

RESULTS: The following comments are compilations from the “Renewable Energy Worksheet” provided at the June 18, 2011 Renewable Energy Meeting hosted by the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (DRP). The comments were provided by meeting attendees and have not been edited. Where there are (), those are additional clarifying comments provided by the attendee. Where there are [], those are additional clarifying comments provided by DRP.

Renewable Energy Worksheet

PART I: ISSUES DISCUSSION

Directions: You may have different concerns about utility-scale renewable energy projects. Please provide your specific concerns below. If you do not have any at this time, please write “none.”

Solar

1. Solar - Environmental impacts:

1. Water consumption.
2. Seem to be minor.
3. Concerned for plant life in [?] animal life.
4. Wild flowers! Most open space blooms in spring, especially westside of valley- will flowers grow under panels? Will it displace east wildlife?
5. Too many looks awful to our land environment in well traveled areas.
6. Problems with security fencing impeding free movement. Keep away from SEA [Significant Ecological Area].
7. Habitat for birds to be able to feed - the tri-colored-blackbird.
8. Need animal access and movement through fences.
9. Land animals.
10. Big fences with barbed wire impact animal habitat. Clearing of land creates huge dust.
11. Wildflower destruction (they just don't grow back).
12. Let's look for construction methods [and] technologies that do not require habitat mitigations/relocation or perhaps only a temporary mitigation.
13. I believe solar impacts are beneficial, not bad. Minimize ecological effects.
14. Habitat alteration/destruction. Blockage of wildlife movement.
15. We need in appropriate areas to maximize use to minimum project size.
16. Removes foraging habitat for protected species. Excessive water use.
17. I believe that bringing renewable energy to our state will save our state money and improve the state and global environment.
18. Sadly our human population will have to find an answer & maybe there will be aesthetic impacts on some [of] us as well as environmental impacts. But unless we want to go back to candle power, we have to make choices!
19. Less intrusive to bird migration and habitat. Depending on size of project- impact on ground dwelling wildlife.
20. Ensure that land recovery after use is accomplished.
21. Encroachment of our community and our farms.
22. Few - concerned about what will be done at end of project/de-commissioning etc.

23. Covers large areas. Fire hazards of vegetation growth. Design into all (new) buildings. Give money break to those who retrofit older structures.
24. The only environmental concern is disturbances to existing sensitive habitat & agricultural resources.
25. Amount of land needed - ground use clusters or spread all over.
26. Animals or any type - ground squirrels are abundant in the city of Lancaster. I don't know if they are the Mojave Ground Squirrel. If they are I don't see how they can possibly be an endangered species or even one of concern.
27. Habitat disturbance concerns. Concerns with aerospace impacts and decommissioning of projects and not leaving the equipment after the effective life of the project.
28. Protect sensitive areas- habitat- wildlife corridors.
29. Interruption of natural habitats.
30. Affect on ground animal habitat.
31. Solar= best reliable renewable energy and should be encouraged.
32. Degradation to plants and wildlife - fencing large tracts restricts animal corridors.
33. Your map has eliminated most of the areas that you can develop wind & solar- efforts should be coordinated with the State.
34. Desert habitat.
35. Antelope Valley has two untapped resources - wind and sun. Building houses impacts a lot more.
36. Moderate impact at best.
37. Fairly strong consideration. More concerned for animal and migratory paths than plants.
38. Form should address utility scale and residential scale. Concerns about large areas of land being covered where sun wouldn't get to the ground.
39. Affect habitat for animals and birds. Interfere if proper water drainage. Hazardous materials being use[d] would affect humans, animals. Run-off from materials getting into ground water.
40. None in desert non-residential.
41. I think our region is completely suitable to our AV area.
42. Impacts forage opportunities for raptors, predators, etc. Fences stop species transition. Stop[s] plant growth and open space regeneration.
43. Ground clearance, dust control, water use for non-PV [photovoltaic] development.
44. Wildlife movability will be limited. Increased traffic and roads. Dust. Serious impact on sheep herding.
45. Destruction of local wildlife and plants (environment).
46. Property zoning. The natural growth that is no longer seen in the A.V. habitat - animals, reptiles you no longer find in the AV.
47. Full CEQA shall be performed. Full EIR performed.
48. Complete eradication of wildlife habitat – owl and hawk foraging, corridors for movement, unrealist need for "life" when all projects are taken together.
49. Won't allow for desert vegetation and wildflower growth. Less impactful than wind.
50. Native animal and wildflower disturbance during construction and operation. Migratory corridors.
51. Significant.
52. Significant.

53. Heat impact to valley floor. Dust pollution caused by huge solar plants.
54. Loss of habitat on undisturbed lands.
55. "Utility scale" says it all, and giving more fuel to the fire will cause greater need. It covers the valley.
56. Desert floor will be covered with panels; all vegetation and animal life in the way will be destroyed.
57. Maintenance and upkeep. How will it be done? Water chemicals or other materials. Where does our wildlife go?
58. Ground cover and maintenance, use of rodenticides and land weed blocks, cleaning agents for panels, runoff testing plant barriers for blowing dust.
59. Limiting of natural habitat.
60. Health hazards.
61. Small animals, coyotes, etc.
62. Consideration of environmental impacts, protected species.
63. Significant removal of habitat, transmission lines, EMF, traffic/road development, substations.
64. Effect on plant life and animals etc that live under panels and reflection.
65. Impact to plant and animal life due to the area of shade and reflective light and heat.
66. Heat generation or reflection.
67. Site only where ground disturbing activities have already taken place and avoid native habitat.
68. Water consumption, chemical cleaning agents used, effects on wildlife, ground and water contamination.
69. Fencing large tracts of land eliminate important bird areas, forage for animals, loss of ag[ricultural] land.
70. Wildlife corridors. Loss of farmland. Loss of natural habitat.
71. Loss of habitat needs to be full mitigated with adequate land in relationship to lost habitat. Mitigation land should be part of a plan that seeks to connect existing open space and emphasize acquisition of land within SEAs. Native landscaping should be used to shield protect view shed.

2. Solar - Aesthetic impacts:

1. Minor.
2. Minor. Should require landscaping along roads (county).
3. Not building a million dollar home to look at crap - anything that is not natural or home landscapes.
4. Main impact is substations. Also, gen-tir [transmission?] lines need to be more carefully evaluated.
5. Reflectivity concerns with pilots and car drivers. Traveling west on Ave H near 14 freeway, reflectivity (glare) from solar on roof of AV Fairgrounds causes momentary sightloss at certain times of day.
6. Is light reflected? Low profile not as big a concern, but cooling towers would be negative.

