6 that's all they know. It's just like abusers choose  
7 victims who cannot protect themselves. That's what  
8 this area is like. We're a small rural area that  
9 is -- don't have -- they don't think we can stand up  
10 for ourselves and protect ourselves.

11           Calpine Energy tried to build a geothermal  
12 plant in the Medicine Lake volcano, that would have  
13 also had major economic, environmental impacts,  
14 cultural impacts. That's what they're doing here.  
15 The same thing. They see a little community, we're  
16 going to put more windmills here. It's a foot in  
17 the door to get more and all that. There's a lot  
18 more, I know my time is getting short.

19           But more than anything for me, this is a  
20 cultural thing, this is a life thing, this is a  
21 religious thing.

22           That area -- like I was telling my son the  
23 other day, like, there's a place in that general  
24 area where you throw a rock over your left shoulder  
25 and you have good luck. Now there's places like

1 that all over. There's places where women gather  
2 traditionally. There's places where we hunt.  
3 There's power places where people go and find their  
4 lives. As a person that has been clean and sober  
5 since I've been 21, I'm 40 now, I directly attribute  
6 that to my beliefs and my culture and my religion,  
7 and everything that goes with being indigenous was  
8 being Itsatawi. So those things are at risk when we  
9 decide to do these things.

10 So when you -- America is at war with,  
11 like, Afghanistan and these other places around the  
12 world. They won't attack holy places. They won't  
13 attack religious places even if insurgents or people  
14 are there hiding putting America's lives at risk.  
15 So I appreciate this process, but it is kind of,  
16 like, hard to sit up here and be, like, I'm just  
17 trying to protect my holy place, too. I'm like,  
18 trying to protect everything that I have for my  
19 people because we're not listened to.

20 The Sundial Bridge is beautiful. It's  
21 built on a burial site. Shasta Dam is one of the  
22 big places here. The Keswick Dam. The Pit River  
23 people, which is Itsatawi, that's what we're Pit  
24 River people, our sign is the three salmon. We  
25 don't get salmon anymore. It stops at Keswick Dam,

1 stops at Shasta Dam, it affects our brothers and  
2 sisters on the McCloud arm.

3 So there's a lot to consider. I know my  
4 time's up, but as a traditional person, please look  
5 into that because to me that is enough -- that  
6 should be enough, but I thank you very much for your  
7 time.

8 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Shaleesha,  
9 and I apologize if I messed that up. And she'll be  
10 followed by Andrew Meredith.

11 SHALEESHA WARD: Good evening. My name is  
12 Shaleesha Ward. I'm a member of the Madesi Band.  
13 My grandfather's a Madesi. My grandmother on my  
14 mom's side is Atsugewi, and then my other  
15 grandmother is Yana. So I come from all three of  
16 those band areas that they talk about. That's where  
17 I come from.

18 I (inaudible) the tribal monitor. When  
19 the Fountain -- not Fountain, the Hatchet Ridge  
20 Project, and they like when I started working up  
21 there, they said that there wasn't animals and there  
22 wasn't birds, but I seen a lot of birds. And I was  
23 up there from the beginning to the end. There was a  
24 lot of dirt. I found obsidian points and stuff up  
25 there when I was walking between the wind turbines,

1 like, the landings. Like the eagle -- this eagle  
2 flew over me, I heard him, and he was powerful and  
3 the way he flew over me, like, you wouldn't realize  
4 how big those birds are. Those are sacred birds to  
5 our people.

6 I grew up on Big Bend Road and those wind  
7 turbines, where they're placed at now, is close to  
8 Hatchet Creek. And the drilling that they're going  
9 to have to go into the ground to put these massive  
10 wind turbines that are, like, what, two football  
11 fields high? That -- that will mess with the water.

12 Well, Hatchet Creek has Hatchet Falls,  
13 that's a very popular spot, and what is it the  
14 Cascade people, they closed it off this -- a couple  
15 years ago because people were vandalizing it. Well,  
16 that's a woman's spot. There's many resources there  
17 that my people use. I grew up there. That's my  
18 whole -- like that's who I am.

19 And I just really wanted to speak on that  
20 because there's plants that -- after the Fountain  
21 Fire, I lived there my whole life, and like seeing  
22 all this stuff that's coming back after the fire and  
23 how long it's taken for these ferns that my people  
24 use for our basket material to grow after something  
25 so devastating as the Fountain Fire.

1           But I just want to say that I oppose this  
2           and I hope you guys say no.

3           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Andrew  
4           Meredith followed by Cameron Middleton.

5           ANDREW MEREDITH: Good afternoon -- good  
6           evening, Mr. Chairman. We're fully into the evening  
7           now, Members of the Board.

8           First of all, I want to thank you for the  
9           diligence in having a meeting like this. I know  
10          it's tough as an elected official to sit up there  
11          and listen to hours and hours of public testimony.  
12          But I give you all credit for being attentive  
13          listeners. I've been watching the body language.  
14          It's very clear that you're listening to the  
15          conversation today.

16          My name is Andrew Meredith. I represent  
17          the State Building and Construction Trades Council  
18          of California. We are 450,000 members deep  
19          statewide. I'm here tonight in support of our local  
20          building trades asking for your approval of this  
21          project. I want to start first by dispelling a  
22          couple things that I heard during testimony today  
23          that I know it to be untrue.

24          The statements that ConnectGEN is an  
25          unethical company is completely fabricated. In all

1 of our dealings with ConnectGEN, they have been  
2 totally honest. And the idea that ConnectGEN  
3 contacted the TERO officer of the Pit River Tribe on  
4 a cold call and connected with him and that was the  
5 only conversation that took place is blatantly  
6 false.

7           Myself and other building trades leaders  
8 engaged in a Zoom call with the TERO officer from  
9 the Pit River Tribe that I felt was more like a  
10 negotiation than it was just a casual conversation.  
11 And I think everybody on our side of the table  
12 believed that to be the same.

13           Also, the idea that firefighting is going  
14 to be completely shut down for any fires that take  
15 place up in the general area of this project, I also  
16 believe is patently false. In the National Guard, I  
17 was a Blackhawk crew chief, we did aerial  
18 firefighting on behalf of CAL FIRE. I can tell you  
19 that there are lots of really interesting places  
20 that we can get the helicopters into to drop water.

21           Now, does that mean that helicopters will  
22 be operating in between these turbines? Absolutely  
23 not. But I think there is enough aerial  
24 firefighting that can take place on the perimeter of  
25 this project that it will make a difference. It's

1 not just we build this project and all of a sudden  
2 there's no aerial firefighting in eastern Shasta  
3 County. So that's false.

4 I want to talk a little bit about job  
5 creation. I want you to remember building trades,  
6 jobs, whether they're union or nonunion are  
7 generally barrier-free employment opportunities.  
8 Barrier-free opportunities to reach the middle  
9 class. Things like prior incarcerations, ethnicity,  
10 gender, sexual orientation, none of these things  
11 matter in our industry. People are afforded the  
12 opportunity to work towards a middle class job.

13 I want to leave you with this: I know a  
14 lot of you personally, and I know a lot of you have  
15 campaigned on the idea of being pro business. There  
16 is not going to be a better opportunity for you to  
17 prove that you're pro business than supporting this  
18 project. You say that you're pro development.  
19 Again, there will not be a better opportunity for  
20 you to prove to your 180,000 constituents that  
21 you're pro development than by approving this  
22 project.

23 Lastly, I want to leave you with this:  
24 Remember the footprint of this project and the  
25 people that will be negatively impacted by it is



1 probably 5,000 people. You were all elected to  
2 represent 180,000 people. Those people are counting  
3 on job creation, they're counting on tax revenue,  
4 and your decision tonight can help them get one step  
5 closer to that.

6 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Cameron, you're up.

7 CAMERON MIDDLETON: Hello, my name is  
8 Cameron Middleton. I'm a local realtor. I'm  
9 chairman of the legislative committee for the Shasta  
10 Association of Realtors and Vice Chairman of the  
11 City Planning Commission for the City of Redding.

12 Although I'm up here not speaking on  
13 either group's behalf -- here as an individual -- I  
14 give you, all of you, I want to tip my hat to you.  
15 My Planning Commission meeting this evening only  
16 lasted three hours, which I think is a short agenda  
17 item for you guys so good work.

18 I come to speak to you today in support of  
19 the project. As a realtor, from my professional  
20 opinion, I do not believe that this will negatively  
21 impact property values in that area. I've seen all  
22 kinds of various developments whether it be WAPA  
23 lines to other projects. And have actually for  
24 years been astonished at how little those affect  
25 people's decision making when it comes to actually

1 purchasing their homes.

2           Secondly, I think -- and this is really  
3 seeing the forest through the trees. I think the  
4 most important thing here is still in Shasta County,  
5 and it's easy to lose sight of with all of the other  
6 issues going on and with the pandemic, but it's  
7 still public safety.

8           And I believe -- we've obviously seen the  
9 tax measures in this county, within the city of  
10 Redding, elsewhere, are just not going to get  
11 through. And we need to have that economic  
12 activity, that economic growth, and that tax revenue  
13 come from new business, new development and new  
14 economic activity in order to get there.

15           I think the problem is within this beast  
16 we have that is Shasta County, 90 percent of the  
17 economic activity takes place in Redding, Anderson  
18 or Shasta Lake City. A very small percentage  
19 actually occurs in the unincorporated area. So it's  
20 very difficult to build up that economic base within  
21 the unincorporated area, as you all know, to have  
22 that be lifted up by very small projects here and  
23 there.

