

DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	23-OPT-01
Project Title:	Fountain Wind Project
TN #:	263338
Document Title:	Joseph Osa Comments - Additional Comments Regarding CEC Staff Assessment of The Fountain Wind Project and 20 May 2025 Public Review Meeting
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Joseph Osa
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	5/23/2025 6:47:05 PM
Docketed Date:	5/27/2025

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

**Additional Comments Regarding CEC Staff Assessment of The
Fountain Wind Project and 20 May 2025 Public Review Meeting**

Additional submitted attachment is included below.

May 23, 2025

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

From: Joseph Osa, Montgomery Creek Resident

Subj: **Additional Comments Regarding CEC Staff Assessment of The Fountain Wind Project and 20 May 2025 Public Review Meeting**

Dear CEC Commissioners,

Thank you for hosting the recent public review meeting in Redding. Considering that meeting and the harsh criticism of your excellent work by the applicant, I wanted to further commend you on a job well done and to comment on a couple of arguments put forth by proponents.

The applicant, its paid experts, and other proponents want to minimize the impacts the project would have on aerial firefighting efforts. A proponent even pointed to the original EIR from the first decision involving the County Planning Commissioner but failed to mention that the EIR was soundly rejected by the Planning Commissioners as being inadequate for several reasons, particularly for the wildfire section, because it suggested that simply providing the location of the turbines would somehow mitigate the fact that the turbines would still be large obstructions that would impede, if not eliminate, aerial firefighting support, in or near the project area. CBS News recently reported on an aerial firefighting success story in California that included a photo of an aerial retardant drop, critical to the successful operation. Achieving similar success would be unattainable within or adjacent to the nearly 3000-acre project area. Thank You again for getting this right and recognizing the criticality of this firefighting tool. Included below is the photograph from the CBS report:

**Cal Fire Tanker 122 5/22/25 on the Midway Fire in Alameda and San Joaquin Counties
CBS News Bay Area.**



I also want to object to an argument put forward by a project proponent regarding the impacts to our Pit River Tribal neighbors. The proponent argued that considering the entire state of California was once inhabited by Indigenous peoples, it would be impractical to focus on impacts to them as this would hinder the approval of any project. This sort of

attitude is very disingenuous and exactly the type of thinking that has inflicted so much harm on them and their culture over our recent history and exactly the type of thinking that should not govern policy decisions now so, please do not fall for this callous argument and inflict any further harm on them. As suggested by a speaker at the review meeting: to continually ignore the impacts of these types of projects on them is tantamount to continued genocidal efforts to erase them as a people forever.

Also, in addition to the low-capacity factor for the marginal wind resource area of the project site, as identified in the staff report, there is the issue of co-interference with the existing Hatchet Ridge Wind Turbines. Pattern Energy, owners of Hatchet Wind, previously objected to the impact downwind turbulence from several of the Fountain Wind turbines would have on their ability to produce power. A reduction in net efficiency may also occur for the Fountain Wind turbines when Hatchet Wind was upwind from them. I could not find this in the staff report, so I am mentioning it again. This impact would further reduce the net energy production because of its impact on both Wind developments.

Finally, I hope it did not escape your attention the relatively large number of those in opposition from across a diverse makeup of County residents and that the vast majority of those in favor were either current or formerly paid consultants and/or those who saw money to be made, despite the cost. Please consider the will of the people in addition to the environmental impacts and deny this project.

Sincerely,

Joseph Osa