7. Several solar panels on a house look nice. Too many awful to our land environment in well traveled areas.
8. Reflectivity of pavers could be a problem for drivers and homeowners/businesses.
9. Avoid putting next to residence[s].
10. Fences, need to be simple 6 foot chain link types with standard barbed wires - no prison fences.
11. Fencing.
12. Fence unsightly.
13. Fencing-dust.
14. Power towers are incredibly ugly.
15. Minimal. This is land largely not being used. It allows land owners to sell property largely unusable.
16. Unattractive- but probably better than bare earth.
17. Central location is preferred.
18. Converts natural open spaces and agricultural land into an industrial use. Glare.
19. I like the way wind farms look. They add a sense of environmental sensitivity to the area.
20. Not as ugly as windmills or oil rigs. Needs to be limited in size.
21. Would like greenery (desert) planted all around fencing.
22. Concerned about what will be done at the end of projects/de-commissioning etc.
23. Control overgrowth vegetation- fire concern.
24. So long as the panels are laid out in a clean manner and screened I don't see any major aesthetic impacts.
25. Decommissioning of projects.
26. Visual impact is important.
27. Looking at high areas of block panels not desirable.
28. Not just regional proximity. Visual proximity is more important.
29. Glare and transmission of energy to utility grid.
30. Yes.
31. In areas proposed for wind energy there are few homes to impact.
32. Most visible from the air. Will not significantly diminish the appeal of the desert.
33. Strong consideration for noise and nausea from windmills. Heat and reflections from solar panels.
34. As it would be seen from driving, brightness, impair vision.
35. None - low profile also can be surrounded easily by landscape.
36. Should be a concern but does not override the overall project.
37. While not as huge as wind, still will have a significant visual impact- panels, lighting, fencing, etc.
38. Landscape screening.
39. Drab look, chain link fencing- prefer block wall surround. Overhead utilities.
40. Large scale fencing is objectionable. Lighting of solar areas impacts the entire area.
41. They are ugly and noisy and destroy our rural lifestyle, cause stress.
42. Wow - not very country.
43. Yes, needs to no aesthetic impacts.
44. Unacceptable - large masses of dark spaces. Not open view of land itself - not rural in effect.

45. Projects should not destroy or impose upon the beauty of our open spaces.
46. Unattractive. Impedes line of sight - views across valley to mountains.
47. Preferred over wind turbines, as they are lower and do not distract from mountain views.
48. Moderate.
49. Moderate.
50. A natural beauty of Poppy Reserve and surrounding areas will be ruined. Must be prohibited in these areas.
51. Potentially require landscape screening adjacent to roadways/development. Underground utilities.
52. It will take up a lot of the actual ground area, and our beautiful desert will suffer.
53. They will make the desert look like a space station.
54. Stations are ugly and growing. Land should have green barriers.
55. Limiting of natural scenery, the beauty of our scenic resources including views of mountains and valleys.
56. Too much area needed.
57. Visual, etc.
58. Underground transmission lines where possible and economically feasible.
59. These are high impacts to desert-scape. Are they going to be allowed on slopes? Is the reflective impacts, cooling/cleaning, process facilities.
60. Would like nice borders around possibly desert trees.
61. Reduce reasonable border plants to hide the visual impact.
62. Suggest screening of project perimeters.
63. Not in viewshed or Poppy Reserve.
64. Size of plant, land consumption, height, reflection, heat and noise generation, vibration effects.
65. Significant impact to scenic areas and preserves in north Antelope Valley, wildflower fields, too.
66. Loss of scenic vistas. Introduction of transmission lines, lights, buildings. Loss of dark night skies.
67. Native landscaping should be used to shield protect view shed.

3. Solar - Adjacent land use compatibility:

1. Place in areas of ag[riculture] and or industrial.
2. No impacts to adjacent land use.
3. As stated above not ever wanting to look at solar panels etc next or near to my property.
4. No major concerns.
5. Poppy park impacts? Limits land used for ag[riculture], especially dry farming.
6. Get item as close to existing transmission line corridors.
7. Blowing dust resulting in allergies, fire.
8. Use the red/yellow/green map concept.
9. Little or no effects on agriculture. Not a highly desirable neighbor.
10. Incompatible and unappealing industrial use mixing with open space.
11. Close to existing power facilities where the land use is already disrupted for wildlife.

12. Be sensitive to surrounding radar sites, also commercial and military aviation operational corridors.
13. Solar should not be a source of glare.
14. Encroachment of other developable land → aerospace.
15. Views.
16. Not just regional proximity. Visual proximity is more important.
17. Residential development or other types of development and the lack thereof.
18. If located in the right areas, very little impacted on environment.
19. A few existing scattered homes should not be an impediment to a progressive comprehensive renewable energy policy.
20. Not a significant concern.
21. I think this would affect zoning issues and zone changes.
22. Blocking views. Noise from systems. May be near homes, impacting sale of property.
23. Yes, see Kaiser facility along Hwy 14 at Avenue L; also at Avenue K Toyota car dealership.
24. Zoning.
25. May significantly reduce residential property values, personal enjoyment, use of trails/open space.
26. Screening of property so adjacent property protected. Screening with landscape.
27. Reflectivity, dust control.
28. Decreases ability to see property.
29. Destruction of views from your house or property.
30. Decrease in our land value.
31. Must be compatible.
32. Reduces land value - only sell to other solar 5-10 acre "producers." Already for sale signs everywhere advertise this
33. Butting up a "wind farm" or "solar farm" to natural areas severely limits natural areas. Natural habitats should not end up like a park in the middle of the city. Impact areas not just physical sites should be given.
34. Not compatible.
35. Use the solar panels over parking areas to reduce environmental impacts. Perfect example is AV College.
36. Moderate.
37. Moderate.
38. How [is] this related to approved City of Lancaster projects? I am very concerned with patches of solar fields scattered everywhere. Also location to the normal growth pattern and blocking the natural growth of our area.
39. Decommissioning plan requirement resolves this item.
40. I prefer to see some land that is not used.
41. No one wants to live around a cleared desert with no wildlife.
42. Not conducive to aesthetic living spaces.
43. Limiting of rural lifestyle. Do not wish to be surrounded by commercial enterprise.
44. Poor.
45. Can mitigate for SEAs/habitat in adjacent land use, but impacts the owners use of those adjacent areas.
46. Lowering of home values that exist close to projects. People move to AV for landscape.

47. Will the buildout affect Northrup [Grumman], Edwards [Air Force Base], [Air Force] Plant 42, the air traffic control center and others?
48. Suggest consideration of buffer areas between incompatible zoning and land use areas.
49. Not in rural residential neighborhoods.
50. Impacts to property values. Noise incompatible with rural community values.
51. Not compatible with open space, rural agricultural land (power plants? Large energy utility?)
52. No development within view of public parts including hiking trails on buttes.