24           Really, we look back over couple of  
25 generations and we -- over several generations and

1 we really find that in the unincorporated area it's  
2 only about one or two times a decade that we get any  
3 type of proposal that's of this size, this scope,  
4 this magnitude, that can have such a positive  
5 economic effect on the County and especially on  
6 County governance, and I think this is one of those  
7 opportunities. They only come up so often, and each  
8 time we turn one down, which we've done too many  
9 times, it does have a cumulative effect and I think  
10 we're starting to see some of the negative effects  
11 of that now.

12 I would encourage you to support the  
13 project and to support the appeal. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Stefany,  
15 do we have anybody in the overflow room? Just a  
16 general question.

17 THE CLERK: We have not for a while. But  
18 give me one second and I can double check that for  
19 you. There's nobody at the alternate site.

20 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Okay. So then I'll  
21 ask, is there anybody in this room who hasn't given  
22 a card that would like to speak either in opposition  
23 or in support of? And speaking of which, here comes  
24 a card.

25 Awi Gustafson. Did I say that first name

1 correctly? They'll tell me if I didn't. If there's  
2 anybody else that would like to speak, just get in  
3 queue, that would be awesome.

4           AWI GUSTAFSON: Good evening. My name is  
5 Awi Gustafson. (Inaudible) part of the Itsatawi  
6 Band. I just want to say a couple quick things.  
7 All these numbers and logistics stand on their own.  
8 They very clearly show why this project is unhealthy  
9 for the land and community.

10           The fire concerns and ruined views are all  
11 valid arguments, but my question is: Why are they  
12 needed? Why is our opposition as indigenous people  
13 not enough? Why are we not taken seriously when we  
14 say that hurting the land is hurting us? Why is the  
15 value of our culture and existence argued over? It  
16 is mentally and emotionally exhausting as indigenous  
17 people to try and explain over and over why we  
18 matter. Why we, in our culture, deserve to be  
19 respected.

20           The mere proposal of this project, the  
21 mere thought or consideration is absurd. Having to  
22 come up here and argue why we deserve to be listened  
23 to is incredibly dehumanizing. I'm asking you to  
24 look at us as human. We are not a small side note  
25 of this project. Understand that this is our

1 livelihood. We have lived here for thousands of  
2 years and here we are having to ask for our land to  
3 not be destroyed. This fight is nothing new. I  
4 grew up going to protests against projects like  
5 these.

6           Though I'm only 16, here I still am  
7 fighting. I should not have to come up here and  
8 argue why I matter. Why me and my people matter.  
9 Heavily consider this when making your decision.  
10 I'm asking for basic respect. Thank you.

11           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you.

12           LOUISE DAVIS: Good evening, my name is  
13 Louise Davis. I'm Itsatawi from the Pit River  
14 Nation, and I am a citizen of the Pit River Nation.  
15 I have been here since time immemorial. My people  
16 have been here. I sit here and I listen to we ask  
17 if this is a bribe, the money, the jobs that it's  
18 going to bring into the county. This is nothing  
19 compared to the damage that it will do to the air,  
20 to the animals, to the people.

21           I'm a grandmother. I heard a gentleman  
22 talk about being able to go on these roads and take  
23 his family, that he feels unsafe. I cannot go on  
24 that road that we are talking about going up on the  
25 other -- where the other windmills are. We used to

1 go up there, we can't go up there now. We can't go  
2 to these sites. We still go, we talk about these  
3 sacred sites, and we go up there and do our -- our  
4 visions, our sacred places where we go, we still  
5 go -- if there's a locked gate, we will go. We will  
6 go and we will still do what we need to do.

7           You build that site up there, you build  
8 these things, and you're destroying, you're  
9 destroying what cannot be replaced. No amount of  
10 money, no amount of job is going to replace that.  
11 You cannot replace that. And when you -- I pray for  
12 all of you, and I pray for your children who you  
13 come to this county to live, and to a wonderful  
14 place, and then you come and you're going to destroy  
15 it.

16           The people -- they're good people, they  
17 want to create jobs, but this is not the right kind  
18 of job. Build it to -- in a place that's not going  
19 to create a fire danger. You're creating danger in  
20 a place where people live and they moved there for a  
21 reason. The people that live in the mountains, they  
22 live off grid. A lot of them do. And why? Why  
23 would you put something up there that they don't  
24 want?

25           I go up there. I'm up there once -- at

1 least once a week I'm up on that road. We're up  
2 there driving those backroads. Why? Because that's  
3 a part of us. That's who we are. So no amount of  
4 money -- the Pit River Tribe is a poor tribe, but we  
5 would not take any amount of money to destroy that  
6 and we don't -- we're not landowners, because it's  
7 been taken from us. But we will not take any kind  
8 of -- amount of money for -- for -- for this. So we  
9 pray for you. We pray for you to make the right  
10 decision.

11 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Is there  
12 anybody else who would like to speak? If you would  
13 like to speak just get in queue over there. You  
14 have three minutes, sir. Do you want to speak?

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

16 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: He's doing  
17 housekeeping, that's all. Keeping things orderly.  
18 It's his nature.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: From what I've seen  
20 here tonight, it's -- the majority of these people  
21 who are for this, this is not in their backyard;  
22 this is in my backyard. I'm a local. I've been in  
23 that area for 30 years, 30-plus years. And, you  
24 know, yeah, it brings in jobs, but for, what, two  
25 years, and then what? You know, maybe 12 people get

1 a job? You know, long term, and then what?

2 You know, and then what about 40 years  
3 down the road when these things got to be  
4 decommissioned and then what? You know, where do  
5 they go? What landfill? Whose landfill?

6 You know, it's -- it's a destruction to  
7 the environment. It's, you know -- we got a clear  
8 cut. How many acres of trees to put these windmills  
9 in? What does that do to the environment? The  
10 animals, you know, the surrounding areas.

11 I live in that area. This is my backyard.  
12 So when I wake up in the morning, I'm drinking my  
13 coffee, I look up and I see these windmills. That's  
14 an eyesore. You know, this isn't in their backyard,  
15 this is in my backyard, you know. And if this was  
16 in their backyard, they would be against this. But,  
17 you know, it isn't in their backyard so they're all  
18 for it. So that's -- that's about it.

19 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. Is there  
20 anybody else that would like to speak on this  
21 matter? Well, then I'm going to close public  
22 hearing. And then I'm going to ask Henry to come up  
23 and do a rebuttal or his designee. But I want to  
24 take one moment just to thank all of you, because I  
25 know this is a very volatile situation, it's an



1 emotional situation, and I really applaud everyone  
2 in this room, regardless of what side of this  
3 equation they were on, how well they respected  
4 themselves and other people in the room. And I  
5 think that's so important for this process to work  
6 properly, and I just want to tell you, I sadly don't  
7 get to see that often in this room, and I thank you  
8 so much for that. It's greatly appreciated.

9 So Henry and your group, you're up, you've  
10 got five minutes.

11 HENRY WOLTAG: Respectfully, Chair, just  
12 one second.

13 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Yeah, we won't start  
14 you until you're ready to play.

15 HENRY WOLTAG: The joys of technology.

16 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: We understand,  
17 intimately.

18 HENRY WOLTAG: Okay. Okay. Mr. Chairman,  
19 Supervisors. Thank you for the opportunity to  
20 respond to the comments presented during this  
21 hearing. It's been a long day and you've heard  
22 comments from various stakeholders providing their  
23 positions on this project.

24 We've listened to these comments, and we  
25 want to use our time to emphasize three main points.

1           No. 1. There's a tremendous amount of  
2 support for this project and the social and economic  
3 benefits it brings to Shasta County.

4           No. 2. The CEQA process has resulted in a  
5 comprehensive and sound EIR.

6           No. 3. Opponents continue to reference  
7 inaccurate information and unsubstantiated claims.  
8 We have addressed these very same topics earlier in  
9 our presentation, as well as, in the myth versus  
10 facts document, including as part of the materials  
11 we provided, which I urge you to take a look at.  
12 We've heard about 15 of those myths here today  
13 repeated.

14           Regarding the issues, I want to respond to  
15 a few of the key ones that were mentioned today.  
16 And I might go a minute or two over five, but I will  
17 keep it brief.

18           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Okay.

19           HENRY WOLTAG: With respect to aerial fire  
20 suppression, you heard multiple people continue to  
21 claim there would be a no-fly zone around this  
22 project. That is not what CAL FIRE concluded in the  
23 staff report when they state that this project will  
24 not create a no-fly zone. Claims that this area  
25 would be indefensible by air are not supported by

1 the experts, and I encourage you to ask Shasta  
2 County Fire, who is here today.

3 The revised visual simulations. I know a  
4 gentleman got up and presented his own. Well, the  
5 visual simulations from the original DEIR and EIR  
6 have been updated, and they were provided to the  
7 County as part of the Refinements Memo. In the  
8 binder, if you go to the end of that section,  
9 there's about ten pages of before and after visual  
10 simulations.

11 Regarding the use of energy. The energy  
12 will stay here in Shasta County. The project  
13 interconnects to the grid at the Pit No. 1 to  
14 Cottonwood transmission line, not the Round Mountain  
15 substation. And all of the power flows into the  
16 substation in Cottonwood. These electrons flow to  
17 the closest place to where it's needed the most from  
18 that location, and they will be used right here in  
19 the local PG&E electrical grid.

20 Furthermore, there are no stability issues  
21 associated with interconnecting this project;  
22 otherwise, the project would not be allowed to  
23 connect to the grid in the first place.

24 Regarding wind turbines in forested areas,  
25 there are over 50 wind projects operating safely on

1 forested lands across the United States. Managed  
2 timberlands is a compatible land use. In addition  
3 to this, fires and modern turbines are exceptionally  
4 rare and concentrated to the older model of  
5 turbines. Every turbine in this project will have  
6 fire detection and extinguishing systems as has been  
7 required by Shasta County Fire.

