

*Comment Received From: Jim Wiegand
Submitted On: 2/1/2024
Docket Number: 23-OPT-01*

It appears people not even qualified,are providing biological input for Wind projects

Additional submitted attachment is included below.

It appears people not even qualified, are providing biological input for all Wind projects. Shasta County needs to demand real answers with proof, from the California Energy Commission, for all the questions I have asked.

For the Fountain Wind project, I submitted several letters and or reports. Over 200 pages in total were submitted, but just 48 pages were answered with the defluctive developer comments. Why?

Most of this avoided factual information, has been submitted and in my recent CEC Fountain Wind comments.

The way these comments were written, it is my belief that attorneys, totally unqualified to even answer, had actually wrote the responses. While the comments were an attempt to discredit my input, if one looks closely, they could not provide any credible responses and completely avoided critical environmental impact questions.

I sent a letter to Shasta County Supervisors and the Planning commission asking for more information regarding the authors and qualifications of the EIR comments, but never received any.

The reason, those responding were advised not to answer.

Lastly, do not forget about the false information submitted in the EIR regarding the critically endangered Sierra Nevada Red Fox.





Shasta County Department of Resource Management
Planning Division

FOUNTAIN WIND PROJECT

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT – VOLUME 2

April 2021

Comment Letter P29

Hatchet Ridge Ten Years later

Now, 10 years after the Hatchet Ridge wind turbines started spinning, the Fountain Wind DEIR reported one occupied raptor nest, within 5 miles of these turbines with no credible explanations. Since 2010 bald eagles attempting to nest at Margaret lake, are very likely being killed off every year.



P29-24

P29-24
cont.

Abandoned Bald Eagle Nest
No proof of occupancy ever given in EIR

No evidence was provided to show this nest was ever occupied after 2010 when the turbines became operational.

P29-24 The status of the Margaret Lake bald eagle nest is described in Response P29-10. While the comment speculates as much, there is no evidence that the Hatchet Ridge Wind Project caused the Margaret Lake bald eagle nest to fail in any year, let alone in every year since 2010. In addition, the comment also attempts to interpret monitoring data from Draft EIR Appendix C12, the *2018 Eagle Nest Status Survey Report*, as nest failures attributable to the Hatchet Ridge Wind Project. Although focused raptor surveys are no longer required for that project, project personnel are required to report eagle mortality, if and when identified. To date, bald eagle mortality has not been documented for the Hatchet Ridge Wind Project. Hence, the connection between bald eagle nest failures and this project has not been validated.

The comment takes issue with the change in eagle nest survey techniques from aerial helicopter surveys in 2017 (Draft EIR Appendix C10) to ground-based surveys in 2018 (Draft EIR Appendix C12), citing the change as a survey flaw. We note that the USFWS (2020) updated Eagle Survey protocol references ground-based and aerial-based surveys, which validates the multi-year survey conducted for the Project (e.g., see Comment A4-11). As the commenter notes, skilled raptor biologists can work effectively from the ground.

The commenter is correct that photograph of nest 308, a large unoccupied eagle nest, is the same in the 2017 and 2018 reports. The 2018 survey was done terrestrially and documented nest 308 as occupied and in use.

Project personnel are required to report eagle carcasses but only to the USFWS, so they can be recycled at the Denver Eagle Repository. The USFWS has hidden these wind turbine carcass numbers for decades and the public will never see these numbers due to 1997 changes in the Freedom of Information Act.

Comment Letter P29

Why did the DEIR not mention that the Fountain wind turbines will have tip speeds approximately 50% faster than those at Hatchet Ridge turbines, with speeds approaching 300 mph?

Why did the DEIR not mention that the total deadly rotor sweep for the Fountain wind project will have over 4 times the deadly cubic rotor sweep of Hatchet Ridge?

Why did the DEIR fail to mention that some turbines will be placed so close to creeks that birds and bats hit by blades are likely to be launched into them?

- Why did the Hatchet Ridge studies use carcass searches only out 63 meters from turbines, when **most carcasses** can be found past this limit around 400 ft. turbines? **.....crickets**
- What has happened to all the occupied raptor nests that were once reported in the Hatchet Wind EIR? **.....crickets**

↑
P29-7
cont.

There are some green energy questions that even the most skilled liars will not answer.

From: Jim Wiegand

Sent: Friday, May 28, 2021 4:54 PM

To: Leonard Moty <lmoty@co.shasta.ca.us>; Joe Chimenti <jchimenti@co.shasta.ca.us>; Mary Rickert <mrickett@co.shasta.ca.us>; pjpjones@co.shasta.ca.us <pjpjones@co.shasta.ca.us>; Les Baugh <lbaugh@co.shasta.ca.us>

Subject: Help needed for Fountain Wind

Attention Shasta County Supervisors,

I am contacting you today because I could use a little help and it's important.

A while back I had made some lengthy and accurate comments regarding the Fountain Wind DEIR. Then a few weeks back on May 5th, I read over the FEIR responses for this project. I was very saddened to see the false and unprofessional responses to my comments. So, I contacted Lio Salazar at the Planning Commission on 5/5 (see emails below) and asked for names of those accountable for these responses to my comments. He will not give them to me. Instead, he's given me the runaround and a long random list of ESA employees.

The "**Names**" are very important because no ethical or competent researcher would have expressed the opinions given in the Final EIR. It's very possible that a wildlife expert did not even write the dismissive and deflective words in the responses to my comments. The FEIR responses appear to have been written by completely unqualified individual like a lawyer or even someone involved with the Planning Department. In addition, being told by Shasta County Employee Lio Salazar, the "**County is not obligated**" to give me those names should raise many eyebrows about the legitimacy of the Final EIR and this entire process.

For anyone actually searching for the truth about the impacts from Hatchet Ridge and the potential impacts of a new massive new wind project, my comments would have been very disturbing. Instead, my science-based comments and questions were totally dismissed with **no legitimate answers being given**.

Either way, before the upcoming Planning Commission special meeting, **I would like the names of those responsible for the actual responses to my comments given in the Final EIR**. Of the responses given most are not only deceptive they're simply not true. I will prove it to all of you and it will be a lot easier with names. Actual Science searches for the truth and the research conducted for the Fountain Wind EIR did not. Instead, deception, avoidance and gross incompetence were used in the Fountain Wind FEIR.

Once I have the actual names of those responsible, I will be able to submit new, very specific, and easy to understand information to that will enlighten both the public and the Shasta County Board of Supervisors.

Thank you, Jim Wiegand