4. Solar - Other concerns:

1. Where is the water source coming from for these projects?
2. Invested too much money to live with nature not solar panels - plants etc. Family has lived in area for near 100 years (farmed). Same for wind.
3. Blinding reflecting sunlight to southeast end of valley from current solar energy in northwest valley. Standard of panel technology acceptable given concern(s).
4. Over reliance on solar energy may make the electrical grid unstable and cause brown-outs or blackouts.
5. Water consumption if used for cooling. Increase in runoff.
6. Water usage and where from? I would not want a large quantity of water usage.
7. Don't kill eagles in Los Angeles County.
8. Carpooling incentives during construction. Use natural weed control; sheep are used in Spain.
9. Storing power?
10. Land erosion.
11. Reflections off panels increasing ambient air temperature.
12. Impacts of some solar technologies on military and commercial aircraft. Example, the solar plant at Avenue G and Sierra Highway is very bright and hot. A utility scale plant might cause problems.
13. I [am]concerned solar projects and other renewable energy projects are not going to be allowed to be built. Renewable energy is crucial to help.
14. Water use, possible increase in temperatures.
15. I own land and if I want solar I should be able to do so.
16. Violation of CEQA to burden an economically disadvantaged area to service more economically advantaged locations.
17. That government will equivocate to the point any project becomes obsolete before it even gets past the drawing board.
18. More solar projects means better technology - means lower prices making solar [and] more accessible to be used personally.
19. An EIR should be done on all projects. Priority should be given to solar projects.
20. All our "hills" will be mirrors. Local work.
21. Fencing around facilities that will affect or eliminate larger wildlife corridors (ie: Bear, fox, coyote, mountain lion, fox, bobcat).

22. Promote design solar features directly into new buildings (homes, businesses). Numerous wildlife/flower reserves and sanctuaries around AV.
23. The entitlement process should be streamlined for solar projects.
24. Reducing and maintaining blow sand.
25. Density allowed per unit land area ie. "green space" between solar farms.
26. Must consider impact of no water provided south of California Aqueduct.
27. Too large of a footprint! Initial increase in job creation but not high long term employment.
28. Less utility scale - more local solar placement.
29. We need renewable energy. Why not utilize our resources? Less money going out, more money comes in.
30. Shared sacrifice within counties.
31. Public safety- noise.
32. Should be located directly in transition corridor.
33. Transmission onto grid.
34. Instability of power delivery. Need to consider peaker-plants & their impact. Loss of farm land.
35. If fencing is used to eliminate large animals, there will be an influx of rodents, snakes, etc. Dust storms will be frequent if the ground is disturbed for solar panels. Panels won't be able to absorb sun energy because of the dust.
36. Destruction of rural lifestyle, the quiet we have and the solitude we enjoy.
37. Money made not coming back to our community. We are the ones impacted greatly.
38. Shall require special tax assessment. All commercial sale of energy shall require a CUP with 90s notice.
39. The only "rural" land left in L.A. County covering potential vineyards, etc. with solar panels. People will not come who desire to create their new vision residents had for areas.
40. Myriad projects will create an unattractive patchwork across the desert/AV.
41. Solar cover all parking lots in AV. Lower generation of electrical offset by lessened by environmental impact and helps locals by provided shade (in the desert!).
42. We do not want to be responsible for meeting the State requirements for all of LA County takes a large portion go the avail. Land in LA County which can be used for many purposes and limits use.
43. Contamination, water run-off when cleaned per schedule. Pesticides used for maintenance.
44. Destruction of habitat for native flora and fauna.
45. Destruction of habitat.
46. How will these solar panels affect the existing trails?
47. Solar is less impactful – posts in ground. Consider this in mapping.
48. Loss of agricultural – but further more open space.
49. If one project is allowed they will continue until the earth is completely covered with them. They should go on existing buildings instead. Dust storms from clearing land.
50. What happens to the affected lands when these companies pull out (close down/fail). Are we left with rusting eyesores?
51. Glint, glare & visual.
52. The intrusion of commercialism without representation of the "little guy" the landowner.
53. Better than wind.
54. Radio frequency interference with system controllers, grid/transmissions systems also.

55. Less [impact] than wind turbines. Still need EIR.
56. Too large size of projects. Too close together. Taking over historically open space. Solar project usefulness in upkeep.
57. Increased cost of electricity due to government support of a very inefficient process.
58. Site on fallow agricultural lands.
 - a. Zoning compatibility, rural type design.
59. Loss of natural vegetation, landscapes, fire danger, need EIRs.
60. No compensation for residents in areas who quality of life is affected.
61. Good job on bringing people from across the AV: 170 E to 170 W! Delineation of zones so precise as to exclude overall coverage.
62. Utility scale industrial solar panel installations should not be allowed to cover the AV and turn it into a mass "electroville." Installations should be limited. Decentralized installations that fill in open space within cities and emphasize roof tops and parking lots should be the preferred approach.

Wind

1. Wind - Environmental impacts:

1. Big bird killer. Fire hazard.
2. Noise and bird impacts.
3. Concerned for plants natural to environment and animal life.
4. Birds.
5. Disturbance of open areas, impact on wildlife, especially birds. There are Golden Eagles on westside as well as hawks and falcons.
6. Rattlesnakes.
7. Magnetic fields. Noise levels (install buffering). Massive cement foundations.
8. Species in the present NextEra and Element projects - golden eagles, bald eagle, american white pelican northern harrier, burrowing owl, loggerhead strike, tricolored blackbird, yellow headed blackbird, peregrine falcon, cooker hawk, ferruginous hawk, merlin hawks, parne falcon.
9. Bird, wildlife migration routes. Land stripping. Mountain erosion.
10. Impact bird flight path. Destroy land of wildlife. Land erosion. Roads developed would hurt land.
11. Destruction of bats and birds. Noise.
12. Same as for solar.
13. Positive.
14. Habitat destruction. Bird and bat kills.
15. Minimal to the square footage area.
16. 100% of the "plan" area is in an international recognized important bird area [IBA]. Specific criteria for an IBA habitat must contain nine sensitive bird species or more.
17. I believe that bringing renewable energy to our State with save our State money and improve the State and global environment.
18. Not energy efficient, poor energy return. Affects both bird species and wildlife due to noise, vibration and blade movement.

19. The unused area of wind farms should be considered open space.
20. Ugliness of towers.
21. No wind towers! How frequency of soundwaves, turbulence created by blades, danger to birds.
22. Land and vegetation removed (necessary for wild animals) to build such enormous turbines.
23. Too many to list. Solar should be considered over wind.
24. Noise. Keep in windy hills and canyons.
25. Prefer solar.
26. Bird impacts. Habitat disturbance.
27. Important wildlife corridors.
28. Effects on bird habitat.
29. Extreme.
30. Increase fire danger in highly dangerous, windy fire zone.
31. No impact.
32. Habitat. Environmental corridor. Fire danger. Destruction of land for construction - windmills bases in concrete.
33. Wind is one of our greatest resources. Very little impact.
34. Very very few concerns about impacts of wind renewable energy.
35. Less concerned with animal and plant impacts (than solar).
36. Wind farms. Visual impacts. Ridgelines.
37. Tall would block views. Unsightly on hills. Scare animals. Interfere with migration of birds.
38. Huge - birds, bats, plant species, noise, erosion, potential impact to waterways, ground water quality.
39. Noise affecting residences.
40. Land clearance. Scarring of mountains.
41. Noise pollution. Wildlife seriously impacted. Fire danger. Increases disrupts natural land, trails.
42. Increase of property tax. Devaluation of property. They are so ugly. Put them somewhere else.
43. Property zoning. The natural growth that is no longer seen in the A.V. habitat- animals, reptiles you no longer find in the AV Fire Hazard in an already high fire zone.
44. Full CEQA shall be performed, full EIR performed.
45. Goes against height requirements in some towns. Massive erosion - destroys natural water flow. Bird/bat kill unavoidable - what "acceptable level"? Roads and grading for huge trucks hauling blades, cement, drive away everything.
46. Delineation of zones so precise as to exclude overall coverage.
47. Dangerous to birds.
48. Bird/bat kill. Land disturbance for tower/pad/access roads during construction and operation.
49. Significant - fire danger as well.
50. Significant.
51. Not enough open space surrounding wind farms. Huge fire hazard for desert floor burns.
52. How are birds affected by wind turbines?
53. Not only here but each windmill has in excess to 500 tons/steel, 300 tons/fiberglass. It will harm us and many more areas.