8           Regarding the FAA, the FAA approves a  
9 lighting plan based on the final turbine layout and  
10 configuration. We are not required to submit  
11 filings if we reduce the turbine height or we reduce  
12 the number of locations associated with the project.  
13 This project has received approvals for all of the  
14 turbines in the original project at a taller height  
15 of 679 feet and we have reduced that. A reduction  
16 in the number of turbines does not require refiling.

17           For tribal coordination, as counsel for  
18 the tribe confirmed, we made substantial efforts to  
19 engage with the tribe. We have never misrepresented  
20 the Pit River Tribe's position and to clarify the  
21 record, we did meet with tribal representatives and  
22 we did receive a call from the TERO officer and  
23 there are no references to the TERO offer on our  
24 website as was claimed. You can confirm that if you  
25 were to go to it right now.

1           Nevertheless, we stand by our commitments  
2 to the tribe and remain open to continued  
3 coordination.

4           Regarding additional projects. You aren't  
5 approving a wind energy zone in the eastern half of  
6 Shasta County. Before you today is this specific  
7 project, which has been studied for over a decade  
8 and undergone rigorous environmental review. And  
9 this project, the Fountain Wind Project, uses up the  
10 remaining capacity on that existing transmission  
11 line I referenced earlier. There is no additional  
12 transmission capacity to support additional projects  
13 in this region.

14           Now, for the Planning Commission hearing,  
15 we're all aware that the Planning Commission's  
16 decision on June 22nd, which went against Staff's  
17 finding and recommendation of approval. Our  
18 disagreement with the decision of the Planning  
19 Commission is not a denigration and it is not  
20 disrespectful. This is a policy decision and people  
21 can differ on policy decisions.

22           The Planning Commission decision is not  
23 final for a reason, and that is because you are the  
24 final policy decision makers for the County. We  
25 have presented compelling policy reasons why the

1 benefits of this project outweigh the burdens.

2 The Planning Commission meeting minutes  
3 from the hearing noted that the Planning Commission  
4 found the FEIR erred in not addressing the  
5 significant impact of the removal of aerial  
6 firefighting capability due to the location and the  
7 height of the proposed structures putting the  
8 communities in a significantly dangerous position.

9 This statement regarding the EIR is  
10 inconsistent with Staff's findings. It's  
11 inconsistent with the EIR, and inconsistent with the  
12 view of experts in wildfire analysis and wildfire  
13 protection, including Shasta County Fire.

14 Since then, Staff has further confirmed in  
15 its updated Staff Report that no new significant  
16 environmental impacts would result. The impacts of  
17 the project would be reduced, and no substantial  
18 increase in the severity of an environmental impact  
19 identified in the EIR would result. This finding  
20 along with the reliance on the June 22nd staff  
21 report clearly point to a comprehensive and sound  
22 EIR which the Board of Supervisors can rely on in  
23 making its decision in its -- this de novo finding.

24 Speakers, including tribal members, has  
25 expressed concerns about increased wildfires

1 over time due to climate change. Wind energy, like  
2 the Fountain Wind Project, is part of the solution  
3 to controlling wildfires in California. We take  
4 pride in our project and we wish nothing more than  
5 to respond to and correct each inaccuracy. But five  
6 minutes, 10 minutes, 15 minutes is not close to  
7 enough time.

8           Rather, we believe the facts of these  
9 matters are clear, publicly known and  
10 well-documented in the EIR. Various technical  
11 studies are also addressed in the materials that you  
12 have before you.

13           In conclusion, ConnectGEN, along with  
14 hundreds of community supporters, strongly believe  
15 the record is clear. The Fountain Wind is a net  
16 benefit to the county. It is supported by the  
17 County General Plan, which promotes and increases  
18 and utilization of renewable energy through its  
19 extensive mitigation and economic commitments. The  
20 project promotes the health, safety, peace, morals,  
21 comfort, and general welfare of the residents of  
22 Shasta County.

23           Accordingly, we respectfully request your  
24 certification of the Fountain Wind EIR and approval  
25 of Use Permit 16-007.

1           Thank you for allowing me to provide these  
2 remarks, and I stand here with not just myself, my  
3 entire team, our experts, ready to address any  
4 questions.

5           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Henry, would either of  
6 your colleagues like a minute or two to add to what  
7 you said?

8           HENRY WOLTAG: I think they're going to be  
9 here for response.

10          CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Okay.

11          HENRY WOLTAG: Yeah, with me is Mark  
12 Lawlor, our vice president of development, and Caton  
13 Fenz, ConnectGEN's CEO.

14          CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Okay. Thank you. So,  
15 with that, I'll bring you back to the Board, and I  
16 think supervisor, if you don't mind, Supervisor  
17 Baugh, I'll just start with Supervisor Rickert and  
18 we can all go down the line.

19          SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Certainly. Certainly.  
20 No problem.

21          CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: So Supervisor Rickert,  
22 you can just ask questions. We brought it back --  
23 I've closed the public hearing officially, and we'll  
24 bring it back to the Board for any and all  
25 conversation, questions of anyone.



1           SUPERVISOR RICKERT: I just want to say,  
2 first of all, I've been thinking about this project  
3 for a long time. And driving down today -- down  
4 299, there's no words to describe the beauty of  
5 these natural resources that we live in that we call  
6 home in Shasta County. And I want to share one  
7 little story. It was the Hat Fire. Someone else  
8 brought it up this evening.

9           I stood in the town of Fall River Mills as  
10 the Hat Fire -- it was ignited at the rifle range --  
11 came towards Fall River Mills. And for anyone that  
12 was there, it was the most -- one of the most  
13 spectacular things I ever remember in my life  
14 watching. And the aircraft that came in and stopped  
15 that fire, it was just spectacular. And it was --  
16 that town of Fall River Mills would have burned if  
17 it hadn't been for the aircraft that showed up that  
18 evening.

19           And I just will never be more grateful to  
20 CAL FIRE, our local fire departments. And it's so  
21 important to be able to attack a fire that -- and  
22 this is not in a forested area, this was, you know,  
23 it's brush, chaparral, oak trees. And I've watched  
24 it firsthand within close proximity, and I think  
25 it's really important that we have the capabilities

1 of attacking these fires the way that they are so  
2 catastrophic in this day and age in the drought and  
3 the dry conditions that we need to use every single  
4 tool that we possibly can.

5 Just my -- my opinion is I do feel that  
6 the Planning Commission decided to oppose this  
7 project for good reason. I've known some of the  
8 Planning Commissioners for 40 years or better. And  
9 I -- I respect their opinions. I respect their  
10 judgment. I do feel that some of the comments made  
11 by the aerial firefighters tonight are very, very  
12 compelling comments, very compelling.

13 I do unequivocally believe it would be a  
14 reduction of land values for the residents. I do  
15 unequivocally believe that insurance will continue  
16 to be a problem to insure their properties.

17 I really respect the comments made by the  
18 tribe tonight. I really do. I understand you  
19 talked about the eagles. I travel 299 all the time,  
20 and I can honestly say I can't remember seeing an  
21 eagle since the Hatchet Ridge Project went in. I  
22 used to see them along that corridor.

23 I find it interesting tonight that not one  
24 community member from that area came here in support  
25 of the project. I think that speaks volumes. I do

1 think the local residents understand the dangers of  
2 wind turbines in forested areas. And my  
3 conversations with appraisers, who are professionals  
4 in this business, they were very surprised that, you  
5 know, it was that kind of elevation, that kind of  
6 forested land that was being considered.

7 Another comment, too, I want to make is  
8 there's been a lot of discussion, and no one wants  
9 money more than I do to fight illegal marijuana  
10 grows, as those of you who are on this Board know.  
11 But I go through Burney all the time. There was a  
12 lot of promises made to the town of Burney. And  
13 there's no -- there's, you know, the theater closed  
14 down. Other than a Dollar General and a Grocery  
15 Outlet that's popped up in every small community in  
16 this state, there hasn't been any economic  
17 development.

18 So that argument, in my opinion, goes out  
19 the window. SPI today they've got a flashing light,  
20 you know, \$1,500 for signing bonus to go to work.  
21 They're desperately looking for people to go to  
22 work.

23 And our enrollment in our schools is  
24 declining. These little small towns are dying, even  
25 with the Hatchet Ridge Project. That was a kind of

1 a case study. So I just wanted to bring up some of  
2 these points. With that, I'll stop right there.

3 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: All right. Thank you.  
4 Supervisor Moty?

5 SUPERVISOR MOTY: Thank you, Chair  
6 Chimenti. I'm going to have to take just a little  
7 bit of exception with just a couple comments  
8 Supervisor Rickert made.

9 One. One of the speakers made a point of  
10 asking if there was anybody who lived in that area  
11 who supported it, and I think I saw at least three  
12 hands come up.

13 And then also you mentioned about any  
14 money that went to the Burney area after the last  
15 deal. And 400,000 went to Mayers Memorial Hospital;  
16 400,000 went to the library; \$100,000 went to the  
17 Chamber; \$100,000 a year goes to Shasta County  
18 Sheriff's Office for law enforcement up there.  
19 There's also annual grants that come out each year  
20 from the community foundation for that area after  
21 people apply for that, and there may be more that  
22 I'm missing.

23 I'm just going to jump right into the big  
24 elephant in the room that no one wants to seem to  
25 ask, which concerned me a little bit from before.

1 So I'm going to ask CAL FIRE to step up and address  
2 this fire issue; fly, no-fly zone. We've heard from  
3 a lot of people. But I want to hear from our chief  
4 if you would like to address that.

