

Scoping Summary

Appendix A-1

Notice of Preparation

Notice of Preparation

To: DISTRIBUTION LIST (attached)
State of California
Office of Planning and Research
1400 Tenth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

From: Shasta County
Dept. of Resource Management
Planning Division
1855 Placer Street, Suite 103
Redding, CA 96001

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report

Project Title: Hatchet Ridge Wind Energy Project EIR

The Shasta County Department of Resource Management, Planning Division, will be the Lead Agency and will prepare an environmental impact report (EIR) for the Hatchet Ridge Wind Energy project pursuant to the requirements of CEQA. We need to know the views of your agency regarding the scope and content of the environmental information that is germane to your agency's statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. The project description, location, and potential environmental effects are contained in the attached materials. A copy of the Initial Study is attached and can also be reviewed at the address listed above. Due to the time limits mandated by state law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date but not later than 30 days after receipt of this notice.

Public Scoping Meeting

A public scoping meeting will be held on April 25, 2007, to solicit comments and input on the content of the EIR. The public scoping meeting will be held at 7:00 p.m. at the Burney Veteran's Hall, 37410 Main Street, Burney, California.

Please send comments to: *Bill Walker, Senior Planner*

Phone: (530) 225-5532

E-mail: bwalker@co.shasta.ca.us

Fax: (530) 245-6468

Address: 1855 Placer Street

Suite 103

Redding, CA 96001

As part of your response, please provide the following information.

The agency contact person's name, title, address, phone number, and email to which future correspondence regarding this project would be directed. To the extent possible, the types of permits or approvals which may be required to implement the proposed project, including applicable code sections and discussion of typical requirements. Concurrence or additional comments regarding the attached summary of significant environmental issues, reasonable alternatives, and mitigation measures that will need to be explored in the EIR for your agency to issue needed approvals (State CEQA Guidelines §15082[b][1][A]).

Date: 04/11/07

Signature: _____

Title: Senior Planner

Telephone: 530/225-5532

Reference: California Code of Regulations, Title 14, (State CEQA Guidelines) Sections 15082(a), 15103, 15375.

Appendix A-2

CEQA Initial Study Checklist

CEQA Initial Study Checklist

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:					
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a scenic highway?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d.	Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts on agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation. Would the project:					
a.	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

III. AIR QUALITY. When available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Strong seismic groundshaking?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Landslides?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in an onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
d.	Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e.	Be located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, be within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f.	Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.

Would the project:

a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
d.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding onsite or offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e.	Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f.	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g.	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h.	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect floodflows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j.	Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:					
a.	Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b.	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
X. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:					
a.	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
b.	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XI. NOISE. Would the project:					
a.	Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c.	Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d.	Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e.	Be located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f.	Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:					
a.	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b.	Displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c.	Displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project:				
a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:				
Fire protection?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
XIV. RECREATION. Would the project:				
a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a. Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause, either individually or cumulatively, exceedance of a level-of-service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.

Would the project:

a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
g.	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XVI MANDATORY FINDINGS OF I. SIGNIFICANCE.

a.	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Appendix A-3

Scoping Summary

Scoping Summary

Introduction

The Shasta County Department of Resource Management (County) is preparing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for a proposed wind energy project on Hatchet Mountain near Burney, California. On April 11, 2007, the County issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the EIR (Appendix A-1), informing agencies and the general public that the document is being prepared and inviting specific comments on the scope and content of the EIR. The NOP also invited public participation at a scoping meeting held on April 25, 2007, at 7:00 p.m. at the Veteran's Hall in Burney, California.

To announce the scoping meeting, the NOP was published in the local newspaper in Redding, California, and public meeting notices were mailed to residents living near the proposed project site.

The following representatives of the County and Jones & Stokes (the environmental consulting firm hired to prepare the EIR) participated in the scoping meeting.

- Bill Walker, Shasta County Department of Resource Management.
- John Forsythe, Jones & Stokes.
- Christy Corzine, Jones & Stokes.
- Jonathan Foster, Jones & Stokes.
- Beth Doolittle-Norby, Jones & Stokes.

The meeting presented an overview of the proposed Hatchet Ridge Wind Energy Project (project)—the goal of the project, the project location and features, and a timeline for both environmental review and construction/operation. Information was also presented describing the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process. Participants were asked to provide comments about project-related issues that should specifically be addressed in the EIR. The staff transcribed participants' verbal comments on large flip charts and encouraged participants to submit written comments on comment cards to be included in the scoping record. Participants were advised to submit comments prior to the comment cutoff date of May 9, 2007.