54. The mountains must be cleared of vegetation. Roads must be built. Complete destruction of habitat.
55. Large footprint, bird and raptor destruction, fires and brush clearance, turbine syndrome – ear and medical, inevitable fires.
56. Limiting of natural habitats for state flower, poppy, desert animals, and quite frankly, the natural surrounding people deserve.
57. Very bad hazard.
58. Do not mess with Portal Ridge area.
59. Destruction of Portal Ridge, SEA 58.
60. Removal of habitat.
61. Increase of animals [like] rodents from loss of birds.
62. Impacts on birds and wind patterns changing because of turbine blade air flow.
63. Noise; I've been near wind turbines recently and they create a lot of noise.
64. Never in SEAs. Use "no regrets approach" now. NextEra trying to site in SEA before policies are in place.
65. Effects on wildlife, cleaning and maintenance, ground and water contamination.
66. Bird and bat kills, effects to local habitats from roads and construction. Eagles, hawks, condors, and raptors are federally protected species.
67. Loss of wildlife corridors, destruction of bird flight patterns.
68. Loss of birds and bats cannot be mitigated - we should not allow industrial scale wind turbines in Los Angeles County.

2. Wind - Aesthetic impacts:

1. Ugly. High visual impact.
2. Huge, if near residences or commercial establishments.
3. Building million-dollar home on family land that has been in family over 100 yrs. (Farming still there). Eyesore.
4. See solar, above. Wind Power is vastly more impactful on aesthetics than solar.
5. Unsightly. Especially numerous towers in concentrated areas. Not desired along ridgelines. Also noisy.
6. SCE [Southern California Edison] poles are there so it would be okay to look at wind turbines. Residential small turbines should be good and okay.
7. Blocking high towers disturbing view.
8. Huge but that's the way they are. Please no strobe lights, few red lights.
9. Eyesore. Noise. Strobe.
10. Unsightly. A decrease in property value. Bothersome lights at night. Fire hazard. Impair fire fighting.
11. Destruction in hill areas of old growth. Erosion from grading. Noise.
12. Viewshed could be impacted.
13. Unattractive, ruins view shed.
14. I think it is a positive and proactive.
15. Affects view shed and converts open space to an industrial use.
16. I like the way wind farms look. They add a sense of environmental sensitivity to the area.

17. Goes against dark sky policy. Cherished unblemished ridgeline views disappear for residents along with birdlife, wildlife.
18. Try to limit the amount of red flashing lights.
19. Killing birds and startling fauna with vibration and hum.
20. Flashing red lights that disturb nocturnal wildlife and mating cycles. Destruction of dark night skies. They are ugly.
21. Definitely negatively impacts Poppy Reserve and rural western AV.
22. Please do not approve a lot of small projects in a hopscotch pattern where people will see them in all directions.
23. Reduction of views; large spaces needed/used.
24. Visual impact.
25. Not something I'd like to look at every day.
26. None for me - some day we will be proud of our adjacent turbines.
27. I personally like them but I'm in the minority.
28. Visual blight. Fire and transmission of energy to utility grid.
29. Yes.
30. If done right it could not even be seen. With all the pluses we could get it just seems right.
31. In view of the proposed low density I don't believe there will be significant negative impacts.
32. Strong consideration for noise and nausea from windmills. Heat and reflections from solar panels.
33. Redesign windmills to blend in better.
34. Unsightly near residential.
35. Underground lines.
36. Huge- sound, sight, night sky (lights), grading, roads, transmission lines- seen for miles and miles.
37. Not attractive, but no suggestions.
38. Disturbance of mountains. Blocks long views of area. Overhead utilities.
39. Lighting affects people at night. Also impacts Air Force/testing. Dark skies will be gone.
40. They are ugly and noisy, cause stress.
41. Do I have to draw a picture. Not pretty in the beautiful countryside. The impact at night with the light.
42. Shall require special tax assessment. With tax income to be spent in 50 miles of wind generators.
43. Blinking red lights. Destruction of hill tops. Never in anyone's plans when choosing rural design.
44. Projects should not destroy or impose upon the beauty of our open spaces.
45. Very unsightly. Noise.
46. Lights at night in natural-rural areas. Appreciate night skies as well.
47. Ruins the viewshed, both day and night (flashing red lights). Ridgelines destruction.
48. Significant.
49. Significant.
50. Complete eyesore on flat land areas.
51. I think this to be obvious, particularly to anyone who has come to love our valley.

52. I think trees and rocks belong on mountains, no 500' wind turbines with 100' diameter footings.
53. 50 story towers are butt ugly. Lights at night – no dark skies.
54. Limiting of our mountain view resources, dark sky resources.
55. Major footprint.
56. No big wind turbines. Don't want to look at them.
57. Bad from visual.
58. SEA, recognized by Los Angeles County in 1981-1983.
59. These are high impacts to desert-scape.
60. Very intrusive and can't avoid seeing. Lights affect dark skies.
61. Visual blight on the valley. Excess negative effect due to high maintenance and inactive towers.
62. Suggest poles/generator painted in a color that better blends with desert colors.
63. Not on ridgelines. Not in SEAs.
64. Heat, noise, design.
65. Destruction of viewsheds protect by General Plan. Flashing red lights.
66. Loss of scenic vista. Intrusive towers. Loss of dark night skies. Noise.
67. Damage to the view shed cannot be mitigated - we should not allow industrial scale wind turbines in Los Angeles County.