5 CHIEF BRET GOUVEA: Good evening, Chair  
6 Chimenti, Members of the Board. I'm Bret Gouvea,  
7 CAL FIRE Unit Chief, Shasta-Trinity Unit, and your  
8 Shasta County Fire Chief.

9 I would like to give a real quick  
10 distinction. We've mixed up Shasta County Fire  
11 Department and CAL FIRE multiple times throughout  
12 the evening. CAL FIRE is responsible for wildland  
13 fire protection in this county. Shasta County Fire  
14 Department is responsible for improvement type  
15 fires, traffic collisions, medical aid, hazardous  
16 materials, and rescue. So I just want to make that  
17 distinction.

18 With me tonight is Jimmy Zanatelli, the  
19 Shasta County Fire Marshal who works for us at  
20 Shasta County Fire. And so when conditioning this  
21 project, and many questions about the water tanks  
22 that are out there, those are all conditioned by the  
23 fire marshal under the fire code, not by CAL FIRE.  
24 So I wanted to make that clarification.

25 So if I'm clear, you want me to speak to

1 the aerial?

2 SUPERVISOR MOTY: To start with, yes.

3 CHIEF BRET GOUVEA: To start with. So  
4 that is really working with Paul Hellman and the  
5 resource management folks on the EIR. That's really  
6 the only thing that I commented on, and the only  
7 thing I've met with anybody in regards to.

8 In looking at that question, it's a  
9 difficult question because it's broad. And so I  
10 turn to the CAL FIRE tactical air unit out of  
11 Sacramento that oversees all aircraft for CAL FIRE  
12 in the State of California.

13 So their response to that is very simple.  
14 Obviously, every situation is different. Every  
15 aerial hazard is different. We fly around aerial  
16 hazards every day. The type of aircraft that are  
17 used is determined by those aerial hazards. A  
18 gentleman earlier that flies VLATs tonight spoke. A  
19 VLAT, a Very Large Air Tanker, needs a 3-mile runway  
20 to make a drop with no aerial hazards. And that's,  
21 too, a smaller aircraft needs a much smaller area to  
22 drop in. We use those in tight areas.

23 Obviously, it's been mentioned that rotary  
24 wing aircraft helicopters can get into much tighter  
25 areas. Obviously, placement and separation of those

1 windmills would dictate the use of aircraft. And  
2 depending on where the fire is into that location.  
3 I had stated that aerial hazards do change the way  
4 that we fight fire and the tactics for aircraft.

5 It is important to note that aircraft  
6 alone do not put our fires out; our ground troops  
7 do. Aircraft reduced the intensity of our fires.  
8 They hold them in check until our ground resources  
9 can get in there and put them out. So having access  
10 to the ground is also very important.

11 But in this case, when you say no-fly  
12 zone, that's a very broad term. I can't agree to  
13 that. Are we going to use a VLAT in a wind farm?  
14 Absolutely not. Are we going to be able to  
15 tactically maneuver inside of a wind farm as we  
16 would without it? No, we are not.

17 It's been mentioned earlier tonight would  
18 we use the outside skirts of that farm area?  
19 Absolutely. Because the reduction of fuel, the  
20 reduction of brush based on the project area is a  
21 benefit. However, there's also negative impacts to  
22 that. When we talk about shaded fuel breaks,  
23 traditionally a shaded fuel break is in place so  
24 that we can use aircraft on a shaded field break so  
25 ground resources can clearly get into a shaded fuel

1 break because we provide access to those.

2 An aircraft can support those ground  
3 resources on that shaded fuel break. It's an area  
4 to try and slow the fire. And also it's an area  
5 that we consider a spotting zone as spot fires land  
6 into a shaded fuel break, they're much easier to  
7 extinguish, and we use those areas to fight fire  
8 from.

9 So I wouldn't consider a wind farm pathway  
10 as a shaded fuel break, because traditionally the  
11 way we use shaded fuel breaks, we would not be able  
12 to do that in that wind farm path. As I said, I  
13 can't take a VLAT and run it right down that wind  
14 farm and utilize it because I need a 3-mile clear  
15 and no hazard stretch.

16 So it is a very complicated -- and,  
17 unfortunately, for all of you, I can't give you a  
18 very silver bullet answer to that question. It is  
19 complicated.

20 Reduction of fuel is definitely a benefit  
21 for fire protection. Anytime you put improvements  
22 or access into an area. Improvements, humans cause  
23 the majority of our fires. About 90 percent of our  
24 fires here in Shasta County. So access to our  
25 forested areas are good for fire protection, but the



1 flip side to that is also it also can increase human  
2 caused fires and ignitions.

3 So those are not probably the black and  
4 white answers that everybody is looking for from me,  
5 but there are negative and positive impacts to both  
6 sides of this.

7 SUPERVISOR MOTY: So are there other  
8 things in other areas that contribute to areas for  
9 difficulties with air attacks such as power lines,  
10 other structures? Is that pretty common in other  
11 areas?

12 CHIEF BRET GOUVEA: Absolutely. And as it  
13 was mentioned earlier in the evening, we have wind  
14 farms up and down the state. I've actually managed  
15 fires in areas. I've managed fires in Tehachapis.  
16 They do create a challenge. Is it a no go for us to  
17 go and fight fire in those areas? We do it.

18 It's also very important to also mention,  
19 though, that the majority of those areas that we  
20 traditionally worked in are very light fuels. This  
21 is a little bit different that I don't have any  
22 experience with of having a wind farm in a heavy  
23 timbered area. That is down off the ridge top, the  
24 extreme ridge top down in the lower ridges. So  
25 looking at that project, I can't, you know, answer

1 that, because we have very little experience  
2 fighting timber fires in wind farmed areas.

3 SUPERVISOR MOTY: Are there other things,  
4 like -- I mean, like, smoke? Does smoke inhibit air  
5 attacks?

6 CHIEF BRET GOUVEA: Absolutely. Smoke  
7 inhibits our air use annually. This year it was.  
8 You saw the inversion we lived under for most of  
9 this year. We had very few windows that we could  
10 fly aircraft this summer, when we were all under --  
11 so, those are times we just can't put aircraft in  
12 the air.

13 SUPERVISOR MOTY: And then there was  
14 mention about sometimes fires create their own  
15 weather, and certainly I saw that firsthand during  
16 the Carr Fire. I assume those kind of issues can  
17 also create no -- times when it's difficult to fly  
18 planes, when the weather is so unpredictable in  
19 those kind of storms.

20 CHIEF BRET GOUVEA: Absolutely. I mean,  
21 and, you know, really where we're really effective  
22 is in initial attack, and you hear us talk about it  
23 all the time. You know, something about our  
24 aircraft, every single morning there's a briefing at  
25 our air base, at all the air bases in California,

1 and in the nation for that matter. Very strict  
2 briefings.

3 In those briefings, every single aerial  
4 hazard that's in the area of operation is  
5 identified. It's GPS'd. It's identified. Those  
6 pilots know where those are. They know the plan on  
7 what's going to go on, and it is the incident  
8 command and the operations that run the aircraft.  
9 That dictate the use of those aircraft.

10 However, we have an aerial supervisor that  
11 communicates with all those aircraft, coordinates  
12 those aircraft, and decides where it's safe for them  
13 to operate and where it's not. Based on the  
14 location of the fire in conjunction to those aerial  
15 hazards, it's a different situation every time. So  
16 it's not a black and white answer. Sometimes we  
17 can, sometimes we can't.

18 SUPERVISOR MOTY: Thank you, Chief. My  
19 next question would be for Mr. Hellman or perhaps  
20 one of your staff. Thank you, Mr. Hellman.  
21 Initially, with the Planning Commission hearing,  
22 what was the recommendation of your department?

23 PAUL HELLMAN: Approval.

24 SUPERVISOR MOTY: Based on what?

25 PAUL HELLMAN: Just compliance with all of

1 the mitigation measures, conditions that we  
2 recommended. The Applicant agreed to all of those.  
3 We had an EIR that we felt was defensible.  
4 Obviously, there were some significant unmitigated  
5 impacts, so that requires a statement of overriding  
6 considerations to find that there are benefits that  
7 outweigh those unmitigated impacts.

8           There really weren't enough, you know,  
9 legitimate reasons that we, you know, found to -- to  
10 support denial. Again, it's a recommendation. We  
11 knew, you know, it was ultimately going to be up to  
12 the Commission to weigh the -- and that was prior to  
13 the public hearing, of course, so we didn't have all  
14 the input that the Commission had when they made  
15 their decision.

16           But from beginning, you know, it was -- we  
17 don't make those recommendations until the end. You  
18 know, we never tell an applicant when they apply  
19 we're going to support this project, we're not going  
20 to support it. We tell them we don't know, we have  
21 to see where things go in the analysis and then  
22 we'll make a recommendation before the hearing and  
23 that's what we did.

24           SUPERVISOR MOTY: And so they followed the  
25 process?

1           PAUL HELLMAN: The applicant?

2           SUPERVISOR MOTY: The Applicant followed  
3 the process? They did follow the process?

4           PAUL HELLMAN: Absolutely. They provided  
5 all the information we requested. Obviously they  
6 paid for the preparation of the EIR. That's their  
7 responsibility.

8           SUPERVISOR MOTY: Okay. You mentioned  
9 earlier that a Use Permit versus a change in zoning.  
10 And that's a different process. So if you just  
11 could touch on -- what that means is that area was  
12 already zoned for this kind of use?

13           PAUL HELLMAN: The Shasta County Zoning  
14 Plan allows for these types of facilities, power  
15 generating facilities, with the approval of a Use  
16 Permit in almost every zone district in the county  
17 including this property. So it's also consistent  
18 with the general plan provided the Use Permit's  
19 approved. So there was no requirement for a zoning  
20 change in order for the project to be processed, it  
21 was just simply a Use Permit requirement.