Summary of Comments and Questions

All written and transcribed comments are part of the administrative record that supports the EIR. For the purpose of this report, comments and questions have been summarized as shown

below. These comments were summarized from verbal comments transcribed at the meeting, comments received on comment cards prior to the comment cutoff date of May 9, 2007, and additional staff notes.

For clarity, the comments have been organized broadly into the categories specified under CEQA; comments that did not fit into such categories are presented in *Other Issue Areas*, following *CEQA Resource Areas*. Comments that were repeated during the scoping meeting or in multiple submissions were combined to reduce redundancy.

A tribal spokesperson for the Pit River Tribe expressed opposition to the project. The Tribe's concerns have, for the sake of consistency, been assigned to the appropriate CEQA resource areas in the summary below.

CEQA Resource Areas

Aesthetics and Visual Resources

- The project will be an eyesore when viewed from State Route 299.
- There will be viewshed impacts.
- Visual simulations should show a range of turbine sizes.
- Visual simulations should show the project from Burney, Big Bend, Montgomery Creek, Macarthur–Burney Falls State Park, the Pacific Crest Trail, and Highway 89 east of Lake Britton.
- Can the project be relocated such that it would not be visible from downtown Burney?
- What is the height of existing towers/radio towers on Hatchet Ridge?
- Will this project look similar to the windmills in Palm Springs?
- Is it possible to paint the towers forest green?

Agricultural and Forest Resources

- Will there be timber removal? If so, how much?
- Will the project be compatible with timber production?
- Commenter requested that there be coordination with the U.S. Forest Service.

Air Quality

- Will climatic influences (e.g., winds, ice) have impacts on the towers/public safety?
- Will the towers change the air currents in the area and/or cause more turbulence? Commenter stated that wind patterns in Burney changed after the Fountain Fire.
- How many tons of carbon dioxide will this project release annually?

- Will the turbines alter the microclimate?

Biological Resources

- How does this project compare to pre-fire conditions and the mature forest, animals and plants?
- Commenter expressed concerns about bird mortality.
- Commenter expressed concerns over potential loss of bird habitat in project area.
- Commenter suggested a multiyear rather than a 1-year study to assess wildlife impacts.
- Commenter requested specific issues be addressed in preliminary avian studies and analyses: baseline studies to determine species use of the project area; review of similarly sited wind projects; establishment of thresholds of acceptable avian mortality standards; feasibility study to assess prey reduction activities to reduce raptor mortality; analysis of habitat fragmentation that could result from project construction, and the results of such fragmentation on nesting or migrating bird species.
- Commenter expressed concern that existing conditions do not represent an appropriate baseline, because wildlife was severely diminished by the Fountain Fire.
- Towers should be spaced far enough apart to allow wildlife corridors between them.
- Could there be a bird guard installed on the blades?
- How will the project affect migratory patterns of bear, deer, elk, geese, and other wildlife?
- Will project noise have an impact on wildlife (elk, deer, raptors, bears)?
- Will the moving turbine blades deter wildlife from moving between the towers?
- Will there be fire-related impacts from the project?

Cultural Resources

- Bunchgrass Mountain is a sacred site.
- Commenter expressed concern over impacts on sacred sites and plants.
- The project would detract from Tribal culture.
- The Pit River Tribe uses plants on Hatchet Mountain as part of their cultural practices.
- The Pit River Tribe does not support the project.
- Cultural values should be protected at sacred/cultural archaeological sites.

Geology and Soils

- Will there be impacts related to seismic activity (especially involving Goose Valley)?
- Will seismic activity in the area surrounding the project be evaluated?

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- Commenter expressed concern about wildland fire caused by sparks from turbines igniting grasslands.
- Commenter expressed concerns involving security and possible vandalism at the project site.

Hydrology and Water Quality

- What is the depth of groundwater at the project site?

Land Use and Planning

- What is the current zoning of the area, and what kind of use permit would be required?
- Who are the two landowners (adjacent to the project location)?
- Other wind projects are proposed in the area (e.g., Pondosa, Burney Mountain, Lassen, Alturas).
- Are there other areas in Shasta County that are designated for wind projects? Do wind projects require special zoning?
- A commenter referenced a map available from the California Energy Commission (CEC) pertaining to the location of wind resource areas in California.

Noise

- Would there be noise impacts in nearby State Parks (i.e., Burney Falls State Park)?
- The commenter stated that there is a loud scraping sound when the blades come off the turbines at other wind power sites.
- How many decibels (of noise) will the towers make?
- Will noise from the turbines be heard in Burney?
- How close does one have to be to hear noise from the turbines?

Public Services

- Commenter expressed concern about wildland fires and fire suppression capabilities.
- Commenter expressed concerns involving security and possible vandalism at the project site, and whether Shasta County Sheriff's Department would be responding to calls.