3. Wind - Adjacent land use compatibility:

1. Reduction of land value and property value.
2. Again, visibility and noise.
3. Family farms between 1,000 to 2,000 acres and will impact greatly income!
4. Major compatibility issues related to aesthetics.
5. Interferes with radar. Could cause loss of Edwards AFB [Air Force Base] ability to flight test aircraft. Without flight test capability the base could be closed causing a huge economic impact to the AV.
6. Not compatible with homes (noise, sight) obtrusive to scenic areas.
7. Magnetic fields. Noise levels.
8. Not next to the Lake Elizabeth residences.
9. Loss value, foreclosures.
10. Reduction in property values. Lights at night, shadows in daylight. Fire.
11. Incompatible for nearby residents.
12. Agriculture and poppy reserve ruins aesthetic appeal.
13. Just don't want to see them!
14. These larger scale power lines how safety of fire fighting places - leave fox field fly very low when loaded.
15. Renewable energy should not impact adjacent land use.
16. Possibly off-road parks in areas of wind energy parks.
17. Adjacent to homes should not be allowed.
18. EAFB and other aerospace uses. Encroachment on developable land.
19. Could cause problems with flicker affect and blinking red light.

20. None for me but my friends are upset!
21. Not compatible in residential.
22. Decrease property values - future development.
23. Little to no develop - small homes.
24. Not within 2 miles of homes.
25. Because of the very few existing dwellings within the unincorporated areas, the areas should be expanded.
26. Yes.
27. This zoning overlay maps need to be sensitive to existing future development.
28. Noise level of blades - dangerous.
29. Farming.
30. Zones.
31. Zoning.
32. Ruins enjoyment of adjacent properties, impact on residential property values (negative).
33. Keep a necessary "space" from nearest residence.
34. Land disturbance, dust control of roads.
35. No one will buy my property as the turbines are loud.
36. Destroyed for life, no one wants to live on so these.
37. Decrease in our land value.
38. People affected for miles away. Tehachapi windmills coming down into Rosamond area called "Christmas tree (towers?)".
39. Butting up a "wind farm" or "solar farm" to natural areas severely limits natural areas. Natural habitats should not end up like a park in the middle of the city. Impact areas not just physical sites should be given.
40. Make housing development less desirable due to aesthetics, limits other potential uses.
41. Will ruin property values.
42. Significant.
43. Significant.
44. We should keep wind plants in existing area only - ie: Kern Co existing farms.
45. It is dangerous to live close to wind generators, and they cause psychological damage.
46. Lowers land costs.
47. Limiting of rural lifestyle, concerned about commercial life crowding around my parcel, literally.
48. Good.
49. Don't mess with a beautiful area (Portal Ridge area).
50. Agriculture.
51. Negative impact to Edwards Air Force Base operations.
52. Their value is unquestioned – why allow NextEra or Element to forever impact SEA 58 and 57. Portal Ridge is unique. Leave it alone.
53. Lower enjoyment of homes and rural lifestyles and property values.
 - a. The noise and modified air flows caused by the turbines.
54. Buffer zones between utility-scale projects and R1/R2 designations.
55. Not in viewshed of Poppy Reserve.
56. Noise, flicker, vibration impacts to landowners adjacent.
57. Incompatible with farming. Incompatible with rural lifestyle.

58. Damage to scenic view, dark skies, birds and bats cannot be mitigated. Audible noise and low frequency vibration caused by wind turbines cannot be mitigated. We should not allow industrial scale wind turbines in Los Angeles County.

4. Wind - Other concerns:

1. Will they be bringing public water to these areas for these projects?
2. Wind turbines keep getting larger. Once permitted, they replace them with higher, larger turbines. This goes for solar as well.
3. Hum and noise studies lead to depression long term.
4. Noise issues.
5. Kills birds. Recent trend to larger units (towers, blades) increase impacts.
6. I have priority tier one on land and priority 3 tier 3 with SEA/ETA which has existing SCE powerlines on land. How "safe" are the wind turbines for residential and business development on land? Is "land arable" with the large turbines? Size of turbines are a variety of sizes.
7. Interfering with flight paths/instrument. Problem landing emergency helicopters, especially in outlying areas [in] life/death situations.
8. Kings Canyon residences.
9. Tax base land owners selling and moving out of the state.
10. Earthquakes, utility, companies are [?] ecological areas.
11. Impact on military and commercial air: 1) navigation systems; 2) weather and altimeter instruments.
12. Once again I am concerned property owners land values will plummet when they cannot sell their property.
13. Health impacts to nearby residents. 480' towers make using water drop helicopters impossible to use in fighting fires.
14. I own land and if I want wind power on it I should be able to.
15. Will remove foraging habitat and endanger raptor species in or next to high fire severity zone.
16. No local jobs. Fire hazard. Flight paths.
17. An EIR should be done on all projects.
18. Lights on the towers. We like dark skies!
19. Same as solar. Fencing around facilities that will affect or eliminate larger wildlife corridors ie: bear, fox, coyote, mountain lion, fox, bobcat.
20. Policies to preserve open spaces - what is in place? Visitors come from all around the world to see the California State flower the California Poppy since 1903. AV chosen from entire state.
21. Reducing/maintaining flora of desert floor around bases. Blow[s] sand.
22. Fires and blades coming off turbines.
23. Density of large wind machines.
24. Should prioritize solar & geothermal.
25. Damage to view shed. Protect ridgelines. Initial increase in job creation, but not high long-term employment. Impact to fly zone for Edwards [Air Force Base], magn [?] base and China Lake, Plant 42.

26. Hazard to health.
27. Renewable energy is the future. Let's start now. We are sitting on a gold mine.
28. My fear is that 50-100 "noisy" and unreasonable others in outlying areas will limit the Antelope Valleys potential for leading the way in renewable energy opportunities.
29. Again shared impact within counties.
30. Use solar panels in parking lots for public safety. Shade- utilize space like that- incorporated together like at school districts. Why use up open space?
31. Safety?
32. No policy in place regarding setbacks, noise levels, dark skies, animal take, property value protection.
33. Transmission to grid & through grid.
34. Instability of power delivery. Need to consider peaker-plants and their impact. Loss of farm land.
35. Height of turbines prohibit fire fighting wildfires.
36. Too much noise. View destruction. Property devaluation. Increased property tax. Destruction of my rural life as I know it and enjoy for 50+ years.
37. What happens at the tops of the hill will flow down to aquifer, our wells, our water. Money made not coming back to our community. Flashing effect. Noise reduces the natural peace on the westside.
38. Shall require special tax assessment with taxes income to be spent in 50 miles of wind generator.
39. (Solar/Wind) encourages land speculation- make[s] it hard to plan for communities vision for selves.
40. Myriad projects will create an unattractive patchwork across the desert/AV.
41. I have previous concerns with wind energy impeding radar signatures for EAFB [Edwards Air Force Base] FAA [Federal Aviation Administration] (western region air traffic) and Plant 42, possible future Palmdale Airport.
42. Quality of life impacts to residents (safety/noise/etc).
43. Noise of turning rotors. Fire suppression.
44. Extremely detrimental to bats, local bird species, as well as migrating species.
45. Will kill hundreds of animals, threaten our endangered species: bald eagles, golden eagles, tricolored black birds.
46. Current map does not take into account existing transmission lines.
47. Lighting impact disrupting valley floor at night.
48. When these are placed too close to trails, horses can become frightened and this is a safety concern for riders.
49. Decommissioning to dismantle inoperable.
50. It should be considered that this "green" energy is oil dependent.
51. Fires, earthquakes, these things are fragile and inefficient.
52. Lack of sustainability – 30% or 1/3 of costs are shouldered by taxpayers. Broken blades. Doppler radar. Oil leaks.
53. The noise, as I am directly adjacent to a proposed project.
54. Interference with base operations, compliance with red/yellow/green mapping restrictions on height and allowable locations for wind development.
55. Not convinced of usefulness.