22           SUPERVISOR MOTY: Is there a bond for --  
23 or will it be required, I should say, for removal of  
24 this afterwards if it were to be approved?

25           PAUL HELLMAN: There are several

1 conditions. I think it refers to a financial  
2 assurance. It doesn't specify what type. That is  
3 to be provided to the satisfaction of the County.  
4 So that will be negotiated in terms of the amount  
5 and the type of assurance. But, yes, that is a  
6 requirement before they obtain their first building  
7 permit for anything within the project area they  
8 would have to comply with that requirement.

9 SUPERVISOR MOTY: And I'll ask this -- and  
10 I don't know if you would answer it or perhaps the  
11 Applicant, but was there ever any discussion about  
12 undergrounding any of the utilities or is it just  
13 not feasible to -- to run from the turbines to the  
14 interconnection with the main line?

15 PAUL HELLMAN: I don't recall that  
16 conversation. You know, a lot of it might have to  
17 do with the topography. I would probably defer to  
18 the Applicant because they obviously had their  
19 designers and engineers looking at, you know, their  
20 proposals, so do you want to respond to that?

21 HENRY WOLTAG: Yeah. So it's an  
22 engineering consideration, like Paul said, based on  
23 the topography and also being able to safely trench  
24 the underground cable over various parts of this  
25 project. There's some questions of that. So it's a

1 construction recommendation based on the safety.

2 There's also the engineering consideration.

3 SUPERVISOR MOTY: So could there be some  
4 undergrounding perhaps when maybe other places it  
5 wouldn't be because it's just not physically  
6 possible or something?

7 HENRY WOLTAG: Yeah. A overwhelming  
8 majority of the project is undergrounded. There are  
9 just very short portions, we call them home runs,  
10 that go into the project substation. So all, you  
11 know, turbines are connected in a string and once  
12 that string, you know, is completed, closer to the  
13 substation, there's very short runs of that  
14 overhead.

15 SUPERVISOR MOTY: And the other question I  
16 have for you is, there was a lot of discussions  
17 about, you know, turbines and fires and things like  
18 that. I mean, one was already mentioned about the  
19 suppression that's built into the nacelles in case  
20 it happens.

21 My question is: If there was a fire in  
22 the area, do the turbines shut down?

23 HENRY WOLTAG: Yes.

24 SUPERVISOR MOTY: Automatically?

25 HENRY WOLTAG: The project would be shut

1 down, turned off, there would be no spinning, and it  
2 would not be operating.

3 SUPERVISOR MOTY: Okay. Because somebody  
4 raised some good points. If there was a fire that  
5 came into that area, and if it were to affect some  
6 of the turbines that you could have debris thrown,  
7 who knows how far, so that's why my question. I  
8 just wanted to make sure I assumed that there would  
9 be a shutdown of turbines if there was a danger like  
10 that.

11 Are there not other times too when the  
12 turbines shut down? Like if there's super high  
13 winds or things like that that can kind of effect  
14 them?

15 HENRY WOLTAG: Yeah, there's -- it's built  
16 into the turbine operating system, and it's  
17 automatic. When winds are too low, below an end  
18 speed, or too high above a cut-out speed, then the  
19 turbines automatically shut down.

20 SUPERVISOR MOTY: And then on the setbacks  
21 at some of the properties and stuff, is there any  
22 flexibility with any additional, you know, adding  
23 distance between the turbines and/or residences or  
24 property lines are located? Do you have any  
25 flexibility with that or are you pretty set to



1 where -- with what you have?

2 HENRY WOLTAG: We pretty much adopted what  
3 was proposed as Project Alternative 2, the increased  
4 setbacks, as part of our refined project. And, you  
5 know, to clarify, you know, we looked at some of the  
6 distances, you know, after the questions that were  
7 received at the beginning. The closest turbine to a  
8 Moose Camp residence is over a mile. It's around  
9 6,000 feet. I believe the Lammers' property is  
10 about 4,500 feet. And the closest turbine to an  
11 actual nonparticipating property line is over  
12 2,000 feet. Not just a structure within the  
13 property.

14 SUPERVISOR MOTY: You mentioned the  
15 Lammers' property and stuff. And is that one of the  
16 areas where the turbines were changed, moved to  
17 reduce that site line?

18 HENRY WOLTAG: Correct. The Lammers'  
19 property is just south of Moose Camp. It's an  
20 inholding property, so the five turbines that were  
21 just immediately west of Lammers and Moose Camp were  
22 removed, and all the turbines to the north -- on the  
23 north side of Highway 299, they were removed.

24 SUPERVISOR MOTY: I don't think you were  
25 able to see because he had just had his handout, but

1 he on -- when he showed his property, particularly  
2 the ranch property, he talked about five turbines  
3 that were pretty close to the, looks like maybe the  
4 southwest of the property or that -- is that the  
5 five you're talking about or is -- are there five  
6 turbines still there?

7 HENRY WOLTAG: Having not seen the images,  
8 I'm not terribly certain. I know that the project  
9 still exists on the south and east side of the  
10 project, so...

11 SUPERVISOR MOTY: I'm going to bring this  
12 to you.

13 THE CLERK: I have a copy.

14 SUPERVISOR MOTY: Do you?

15 THE CLERK: What page?

16 SUPERVISOR MOTY: (inaudible).

17 HENRY WOLTAG: Okay.

18 SUPERVISOR MOTY: He indicated his to be  
19 pieces of property basically in the rectangles and  
20 then it shows a lot of little blue dots. I don't  
21 know if those -- if those are the remains of --

22 HENRY WOLTAG: Yeah, I believe that's the  
23 E string, E1 through E5.

24 SUPERVISOR MOTY: There are five of them  
25 there?

1           HENRY WOLTAG: To the south of the  
2 property.

3           SUPERVISOR MOTY: So were those moved,  
4 changed, lowered, over the hillside, anything?  
5 Based -- compared to what -- because his concern is  
6 what it shows is just right there on the ridge top,  
7 or appears to be the ridge top.

8           HENRY WOLTAG: Yeah, those would be part  
9 of the entire project, which was reduced in overall  
10 height, but those were not removed as part of the  
11 project refinements.

12           SUPERVISOR MOTY: Okay. Just lower as far  
13 as the overall size?

14           HENRY WOLTAG: That's correct.

15           SUPERVISOR MOTY: Is there any flexibility  
16 with those.

17           HENRY WOLTAG: You know, I would like to  
18 say we took a very hard look at the entire project  
19 turbine by turbine. You know, and we made pretty  
20 substantial reduction to the project. And, you  
21 know, without having the benefit of some of that  
22 additional analysis, you know, I could say that, you  
23 know, maybe there would be the opportunity and  
24 flexibility for a few of those, but I don't -- I  
25 can't speak to all of them.

1 SUPERVISOR MOTY: Okay. Thank you.

2 Chair Chimenti, I do have some other  
3 things, but I think there are -- they're more  
4 statements and stuff, so I think I would let the  
5 others speak.

6 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Okay.

7 PAUL HELLMAN: So I do have an answer to  
8 the question about the electrical system. So with  
9 the modified project with the 40 miles of electrical  
10 collection, collector system, 35 miles would be  
11 underground and 5 miles would be overhead.

12 SUPERVISOR MOTY: Okay. Thank you very  
13 much. Let me just ask one -- Mr. Hellman, one of  
14 the issues that's been discussed several times here  
15 today by a number of speakers, the cultural and/or  
16 tribal concerns about the area, and I'm sure that  
17 was handled through the EIR and stuff.

18 Where did -- did we identify certain areas  
19 or a whole bunch of areas or, I mean, how did we  
20 address the concerns there?

21 PAUL HELLMAN: I'm going to refer to Janna  
22 on that.

23 JANNA SCOTT: I can give you a general  
24 answer and we also have our cultural resources lead  
25 for this project available by phone if you have more

1 specific questions or want more details.

2 With respect to potential impacts on  
3 tribal cultural resources we listened to the tribe.  
4 They are the experts regarding the things that are  
5 of cultural value to them. We are not in a position  
6 as drafters of the EIR to tell them what's important  
7 to them.

8 We accepted what they told us. We  
9 respected that across the project site and concluded  
10 that the project impacts would be significant and  
11 unavoidable. Consistent with CEQA, we looked at  
12 potential mitigation measures to see whether the  
13 impacts could be reduced below a level of  
14 significance. We identified five, and concluded  
15 ultimately that there isn't a way to further reduce  
16 impacts to tribal cultural resources, which is why  
17 those impacts remain significant and unavoidable.

18 SUPERVISOR MOTY: So does that mean that  
19 the actual construction of this project is where  
20 those sites are? Is that what you're talking about  
21 or is it just in areas nearby or?

22 JANNA SCOTT: The project avoided known  
23 resources. There are unknown resources, potentially  
24 subsurface. So anytime you do soil disturbance,  
25 there's a risk. And there are protocols in place

1 should you find a resource. But if finding the  
2 resource is what causes the impact, you can't rule  
3 areas out. There isn't a basis to rule areas out  
4 within the project site.

5 SUPERVISOR MOTY: But you mentioned there  
6 was five -- I think you mentioned --

7 JANNA SCOTT: Five mitigation measures.

8 SUPERVISOR MOTY: Oh, measures.

9 JANNA SCOTT: Right.

10 SUPERVISOR MOTY: Not five sites.

11 JANNA SCOTT: Right.

12 SUPERVISOR MOTY: Okay. So you haven't  
13 specifically identified sites, but just indicating  
14 if during this process they come across them, then  
15 you have the five measures, but it's not -- you  
16 think you're not going to be able to do enough to  
17 avoid substantial impact on them?

