

<b>DOCKETED</b>	
<b>Docket Number:</b>	23-OPT-01
<b>Project Title:</b>	Fountain Wind Project
<b>TN #:</b>	263277
<b>Document Title:</b>	John Gable Comments - Voters Guide for California Energy Commissioners
<b>Description:</b>	N/A
<b>Filer:</b>	System
<b>Organization:</b>	John Gable
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Public
<b>Submission Date:</b>	5/23/2025 11:36:49 AM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	5/23/2025

*Comment Received From: John Gable  
Submitted On: 5/23/2025  
Docket Number: 23-OPT-01*

## **Voters Guide for California Energy Commissioners**

*Additional submitted attachment is included below.*

# Voters Guide for California Energy Commissioners

## Direct quotes from your CEC Staff Assessment Report

**Page 1-1** - “staff recommends the CEC deny the project application”

**Page 1-4** - “Staff acknowledges the key role wind generation plays in SB 100 goals, but concludes the evidence is clear that this location is not compatible with this proposed facility.”

**Page 1-4** - “the project conflicts with three local laws or ordinances regarding the allowable uses of the proposed project site.”

**Page 1-4** - “the project is not necessary for public convenience and necessity and that a battery energy storage system would be a more prudent and feasible alternative and the project benefits do not outweigh its unavoidable environmental impacts.”

**Page 5.2-139** - “Staff considers it likely that a wildfire will occur in the region based on the existing fire history”

**Page 5.2-149** - “The key concern for staff is how the location and design of the project hinders aerial firefighting in the project site and in the surrounding area.”

**Page 5.7-4** - “There are no specifically designated evacuation routes described in the Emergency Operation Plan, Community Wildfire Protection Plan, or the Shasta County General Plan. The area surrounding the project is a rural area with limited local access roads and with the main access road and potential evacuation route being SR 299, on the north edge of the project.”

**Page 11-9** - “The proposed site location is not within one of the previously identified and established wind resources areas and the project’s expected capacity factor will be lower than other projects located in the state’s traditional wind resources areas.”

**Page 11-4** - “While the project would contribute renewable energy to the wider grid, the expectation that the facility’s capacity factor will be lower in the summer, a time when grid stress is most likely to occur, supports the conclusion that reliability benefits of the project are not significant”

**Page 11-30** - “Based on substantial evidence and detailed analysis identifying multiple significant and unavoidable impacts, which includes potential injury and death to special status species, disruptive changes to the visual characteristics of the region, damage to cultural sites and interference with tribal practices, and impacts to aerial firefighting, and only moderate local and statewide benefits in the areas of renewable energy, greenhouse gas emission reductions, and local jobs, staff recommends the CEC find that on balance, the project’s significant impacts are not outweighed by the project’s benefits and the project should be denied.”