56. Increased cost of electricity due to subsidies from the government.
57. Very bad for condor and golden eagle. Read attached federal guidelines for wind projects.
58. Zoning compatibility, rural type design.
59. Loss of land value. Limited access for water dropping aircraft in our Fire Zone 4 areas.
They don't look nice.
60. We should not allow industrial scale wind turbines in Los Angeles County.

Process

1. Process - Permitting:

1. Not in SEAs, otherwise what's the point of having SEAs.
2. Staff up to facilitate process.
3. County should require developers to conduct active outreach to the public.
4. Streamline all processing.
5. County should establish standard mitigations for bio to allow MNDS [Mitigated Negative Declarations] to be used in lieu of EIRs.
6. Interconnectivity timeline is too long. Due to solar rebates/initiative SCE [Southern California Edison] overwhelmed with applications.
7. Should go thru same process as other uses, but impacts can be more significant.
8. Yes permits.
9. County should mandate all residents representatives participate in mitigation.
10. Next tower and project permit should consolidate.
11. "Next light" never contacted people around their project, played off town councils.
12. Combine met tower permit with wind & solar farm permit.
13. EIR should be required for all large projects.
14. It should be streamline and not take too long.
15. EIRs in IBA [Important Bird Area] must be completed. All projects collective must be examined for cumulative impact.
16. The permitting process should be made as efficient as possible without losing the integrity of the process.
17. How long will LA County study the situation before it's addressed?
18. As the process moves along, each step explained at public meetings.
19. An EIR should be done on all projects.
20. Much more outreach to public regarding zoning and how current residents expect to live in the future. It's why we moved there in the first place.
21. The permitting process and CEQA [California Environmental Quality Act] process needs to be streamlined to help expedite the process for properties in Priority 1.
22. Clarify process through out.
23. Clear, easy info to public and developers regarding process and public hearing.
24. Fast track (possible speed it up).
25. Still permitting process.
26. Fast track solar and geotechnic. No time to waste.
27. Unsure of current permitting process.
28. The map is too restrictive.

29. A well publicized and public comment period. Newspapers.
30. Look to the State for some input on the need to expand the project area.
31. Add local T.C. [Town Council] involvement and notification.
32. Small scale [is] less cumbersome in general.
33. Need CUP [Conditional Use Permit]. EIR.
34. Lengthy.
35. Residents should be able to go thru permit process easier.
36. All projects should be stringently scrutinized- full EIR, extensive investigating for environmental impacts.
37. Must be streamlined to allow projects to move forward with less costs.
38. Too long. Lack of single pol [?]in County - have to deal with multiple departments.
39. Put moratorium on the construction until guidelines are in place.
40. The people that live within view of the project should be asked for their input.
41. Yes \$2 million upfront bond.
42. Fells that County by even having "optimal areas" maps are telling people they will get approved.
43. Should include fees to pay for additional public notification.
44. Wind towers should have a very stringent permitting. Require underground transmission from projects to grid.
45. EIR must be required for all utility-scale development.
46. Should not be done without consideration for residents and major negative impact on environment.
47. Residents need to be involved. Proper environmental studies.
48. Needs to have a plan in place to guide all company developments.
49. Do not require EIR for disturbed lands. Can consider cumulative impacts with MND [Mitigated Negative Declaration].
50. Should not allow destruction of undisturbed habitat.
51. Seems some deals are being made in an expedited fashion. Will we regret quick decisions that will negatively impact down the line?
52. EIR must be required for all projects.
53. I recommend a hold of all permit issuance until completion of the Town & Country plan.
54. Let locals know.
55. Need to know ahead of time possibilities. Sometimes the permitting process is way too long.
56. Need established detailed process which addresses all environmental aspects.
57. EIR.
58. Map should indicate existing zoning and impact if solar is not consistent with zoning. Conditional use or zone change needed.
59. Allow full EIR with emphasis on effects to the whole Antelope Valley, not just their property.
60. If not already required a CUP [Conditional Use Permit] process would help provide studies and public input.
61. No permits in SEAs now or after policy development.
62. Mandate Environmental Impact Studies.
63. No fast-tracking on agricultural land or "disturbed" land. Definite[ly] disturbed.

64. Should not be rubber stamped. Should produce an EIR.
65. Full EIR process should be required for all industrial utility scale energy projects.

2. Process - Public Hearing:

1. Need a broader notices and a larger facility.
2. Need to make sure adjacent homeowners participate. Increase notification areas for specific projects.
3. Yes.
4. Should be in the area of the project.
5. Have hearings closer to home West Antelope Valley.
6. Need hearings in area which is affected ie. Lancaster/AV [Antelope Valley]. Los Angeles too far for most.
7. Public hearing should start early in the process. Antelope Valley residents shouldn't have to travel 60 miles to downtown L.A. to attend planning commission hearings on issues that affect the AV.
8. Hearings for the entire overlay must address the cumulative impact.
9. The public hearing should be made as open and available to all.
10. The more meetings the more ambiguity. Set a deadline for input and keep it.
11. Must have objective long term wildlife and habitat studies (2 years minimum).
12. Make sure you speak to all community councils so more people are in the loop.
13. More public meetings in the North County to reach the unincorporated area residents.
14. Preserve open space. Establish open areas.
15. More public outreach and communication.
16. Local for areas effected.
17. Yes- definitely have public hearings.
18. Need more local advertisement- radio; major local (LA County) news channels (ABC CBS, etc).
19. Yes.
20. More.
21. Yes- not just 'lip service'. Partner with residents 'developers.
22. Yes for wind.
23. Should always be local.
24. Commercial projects- yes. Residential – no only for wind generators (noise).
25. Better public notification- signs placed where public may view. Mail notice to nearest 1,000 residents, not 1000', does not work in rural area.
26. Keep the frequency. We need to hear what is happening.
27. Hold monthly.
28. We were not informed of any.
29. Are our words really heard? And taken into consideration.
30. Yes min of 10 public hearings in facilities that can handle 500+ people.
31. If community is opposed, County should back them- it is not County's job to facilitate any big business, regardless of State pressure.