18 JANNA SCOTT: The known resources were  
19 avoided.

20 SUPERVISOR MOTY: Okay.

21 JANNA SCOTT: So the measures are to avoid  
22 impacts associated with the discovery of impacts  
23 that we don't know are there.

24 SUPERVISOR MOTY: Okay.

25 JANNA SCOTT: And, again, we do have our

1 cultural resources lead available by phone if you  
2 have more detailed questions.

3 SUPERVISOR MOTY: I think you kind of  
4 covered generally what I was asking. Thank you.

5 JANNA SCOTT: Sure.

6 SUPERVISOR MOTY: Thank you, Chair.

7 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Supervisor Baugh?

8 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Thank you, Chairman.  
9 And I'll get you back up there because you've led  
10 nicely into my first question, as well, Supervisor,  
11 I appreciate. By the way, great questions,  
12 well-thought-out.

13 I just want to make sure I'm hearing  
14 correctly. The answer that you gave to Supervisor  
15 Moty was that cultural impacts are significant and  
16 unavoidable.

17 JANNA SCOTT: Tribal cultural impacts of  
18 the project are significant and unavoidable. That's  
19 correct.

20 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: I just want to make  
21 sure I was hearing correctly, because whatever  
22 mitigations are slightly possible, the end result is  
23 it's not possible to mitigate.

24 JANNA SCOTT: Even with the implementation  
25 of all five mitigation measures, the resulting

1 impact would remain significant.

2 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Okay. Thank you.

3 JANNA SCOTT: Sure.

4 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: That helps a lot.

5 Donn, I'm going to borrow from your  
6 comments earlier. I felt like you were reading my  
7 mind. I went into the Planning Commission meeting  
8 and I, by the way, just for those of you who aren't  
9 aware of it, I believe all of us were there. I was  
10 there early and I stayed until the very last speaker  
11 was finished.

12 The most significant part of that was to  
13 be able to hear personally from those who are  
14 proponents and those who are in opposition and I  
15 felt it was the most valuable time. I went into  
16 that meeting with eyes wide open, actually, as a  
17 businessman and a supporter of building projects  
18 throughout Shasta County. My entire public service  
19 with the hope that it would be a project that could  
20 be approved, and I had every intention of finding  
21 all the positives from it. I left with more  
22 questions than there were answers.

23 Chief, I want to just say to you -- and  
24 you don't need to get up there, there's no question  
25 for you -- just my compliment on one thing. You



1 answered the question based upon your entire life as  
2 a professional firefighter. And you didn't allow  
3 anybody else's comments in the room to change your  
4 response, and I really appreciate that, because you  
5 helped to clear up the answers, and the answers were  
6 that there's some positive and there's some  
7 negative. So thank you for standing your ground and  
8 not being swayed by anyone in the room, including  
9 us. So I appreciate that very much.

10 The thing that has the biggest potential  
11 impact for me, my white elephant, although, I think  
12 the firefighting is necessary. But I -- I think CAL  
13 FIRE puts out fires wherever they can. That's their  
14 whole mission, and they're going to do the very best  
15 they can with this difficult project, just as they  
16 do with other difficult challenges and topography,  
17 and with the challenges for flying. So that I just  
18 assume that that doesn't change.

19 The white elephant in the room for me is,  
20 frankly, the size of these darn things. And I'm  
21 setting here looking at the courthouse that's being  
22 constructed across the street and almost finished,  
23 and I'm just thinking that's about a hundred feet  
24 tall. So add another 500 feet to the darn thing.  
25 Is there any place -- is there any place in the city

1 of Redding or actually in the basin, unless you're  
2 hiding behind a house that's bigger than you, or a  
3 mountain, that you're not going to see the darn  
4 thing? And the answer is no.

5           It's impossible to mitigate 600 feet of  
6 tower. I just don't see the possibility. I've seen  
7 all of this. And, significantly, I did go to those  
8 last ten pages -- I think there's actually eight,  
9 but who's counting. Not a single one of them  
10 actually illustrates. It has all aerial views. It  
11 doesn't give me a -- on any of these maps, unless  
12 I'm just missing one from my packet, it doesn't give  
13 me anything that shows line of sight.

14           So the only -- the only perspective that I  
15 have to go by on this -- which I also found this to  
16 be lacking in the original presentation in front of  
17 the Planning Commission -- is the Lammers did a  
18 pretty good job of trying to -- trying to site them  
19 and view them. And I don't know whether or not they  
20 fairly have represented -- I'll just show you guys  
21 what I'm talking about, what 600 feet looks like  
22 from their property.

23           But even if -- even if this is a little  
24 overstated, how is this not visible from everywhere?  
25 You've got basically 500 feet above the tree line,

1 actually more, but I don't understand how it isn't  
2 visible. So the most significant thing in your  
3 presentation tonight, Mr. Woltag, is that I gave you  
4 an opportunity to answer that question right up  
5 front and you avoided it a hundred percent. You  
6 told me that you have an answer in your packet, I'm  
7 not seeing it. So I would like to see that.

8 HENRY WOLTAG: Yeah.

9 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: But I don't know how  
10 you mitigate, frankly -- I mean, look across the  
11 street. You can see the same building I'm talking  
12 about. How do you add 500 feet to that thing and  
13 say it's possible to mitigate it at all? I don't  
14 think you could move them 5 miles away, it wouldn't  
15 make a bit of difference unless it's behind a  
16 mountain range.

17 So I just -- I don't know how to state it  
18 any other way than I found your presentation  
19 insufficient.

20 HENRY WOLTAG: Okay. Well, just to  
21 clarify briefly that the visual simulations are the  
22 last ten pages of section 5.

23 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Of section 5? Okay.

24 HENRY WOLTAG: Yes.

25 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: So not at the end of

1 the binder?

2 HENRY WOLTAG: No. The end of the binder  
3 those are maps.

4 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Okay. Thank you.

5 HENRY WOLTAG: That's correct.

6 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: So I misunderstood. So  
7 to confirm, it basically looks like Mr. Lammers'  
8 simulation, which confirms what I just said. How do  
9 you -- how do you hide another 500 feet? So what's  
10 the possible mitigation?

11 HENRY WOLTAG: The short answer is you  
12 can't hide a turbine.

13 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Yeah.

14 HENRY WOLTAG: So these visual simulations  
15 that walk through, you start with a view from Round  
16 Mountain looking over the -- I'm sorry, Montgomery  
17 Creek, looking over the elementary school.

18 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Okay.

19 HENRY WOLTAG: Then you go to the next  
20 KOP, which is looking over the Round Mountain  
21 substation. And then -- so the upper right-hand  
22 corner was before the project refinements, the  
23 bottom right-hand corner is after the project  
24 refinements. I should have clarified, I apologize,  
25 and the upper left is the existing view.

1 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Okay. Well, that is  
2 helpful. Unfortunately for you, it actually  
3 confirms my original thought process, so I do  
4 appreciate that.

5 One more question for you, Mr. Woltag.  
6 You mentioned the connection in Cottonwood.

7 HENRY WOLTAG: Uh-huh.

8 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: I have participated in  
9 some of the thought process that that connection as  
10 well as the lines for Cottonwood. Apparently there  
11 has been some discussion about parallel lines  
12 needing to be installed or an upgrade to the  
13 connection there.

14 Has your company participated in any of  
15 those or do you see that that happens to the power  
16 grid? Have you taken an advanced look at to what  
17 would be necessary in terms of the community of  
18 Cottonwood to be able to get the power to SMUD or  
19 whoever wanted to take advantage of the power?

20 HENRY WOLTAG: So the project was  
21 extensively studied over a four-year interconnection  
22 process that's managed by the CPUC overseen by the  
23 California ISO. And PG&E does look at the forward  
24 projections, so that's taken into account. When  
25 they analyzed the project and determined that we can

1 sufficiently interconnect, you know, our  
2 216 megawatts of electricity to the grid.

3 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: So am I correct in  
4 saying that their forward look does include  
5 significant needs to upgrading the system through  
6 Cottonwood?

7 HENRY WOLTAG: No, it includes the  
8 existing system and planned upgrades. So the  
9 existing system and what has already been announced  
10 is what's included in the study. That doesn't  
11 analyze, you know, future transmission plans. We're  
12 not involved in that.

13 We analyze the existing grid. And the  
14 project can safely and efficiently flow onto the  
15 grid to Cottonwood, and from there it goes to the  
16 closest point where it's needed the most.

17 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: So you've obviously  
18 done your research and you realize I was involved in  
19 the opposition to the SMUD project. It was called  
20 Stop TANC, and that was the Transmission Authority  
21 of Northern California, and that project called for  
22 significant upgrades to the Cottonwood line. It  
23 would require additional either towers or hanging on  
24 the existing towers that go across Parkville, one of  
25 the most pristine areas in Shasta County, gorgeous

1 area. I'm led to understand that that still is  
2 under consideration, but you're not aware of that?

3 HENRY WOLTAG: I'm not aware of that.

4 This project does not require --

5 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Not in your house --

6 HENRY WOLTAG: -- any new high voltage  
7 transmission, period, for it to interconnect.

8 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Okay. Thank you.

9 Thank you. That's it for right now.

10 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Supervisor Jones.

11 SUPERVISOR JONES: Thank you, Chair.

12 So I've tried to keep an open mind to  
13 this, and it's been obviously ongoing for quite some  
14 time. I've only been on the job for ten months, but  
15 I did get to go to the Planning Commission meeting,  
16 and have talked to people on both sides in many  
17 meetings.