Recreation

- Will there be local access for fishing and hunting once the project is built?
- Commenter expressed concern regarding possible impacts on roads and trails that access the project vicinity.

- How will public access to the project area change?
- Will there still be cross-county skiing/hunting access?
- Will the project eliminate private use of Bunchgrass Road beyond the Operations/Maintenance building?
- Will gates be placed across access roads preventing local people the access they have enjoyed for years?
- Burney Falls State Park is located 14 miles away from the project area. Will there be any impact on the park?

Transportation/Traffic

- What will be the traffic impacts on SR 299 at the Hatchet Ridge summit, especially during construction?
- Is Shasta County responsible for the maintenance of Bunchgrass Road after construction?

Utilities and Service Systems

- Will there be dam removal elsewhere to offset increased power generation from the project?
- Will the project interfere with existing radio/communication towers on the mountain?
- Will the project interfere with microwaves?
- Will the project cause electrical/cell phone interference?
- Where does the energy go? Is it kept in the local area? Does it benefit people in California?

Mandatory Findings of Significance, Cumulative Impacts, and Growth Inducement

- It is important to preserve the rural character of the project vicinity.
- If you build it, more will come.
- Are there other wind energy projects proposed in this specific area? Other wind projects proposed in Shasta County? Other projects in California? Other RES projects?
- Will this project cause more windmills to be built on the site or in the area?
- What other wind energy project applications have been made to date in Shasta County?
- There are a lot of windmill projects within a 100-mile radius. What is the cumulative effect?

Other Issue Areas

Project Description

- Commenter asked for details of design and construction (e.g., excavation, guy wires, foundation size, tower materials, construction techniques).
- Will the project permit allow future expansion?
- Commenter asked about low-voltage collection and transmission: would the collection system be pole-mounted uninsulated conductors or insulated conductors in ductwork? What are the dimensions? If a duct system is used, would it be surface trenched?
- Is everything shown as “Projected Corridor” at or below 34 kilovolts?
- Project area – the area occupied by towers seems to expand each year.
- How many miles of roads will be built?
- How many maintenance buildings will be built?
- What size staff will be required?
- What is the project’s design life?
- How will the project tie in to PG&E’s system?
- Will the project involve aboveground or underground cables?
- Will the project area be fenced?
- What will the distance be between towers?
- Will the transformer and switch gears be indoor or outdoor?
- Will the transformer be located on an existing PG&E right-of-way or adjacent to it?
- Will PG&E or HRW own and operate the tap?
- Does this project require upgrading, relocation or any changes to PG&E existing 230kv line or right-of-way?
- Are any changes required by PG&E addressed in the project EIR?
- How many homes will this project serve?
- Can towers withstand high wind speeds and ice in winter storms?
- Why was this site selected?
- What is the distance from the ground to the bottom of the blade?
- Good websites exist about construction of windmills: Commenter cited the American Wind Energy Association.

- Commenter asked that the EIR explain the new “California renewable portfolio standards.”
- What direction would the turbines face?
- How does wind energy compare to solar energy?

Economics

- An economic impact study should be conducted in addition to an EIR.
- Would the project require a special tax district?
- Would the project generate tax revenue for the Intermountain region?
- Would the County receive tax revenue or tax credit?
- Would there be benefits to the Shasta County tax base? Would those benefits be kept local?
- Would equipment/turbines be included in the Shasta County business property tax?
- Will Shasta County pay the cost of the EIR?
- What will be the impact on recreation, hunting, and tourism revenue?
- Commenter expressed concern over possible reduction of property values.
- Expand on the statement that “the project would be a major tax contributor for Shasta County.”
- What are the local benefits?
- Who benefits? Contractors? Will there be local construction jobs?
- How many construction and permanent local jobs will be created?
- Commenter indicated that analysis of economic impacts is not a requirement of CEQA, but requested that additional studies be conducted by Shasta County.

EIR Process

- There should be a Planning Commission meeting in Burney.
- There should be small group meetings with the project proponent.
- How can people give public input?
- A forum to discuss economic impacts should be developed.
- What is Jones & Stokes’ expertise?
- Who conducts the studies and technical analyses?
- When will the avian study be complete?
- Please provide the date/description/author of the avian monitoring report.

- Will data be available for public access?
- What is the underlying methodology of the avian study?
- Is this meeting a formality required by the state, and will the powers that be do as they wish regardless of what locals think?

Community Impacts

- A commenter stated that this project falls under private property rights and does not necessarily lead to public benefits. It is free enterprise.
- Local students should be involved in the process, or at least they should be educated about the project.
- Will local citizens get a reduction in their power bills?
- Residents need control over local decisions that affect them.