32. Be held in local areas (to account for increased costs in gas to individuals) and preferably email and mail notification especially to residents who have limited resources.
33. Should be held in AV with the Planning Commission.
34. Yes, as a requirement and held locally.
35. Please advertise and hold meeting when impacted residents can attend.
36. Need to be advertised and all residents in the area must be notified.
37. Discussions about projects should be based on public hearings.
38. Hearings scheduled in downtown Los Angeles. Precludes a lot of stakeholders here in the Antelope Valley. Let's do some hearings here in the affected area.
39. Local.
40. I recommend a public hearing at the very outset of a proposed utility-scale project, not further down the road.
41. More.
42. Good – also important to us to have someone from County to ask specific individual questions for our specific area.
43. Host in suitable facility that will accommodate interested parties. Post documents online prior.
44. Must have.
45. Need more notice to public and way to comment in a rational and safe manner.
46. All companies should hold public hearings as well as visit community organizations.
47. Yes.
48. More transparent process. Hidden notices a pervasive problem with NextEra and Element.
49. EIR must be required.
50. Should be held locally (not Los Angeles). More community hearings.
51. Should be in the Antelope Valley and reflect full EIR process that should be required for all industrial utility scale energy projects.

3. Process - Other:

1. Reduce ability of regional Town Councils to extort money from developers.
2. All Town Councils and interested parties s/b [should be] invited to mitigate with prospective companies. Too often the companies choose who they talk to and who is ignored.
3. Consider using the red, yellow, green map concept.
4. Areas that they could occur not where they are actually occurring.
5. The entire proposed area for renewable projects is in an internationally recognized important bird area.
6. 2020. How much money is being spent trying to cater to everyone's needs. In the meantime money is still going down the drain.
7. More clarity/definitions on the process with outreach to community to help understand where, when and how opportunities exist for public comment.
8. Perhaps hold a meeting at the Del Sur Elementary School or Fox Field Airfield terminal, Lancaster Park Recreation Center.
9. Choose larger meeting place to accommodate overflow: AV Fair Grounds?

10. Don't let these projects scatter throughout the areas stopping other cohesive development possibilities.
11. No choice but to pursue solar. 337u is needed asap [as soon as possible] in areas with most sun and least rain.
12. Less utility scale, more incentive for individual renewable energy.
13. Antelope Valley was always the leader in aerospace development and advancements. It should do the same with renewable energy opportunities.
14. 1) Solar should be considered non structural no setbacks on property lines. Interactive Map.
15. Local community involvement all.
16. Need more detailed map showing street grids.
17. 1) Solar panels on residential roofs should be over the county. No regional planning. 2. Wind should be hearing and regional planning.
18. No projects should be approved until renewable energy ordinance is in place. Rights of individual landowners should not be overrun by industrial energy/government.
19. Town councils should be notified of "all" applications.
20. I do not want wind turbine or solar in the AV. The wind turbines and solar detrimental to rural lifestyle. They pollute the visual beauty of the AV, also the rural life and the life of the animals. Also the zoning should not be changed to large pieces of property to increase all property in the area. No destruction of the SEA areas. They should be left as they are not disturbed.
21. Viewshed taxes should be applied.
22. Mitigation lands should stay in the area.
23. Consider that the federal funding for this project will not determine success and keep in mind what will happen when the project is abandoned. Project not financially viable! This is a grab for Federal money.
24. The project is not viable. Another push for "green" initiatives that are not green. The only green here is the federal grants.
25. Current map does not take into account existing transmission lines.
26. Allow smaller companies to get equally paid for electricity supplied to the grid.
27. All projects should abide by all Community Standards Districts in surrounding areas.
28. Require EIR on all projects.
29. Have a direct contact with co. re questions.
30. Other ways to have input count than public meetings which can be intense and intimidating to speak at given how emotional this topic can become.
31. Stop all projects until overall effect to valley are known. If we don't know don't proceed.
32. Move hearings to location where project is being sited.
33. Streamline process where possible. Slow process where necessary (i.e. impacts, environmental, public input).
34. Mitigation should stay in area. Communities should have weighted impact and decision making ability when projects are proposed for their areas.
35. Each home and business in this area should be supplied with a solar or wind system (free of charge) by the energy companies that exploit (or use) our areas land for the benefit of other cities.

PART II: ANALYSIS OF DRAFT MATERIALS

Directions: A draft map, goals, and policies were developed to provide a starting point for further discussion on how to address utility-scale renewable energy projects in the unincorporated Antelope Valley. Please provide feedback on these materials.

Draft Renewable Energy Production Priority Map

1. Are there other factors that need to be included in the map? If yes, what others and why?
 1. More flood zones- have more detailed of markings in maps.
 2. Topography! Example: windfarms are huge areas. On steep hills their construction needs dense road patten and major grading creating a big eye sore.
 3. Hydrology- major flooding potential flood zones.
 4. None- there are already to few areas available for renewable development.
 5. Existing residences, existing land uses (AG, Livestock, Grazing, etc) as impacts can be significant. Flood zones could impact solar. Scenic areas- Lancaster Road is very scenic, perhaps it should be designated as a scenic highway.
 6. Current residents in the West Antelope Valley need some growth/business areas. Despite significant population increase (according to last census) zoning/Town & Country does not provide proper zoning for community development! Way too little commercial/industrial zoning!
 7. Priority areas should be based on existing protected open space; existing residential areas; Scenic Resource Areas; protection of significant ridgelines, existing SEA's and ETA's, and connectivity between existing open spaces and the Angeles National Forest. This map does not reflect these priority.
 8. More cross streets, very hard to locate areas.
 9. Few more landmarks, extending more roads, adding bodies of water ie. lake aquaculture, migration corridors.
 10. There needs to be more detail like roads landmarks canyons. There should be a migratory overlay.
 11. Elizabeth Lake and Lake Hughes needs to be protected migration corridors. Need clearer road map for identification.
 12. How long the lands have been unused.
 13. Safety hazards including seismic zones, fires zones, and other hazards. Scenic values- scenic resources areas importance of habitat for regionally significant biological species.
 14. It is okay for a draft.
 15. No wind solar energy projects should be located within 9 km of breeding pond sites (Holiday lake, fairmoth reservoir & Quail Lake).
 16. I would like to see the map being more clear as to where the different Zones are. I can locate a land area based on the streets and avenues. Without those clearly defined, it is difficult to understand.
 17. Staying within power corridors.
 18. Identify lakes, inhabited areas, current power infrastructure.