18 Henry, I appreciate taking me to the site  
19 and showing me the topography and the lay of the  
20 land. I hadn't been in that country for quite some  
21 time. And, obviously, when we're talking about  
22 power generation and Shasta County, and jobs, you've  
23 certainly gotten my attention. This is a big  
24 project, \$350 million and short-term and long-term  
25 job opportunities. And just at the face, that

1 intrigues me, and is important here in Shasta  
2 County.

3 I'm not opposed to people coming in from  
4 out of state or out of country with money and doing  
5 a project here in Shasta County. Not opposed to  
6 that. In fact, I think new influx of money into our  
7 area is very good, and very helpful to a small,  
8 relatively poor county.

9 The real question of this comes down to is  
10 this project the right fit for that location?  
11 That's really what it comes down to. The job  
12 opportunities is undeniable. They're there. And I  
13 would say that if this project goes forward, more  
14 will come.

15 I've hunted for 20 years in Wyoming on a  
16 very big ranch close to Medicine Bow, in a place  
17 called Simpson Ridge, an area of high wind. It's a  
18 200,000-acre ranch. The son owns one side and the  
19 father owns a 200,000-acre ranch on the other side  
20 of the Lincoln Highway. Father and son been there a  
21 long time. Property's been in their family over a  
22 hundred years. They were some of the first settlers  
23 in this area of Medicine Bow noted by the Virginian  
24 Hotel nearby.

25 On one side of the highway the father,



1 it's lined with large GE wind turbines for as far as  
2 the eye could see. The father's now a millionaire;  
3 he drives a new truck, got a nice house.

4 The son on the other side absolutely  
5 refuses to have one single turbine on his property.  
6 He doesn't want to look at them. And they're big  
7 like this. They're monsters. He lives in a average  
8 house and drives an older truck. But they've been  
9 on this property for a long time.

10 And here, you know, a thousand miles away  
11 you have a father and a son that have different  
12 views on something and on these wind turbines. And  
13 I wouldn't say it split the family apart, but it's  
14 just two people with the same blood with different  
15 ideas of what should be allowed on some land that's  
16 very important to them. And you see that playing  
17 out all over Wyoming. And it can be very lucrative.

18 And, again, the job opportunities in  
19 Wyoming are immense. Because when I first started  
20 hunting there, there wasn't much gas, oil or wind  
21 power generation. Now, it is -- it has littered the  
22 landscape. And everywhere you see, you see these  
23 turbines. So I have to ask myself, what would I do?  
24 Would I be the father or would I be the son? And I  
25 think I would be the son.

1 I don't think I would want to look at  
2 these every day and that's the -- that's the  
3 question here. That's what people in the Round  
4 Mountain, Montgomery area are saying -- the  
5 Montgomery Creek area. That these are unavoidable.  
6 There is no mitigation for it. You're just simply  
7 going to have to look at these for the rest of your  
8 life. You'll have to be okay with that.

9 I, too, am concerned with the fire, aerial  
10 firefighting is important. We see that all the  
11 time. Mark Baird spoke here today. You're not  
12 going to find a better pilot than Mark. He's been  
13 around a long time, and his words are very powerful  
14 to me. When I was evacuated from the Fawn Fire very  
15 close to where Commissioner Walgamath lives. As I'm  
16 leaving, Mark Baird is over my head dropping, and  
17 our house was saved.

18 So the final thing for me is who do we  
19 listen to? We had a Planning Commission that voted  
20 5-0. Henry, you said that there was some inaccurate  
21 understanding of the project's risk by our Planning  
22 Commission. And I think I would just disagree with  
23 that. I think they understand the risks. I think  
24 they understand the environment here better than  
25 anybody. And so I put a lot of value on what the

1 Planning Commission did. They didn't take that  
2 lightly, just as I wouldn't take it lightly.

3 I didn't talk to my planning commissioner  
4 appointment, which was only ten months earlier. I  
5 knew he was capable of making whatever decision he  
6 felt best, which I think all of us are going to do  
7 the same thing. And so, with that, I guess I'll get  
8 the ball started tonight. By resolution, I'll make  
9 a motion --

10 SUPERVISOR MOTY: Chair, are you going  
11 to --

12 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Yeah, I --

13 SUPERVISOR MOTY: I think I let all the  
14 supervisors speak first.

15 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: But you can go if you  
16 want, but I'm still going to -- I'm still going to  
17 put my 2 cents in.

18 SUPERVISOR JONES: I appreciate not being  
19 interrupted. Thank you.

20 By resolution --

21 (Talking over one another)

22 SUPERVISOR JONES: I am speaking. So, by  
23 resolution, I am going to make a motion that we deny  
24 the Use Permit 16-007 for the Fountain Wind Project.

25 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: I'll second that.

1           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: So we've got a motion  
2 and a second. So I am capable of being brief.

3           When I look at this project from a macro  
4 perspective. I certainly believe in green energy.  
5 I do believe in global warming. The planet's been  
6 around for four-and-a-half billion years, it's going  
7 to change. It's going to continue to change. I  
8 think we have to be responsible, more responsible  
9 stewards of our -- of our world. I think we need to  
10 reduce our carbon footprint. I agree with all of  
11 that.

12           But when I bring it back to the -- to the  
13 micro to Shasta County. First of all, I love the  
14 idea of the jobs. I love the idea of the economic  
15 development. I am a big supporter of trade  
16 training. I believe those things are very important  
17 to our community. But when I look at it from a  
18 micro perspective, what is the greatest -- since  
19 this is environmentally geared, what is the greatest  
20 environmental danger to our community right now?  
21 It's wildfire.

22           When you look at the environmental, the  
23 economic, the physical, the emotional impact. Last  
24 year, over 4 million acres, Chief, was it  
25 4 million acres that burned? How many homes were

1 lost? How many lives were lost? How many people's  
2 lives were changed? How many cars, boats,  
3 refrigerators, computers, where did all that go? I  
4 mean, it went into the air, went into the ground,  
5 went into the water.

6 So I appreciate us looking from a macro  
7 perspective, but we really have to look from a micro  
8 perspective. And that is what -- what are these  
9 wildfires doing? Now, I have a tremendous amount of  
10 respect for the firefighters and certainly for our  
11 chief. And about a year ago he and I talked about  
12 this, because one of the first things I looked at  
13 when I took office. And I asked him what he thought  
14 about this project and he answered it the way I  
15 would expect a professional firefighter to answer  
16 it. And I'm paraphrasing you, Chief.

17 But he said, If there's a fire, we're  
18 going to figure out how to fight it. And I have no  
19 doubt that is what they will always do. The  
20 question I have to ask myself, which is as  
21 fundamental as they come, is this is a -- this is a  
22 high to severe fire danger area. Would it be easier  
23 to fight a fire, which is inevitable, if these -- if  
24 these turbines are not there? And the answer is  
25 resoundingly, yes.

1           And the chief in his own admission said --  
2   and this isn't in any way a slight. It's an  
3   acknowledgment that there isn't a lot of experience  
4   in fighting fires with wind farms in this type of  
5   terrain. And, although, I really like us to be  
6   innovative and leading edge, this is not an area  
7   where I would like to have that happen.

8           I don't want us to be fighting fires in an  
9   area where we don't have the experience, and let it  
10   be the value to someone else to learn how to do  
11   this. So that to me compounded on basically what  
12   the Planning Commission said was how does this  
13   improve the quality of life? Because that's our  
14   responsibility. Responsibility is to make sure that  
15   anything we do not only does no harm, but improves  
16   the quality of life.

17           And when you look at the quality of life  
18   and compatibility of life here in this region,  
19   certainly the impact it has on tribal lands and  
20   tribal culture, which has been decimated for  
21   centuries now, that is not appropriate to me. That  
22   we really have to be sensitive to those needs, and  
23   to how it fits into our community. And what we want  
24   our community to be known for.

25           So, to me, those are the issues that are

1 most pressing. So, with that, if there's no further  
2 discussion -- and Supervisor Moty something you want  
3 to say?

4 SUPERVISOR MOTY: I do.

5 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: And, I'm sorry, we  
6 have two of them.

7 SUPERVISOR MOTY: And if Supervisor Baugh  
8 wants to go first.

9 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: No, go ahead. Please,  
10 that's fine.

11 SUPERVISOR MOTY: So I have a couple of  
12 concerns.

13 One. Private property rights and for the  
14 property owner to try to do what he wants to. I'm  
15 concerned, as was mentioned, that if he's not able  
16 to successfully profit off his land that he may turn  
17 around and sell it, and do other things with it,  
18 which may dramatically change the area out there.  
19 Also, there's been a lot of talk about the money  
20 that would go to the county as far as the 2 million,  
21 the 1 million, that kind of stuff and whether or not  
22 that's just a bribe.

23 I take that -- I take great offense to  
24 that. In fact, to me, it's not even about the money  
25 that goes to the County. It's about the jobs for

1 our community. It's about people who are looking  
2 for good paying jobs, who want to live -- who want  
3 to live and stay in our community, support their  
4 families, and be good, you know, good stewards of  
5 the area that they live in, and be part of our  
6 community. And I think that this is a real travesty  
7 that we're going to turn those jobs away.

8           Also, there's been a lot of talk about the  
9 clean energy and whether or not, you know, the  
10 turbine blades may be, you know, have to be buried  
11 and different things like that. But the use --  
12 continued use of fossil fuel is going to be far more  
13 detrimental to our climate and our lifestyle and our  
14 country far more than burying some blades.

15           I will say that we should be mindful that  
16 our hydropower, which is great to have and very  
17 clean, is not going to be as reliable as it used to  
18 be as we just saw here recently. Oroville Lake was  
19 no longer able to produce power through their system  
20 because the lake was too low. And certainly our  
21 Shasta Lake is not as high as we would like it to be  
22 and that reduces the amount of power that they can  
23 generate.

