

DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	23-OPT-01
Project Title:	Fountain Wind Project
TN #:	263189
Document Title:	Joseph Osa Comments - Comments Regarding CEC Staff Assessment of The Fountain Wind Project
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Joseph Osa
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	5/17/2025 7:11:21 PM
Docketed Date:	5/19/2025

*Comment Received From: Joseph Osa
Submitted On: 5/17/2025
Docket Number: 23-OPT-01*

Comments Regarding CEC Staff Assessment of The Fountain Wind Project

Additional submitted attachment is included below.

May 17, 2025

To: California Energy Commission (CEC), Docket Number 23-Opt-01

From: Joseph Osa, Montgomery Creek Resident

Subj: **Comments Regarding CEC Staff Assessment of The Fountain Wind Project**

Dear CEC Commissioners,

Although I do not agree with all the environmental impacts assessments, I do wholeheartedly agree with the staff's recommendation to deny this project. I commend the CEC staff on their excellent assessment of the viability and environmental impacts of the proposed Fountain Wind Project. The CEC Staff have objectively come to many of the same conclusions as the Shasta County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors, who denied the project twice before, and henceforth implemented a County-wide ban on industrial wind developments because of the highly probability of harm to public safety and the general welfare of its residents, the environment, and the net negative benefits to the State and County.

I further support the full reimbursement of County and Tribal expenses incurred during this third attempt by Fountain Wind to get their project approved. I formally object to the CEC allowing the applicant to proceed with this Opt-In application process under AB205 knowing that Shasta County had already denied the project twice through a legitimate CEQA process. The expediated process outlined in AB205 should apply to new applicants only, who would have the option of going through the local authorities or Opting-In to the CEC's expedited process. This third attempt by Fountain Wind has placed considerable strain on County and Tribal resources and caused substantial stress for County residents, especially those living near the project site.

I also believe that each of the various topic areas, where applicable, should have considered the probable impact of an out-of-control wildfire, driven by intense winds, and minimally hampered by impeded aerial firefighting support. For example, within the Executive Summary, the **Biological Resources** topic area included the following statement: *"In addition, because the project would impair aerial firefighting, should a fire start on or near the project site it has the potential to result in substantial impacts to biological and aquatic resources on the project site and surrounding region including the adjacent National Forest Lands."* This statement accurately acknowledges the probable

impact of wildfires and **impaired aerial firefighting** support on Biological Resources. A comparable statement applies to the following areas: **Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources, Forestry Resources, Public Health, Socioeconomics, Transmission Line Safety and Nuisance, Visual Resources, Water Resources, Environmental Justice, and Net Economic Benefits**. Many conclusions of *“Less Than Significant but Avoidable Impacts With/Without Mitigation”* would be *“Significant and Unavoidable Impacts,”* if uncontrolled wildfires were considered in each topic area as they were in the Biological Resource topic; there would be **no net** Green House Gas Emissions benefit, nor would there be any net economic benefit, and Visual impacts would be much more significant, etc. As the Staff Assessment correctly acknowledges, and actual experience has shown numerous times, wildfires will occur in the project and surrounding areas, and without the critically required aerial firefighting support, any fire in or moving through the project area will quite probably become an out-of-control wildfire with devastating environmental and even life-threatening consequences.

Welcomed energy projects compatible with Shasta County land use could and do include hydro, biomass, solar and battery storage but not industrial wind. The CEC staff correctly determined that this project does not align with the characteristics of this area of the State and that the Commissioners should not approve the application.

Please deny the Fountain Wind Project for a third and final time as recommended by your expert staff and outlined commendably in the project assessment report.

Sincerely,

Joseph Osa