24           Climate change is real. Whether or not  
25 you want to decide whose fault it is, I will tell



1 you someone who has lived here all my life, the  
2 climate in this community is not even close to what  
3 it was when I was a kid growing up here. It has  
4 drastically changed. Drastically. And it's  
5 continued that way.

6 And are we going to solve that problem in  
7 Shasta County? No. By ourselves? No. But we  
8 better step up and start realizing that we have to  
9 be part of the overall solution as a country. And,  
10 eventually, as someone mentioned, as part of the  
11 world because it is changing and it is changing  
12 fast. And the fact that we're losing an opportunity  
13 to be part of that solution, I worry that it will  
14 have impact on my kids and maybe my grandkids.

15 So I -- I see where we're going with this  
16 thing, but I am disappointed that I think we're  
17 missing a great opportunity to do a good thing for  
18 our community and even a better thing for our  
19 climate. Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Do we have any other  
21 comments? Supervisor Baugh and then County Counsel.

22 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: So just to clarify, the  
23 reason for my opposition -- and I am going to vote  
24 in opposition for the motion, but which is in  
25 opposition to building the project -- is there's a

1 huge perceived value here, and the finances I do  
2 think deserve respect as do the jobs. I think we  
3 all recognize that Shasta County is -- is a poor  
4 community and the jobs are important.

5 But the perceived value versus the  
6 potential for ongoing adverse generational impact I  
7 think is far more. I think that if it's approved,  
8 which I don't see it being approved, obviously, by  
9 the folks who have already spoken tonight up here,  
10 and we are the decision makers for the County, I  
11 don't think you can unwind it once it's out of the  
12 box. I don't think you can put it back.

13 I am greatly concerned, and I did not  
14 consider this when we voted to approve Hatchet  
15 Ridge, and the record will show I voted to approve  
16 Hatchet Ridge. In fact, I thought it was the best  
17 thing since sliced white bread, but when I look it  
18 down the road, would this continue? I think the  
19 answer's yes.

20 And so to the very personal question is  
21 would I approve it if it were in my neighborhood? I  
22 live on the windiest hill in Anderson, California.  
23 The wind blows all the time. It would make a great  
24 location for 600 foot towers. Would I fight it  
25 tooth and nail? I would be sitting right over

1 there. There's no way with my heart that I can  
2 introduce and approve this for Shasta County. I  
3 think it's a mistake, so...

4 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you.

5 Mr. Cruse?

6 MR. CRUSE: Thank you, Chair Chimenti. I  
7 just have a point of clarification for the maker of  
8 the motion and the second.

9 Staff has not presented any resolutions  
10 today for the Board in connection with this matter,  
11 and so what we would be proposing is if the maker  
12 and the second agree, that it would be a motion of  
13 intent to adopt a resolution affirming the Planning  
14 Commission's decision, and denying the Use Permit.  
15 If that motion should pass, we would then take a  
16 brief recess of about five to ten minutes, bring  
17 back a resolution which memorializes that intent,  
18 and then that would then be adopted by the Board as  
19 the final action this evening.

20 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Amend my motion for  
21 that.

22 MR. CRUSE: And is that acceptable to  
23 the --

24 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Mary was the maker of  
25 the second.

1 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: Yeah, I was second.

2 I will second the motion.

3 MR. CRUSE: Thank you very much for the  
4 clarification.

5 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: It's getting late.

6 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: And Supervisor  
7 Rickert?

8 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: I just wanted to make  
9 a couple other -- I'm a strong proponent of all  
10 kinds of, you know, renewable energy. We're in the  
11 process of putting in 20 acres -- another solar  
12 array in Siskiyou County. A lot of our water  
13 troughs are all solar powered. I'm a great believer  
14 in preserving the environment. I'm a strong  
15 believer in promoting biomass facilities. To me  
16 that makes a lot of sense for Shasta County. We  
17 have a lot of material where we could use biomass  
18 facilities. So, it's not that I'm against that, I  
19 think people said it over and over and over again  
20 tonight, I think it's the wrong location for this  
21 project. And it really confirmed when I talked to  
22 these professionals that I've known for years  
23 outside the area just saying that it -- a forested  
24 area is just not a good idea. And that really,  
25 really reinforced it to me.

1           And then the one last thing, I just want  
2 to say personally is if there was a -- if there  
3 had -- they -- say they built out the project and  
4 there was a fire, I could never live with myself if  
5 there was loss of life. And that's something that I  
6 think is really important that we need to bring up  
7 in the comments is that we're here to protect the  
8 people of Shasta County and that's where I'm coming  
9 from. So thank you.

10           SUPERVISOR BAUGH: And I'm going to add  
11 one thought to what you said just to confirm the  
12 biomass and the cogeneration efforts. We do look at  
13 this as a one-time opportunity, but paralleling this  
14 project as a project that I've been working on in  
15 the County portion of Anderson, that is a \$300- to  
16 \$400 million project, which uses the forest slash,  
17 the biomass, and those things that we have abundance  
18 of.

19           Now, as you're aware, because I've shared  
20 this at prior meetings, we came in third, but that  
21 doesn't mean that we're not continuing it because  
22 the business opportunity intends to build a minimum  
23 of two plants, if not a third plant. And who knows,  
24 as things change and there are more forests in our  
25 area that need to be taken apart, we may move up the

1 ladder. And that project itself on its surface  
2 would exceed this project without any towers.

3 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: And I've been sending  
4 out letters of support for -- there's three  
5 different projects in the intermountain mountain  
6 area for biomass, small biomass. So it's still on  
7 our radar to promote those kinds of projects.

8 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Thank you. All right.  
9 So if there's no further discussion, we have a  
10 motion and a second. So I will ask Stefany to do a  
11 role call vote, please.

12 THE CLERK: Absolutely. Supervisor  
13 Chimenti?

14 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Yes.

15 THE CLERK: Supervisor Moty?

16 SUPERVISOR MOTY: No.

17 THE CLERK: Supervisor Rickert?

18 SUPERVISOR RICKERT: Yes.

19 THE CLERK: Supervisor Jones?

20 SUPERVISOR JONES: Yes.

21 THE CLERK: And Supervisor Baugh?

22 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: So the motion passes 4  
24 to 1, and we will now take a recess while we,  
25 meaning County Counsel, drafts a resolution.

1 MR. CRUSE: Yes. And I would say ten  
2 minutes.

3 (Recess taken.)

4 CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Okay. Ladies and  
5 Gentlemen, I think we're prepared to make it formal.  
6 And I'm going to ask, actually, County Counsel, if  
7 you'll be so kind as to read the resolution.

8 MR. CRUSE: Thank you, Chair Chimenti.

9 In the interest of time and the lateness  
10 of the hour, I'll skip the various "whereas"  
11 sections and get right to the meat of the matter.

12 SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Bless you.

13 MR. CRUSE: Which is, Now, therefore, be  
14 it resolved, that the Board of Supervisors of the  
15 County of Shasta, one, makes the following Use  
16 Permit finding:

17 The establishment, operation and  
18 maintenance of the subject use under the  
19 circumstances of the particular case will be  
20 detrimental to the health, safety, peace, morals,  
21 comfort and general welfare of persons residing or  
22 working in the neighborhood, or would be detrimental  
23 or injurious to property or improvements in the  
24 neighborhood or to the general welfare of the  
25 county. Testimony was received regarding potential

1 increased fire danger, and impaired emergency  
2 evacuation and/or hindrance of firefighting efforts.

3 Testimony was received from residents in  
4 the area regarding impaired aesthetics of the region  
5 by creating visual blight.

6 Testimony was received by residents and  
7 tribal members regarding encroachment on and impact  
8 to historical, cultural and tribal resources  
9 considered to be spiritually and culturally  
10 important to local tribes.

11 Testimony was also received that the  
12 detriment to the health, safety, peace, morals,  
13 comfort, and general welfare of persons residing or  
14 working in the area of the project, and the county,  
15 in general, outweighed the proposed benefits to the  
16 County.

17 In addition to the testimony received,  
18 documents were presented to the Board and made a  
19 part of the record that supported the testimony  
20 received in the findings made here in.

21 In No. 2. The Board of Supervisors  
22 affirms the decision of the Planning Commissions  
23 denial of Use Permit 16-007, and denies Use Permit  
24 16-007 as originally proposed and as modified by the  
25 Applicant.



1           That is the resolution for the Board's  
2 final consideration.

3           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: So then we vote on it?

4           MR. CRUSE: A motion and a second, please.

5           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: So I'm looking for --

6           SUPERVISOR RICKERT: I'll make the motion.

7           CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: We have a motion to  
8 approve by Supervisor Rickert.

9           SUPERVISOR JONES: Second.

10          CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Second from Supervisor  
11 Jones.

12          Is there are any further discussion? Then  
13 all in favor say, "Aye."

14          Aye.

15          SUPERVISOR JONES: Aye.

16          SUPERVISOR BAUGH: Aye.

17          SUPERVISOR RICKERT: Aye.

18          CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: Any opposed?

19          SUPERVISOR MOTY: No.

20          CHAIRMAN CHIMENTI: So it passes 4 to 1.

21 And, with that, I think we are adjourned. Thank you  
22 everyone.

23          (End of audio file.)

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

STENOGRAPHIC REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Valerie Nunemacher, a duly certified shorthand reporter, DO HEREBY CERTIFY:

That I transcribed the foregoing proceedings from an electronic recording of said proceeding and that the above and foregoing transcript is a full, true and correct record of said proceedings to the best of my ability, except where noted "unintelligible" or "inaudible."

Dated this 16th day of November, 2023.



VALERIE NUNEMACHER, CSR, RPR