19. Be more specific in outlining areas where projects are permitted.
20. Show the communities involved, on the map. Make roads noticeable.
21. Identify all parks and reserves. More maps with greater detail. I would like to see boundaries for light sensitive and low light areas to be preserved for dark sky observation so generations to come will be able to enjoy our star filled night skies.
22. Identify all wildlife/flower sanctuaries and reserves ie. AV California Poppy Reserve. Identify communities: Antelope Acres, Neenach.
23. Yes, there are several properties with existing solar options. A large amount of money and time has been invested. This should be considered. Adjacent uses should also be considered.
24. Identifying the Poppy Reserve and Ripley's property would be beneficial, but identifying too many details could be more confusing.
25. The map is confusing. The 'Zones' show priority "transmission corridors"(?), but not priority project areas. We should be focusing these projects in areas that allow development in other areas.
26. Water availability s/o aqueduct areas that are naturally more windy.
27. Yes wind turbines will disrupt residential areas with the flicker effect and blinking red lights. The map should indicate residential areas and keep wind turbines away from the sight of residents.
28. Edwards isn't a sacred cow. Edwards needs to participate in installation of utility scale renewable energy adjacent to their existing infrastructure. Edwards has room for houses, buildings and people. They have room for renewable energy.
29. Available access to municipal water must be addressed in all land use plans to allow "land use" and avoid litigation.
30. It would be better if you could quantify the number of acreage per zone and the currently proposed permits submitted/applied for- number of projects- large scale.
31. The map appears to only allow for a small area of solar & wind production.
32. Water resources.
33. It is too vague. It need[s] to be a larger area.
34. Yes. You need to include an overlay for the Renewable Energy Production Priority map that clearly and accurately depicts the streets and landmarks so that the boundary of the proposed designations can be determined. It is too restrictive.
35. I'm only interested [in]migration corridors. The impacts on rodents, squirrels, rat population and bats don't concern me.
36. Address corridors of military- Edwards, Plant 42.
37. 1. More detailed map 2. Information on changes when and if they occur sent to people on contact list.
38. Residential properties, existing trails, burrowing owls? Other endangered species? Larger buffer between State parks, SEAs, County parks, etc. Zone 1 and 3 shall not touch animals plants don't read maps hard to root [?].
39. Specific designations of solar projects. Specific designations of wind projects.
40. Does not reflect burrowing owls located in western portion of desert.
41. Zoning may be too varied, perhaps limit to general zones, such as heavy agriculture and industrial.

42. Better outlines of proposed areas. Freeways and streets are not visible. It should show the SEA zones and protected areas.
43. The concerns of the communities' affected need more detail to show the communities- rural communities.
44. Posted safe zone for out of control windmills. Propose good blocks for shutting down road in the event of out of control windmills.
45. Seismic, hillside slope (topographic info).
46. Impact areas: Site for solar/wind/etc must extend to show the areas that are impacted by projects- visually, aurally, wildlife, safety, property tax impact on residents/business location of schools, homes similar to the way (cities not incl too).
47. Streets- mile markers. Show areas where wind would be allowed specifically. Show areas where solar would be allowed specifically. Show current transmission lines & those appr. or close to appr.
48. Map needs to have "zoom" of just AV to provide clearer picture of our area and have larger labels to read. Also, map could have existing efforts included (solar panels, wind towers, transmission lines). Add Poppy Reserve as area- parks- local land in parks- Apollo park.
49. Priority areas should be based on existing protected open space, existing residential areas, scenic resource areas, protection of significant ridgelines, existing and proposed SEAs and ETAs and connectivity between existing Antelope Valley protected opens spaces and the Angeles National Forest. This map does not reflect these priorities which are clearly stated in the land use element of Town & Country Plan.
50. First and foremost, realize that these lines are arbitrary and there an no hard lines to "significant ecological areas." Islands of significance will be destroyed when cut off from surrounding habitat by these large scale projects.
51. Total nonsense. Migration routes and habitats of wildlife do not follow "a map."
52. Reconsider use of CREZ [Competitive Renewable Energy Zones] as base. Start with local issues (compatibility with land use; wildlife/environment concern; adjacency to existing transmission and substations, disturbed land).
53. We should also see where the electricity being produced will be consumed. Detriment/prosperity.
54. Map needs to be more specific, street names. People should be able to locate exactly where they live on the map. Delicate ecological areas are not sited on the map.
55. The map appears slightly out of date. Some sensitive biotic areas are not accurately represented. Doesn't show the scenic and protected open areas.
56. Yes, the map is out of date, does not reflect sensitive biotic areas, does not accurately reflect SEAs and conservation areas; does not reflect scenic and protected open areas.
57. Human resource. What about the local landowner, neighbors to "big energy" projects. We need to maintain respect for the little guy, who enjoys a rural lifestyle and doesn't wish to be surrounded by industrialism. Let's find more suitable areas for renewable energy.
58. Be more precise.
59. Save the SEA areas. Do not let energy into these areas.
60. Areas better delineated.
61. Red, yellow, green map which addresses wind development under R-2508 and R2575 flight areas. Include a wind turbine exclusion zone.
62. Outline all SEAs with name (number).

63. Proposed zoning changes to present zoning and how it would impact landowner costs.
64. General distance from urban areas to utility-scale projects. Suggest projects be as far from concentrations of urban developed areas.
65. Map needs major rework. All areas that connect SEAs to each other must be in same category as SEA because lack of connectivity.
66. Add water locations and type (aqueduct, lake, reservoir). Map site specific and label cities for easier read.
67. Scenic areas, scenic highways and roads. Audubon Important Bird Areas, well-studied connectivity corridors to Valley floor and forest. Portal Ridge, Special Resource Areas, Hillside Management Areas, Significant Ridgelines. There are other species that will be affected.
68. The map needs more detail as to roads. Wildlife corridors should be contiguous, not broken up.
69. Production Priority Map does not reflect coordination with policies stated in the Land Use Element (Chapter 2 of the Town and Country Plan) which emphasizes:
 - Importance of environmental resources
 - Safety hazards including seismic zones and high hazard severity zones
 - Importance of habitat for regionally significant biological species and
 - Scenic value to residents

Specifically, the Land Use Element states that the "primary benefit of these areas is that they provide habitat for regionally significant biologic species while simultaneously providing scenic value to residents." Map does not reflect these stated goals.

Further, the Production Priority Map does not reflect coordination with policies stated in the Conservation and Open Space (Chapter 4 of the Town and Country plan), page 26 which states *"In order to serve the Area Plan's Vision Statement, the Antelope Valley will continue to include many open spaces that are undeveloped or developed with exceptionally low intensity uses that respect natural environmental landforms and are compatible with open space uses. When growth occurs, this Element will direct sustainable development to suitable locations in rural town areas and rural town center areas with existing infrastructure, protecting natural areas that provide sources of material and scenic value, as provided in the Area Plan's Rural Preservation Strategy. The future economic resiliency of the Antelope Valley requires careful stewardship of existing natural resources with a focus towards creative solutions, especially in regard to energy creation, minerals extraction, and agricultural pursuits."*

How will these goals be implemented? (From Vision and Strategy):

 - respect natural environmental landforms and are compatible with open space uses.
 - protecting natural areas that provide sources of material and scenic value

Proposed County energy policy does not reflect this vision stated in the above quote: "The future economic resiliency of the Antelope Valley requires careful stewardship of existing natural resources."

2. Are the tiered zones, intended to provide different priority levels to areas depending on their level of biological sensitivity, a good approach? If not, why?

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Never saw a concern for the golden eagle, only saw concern for squirrels, hawks, turtles.

4. It is an acceptable approach, provided the County offers U to developers who seek to develop in areas with few bio impacts rather than punishments for wanting to develop in more sensitive areas.
5. It seems to be appropriate.
6. Yes in general. However, knowing that tens of thousands of acres will be developed as renewable energy farms, this concern will have to be pushed out (state and federal mandates).
7. The map needs more landmarks and roads for residential safety, fire hazards and seismic zones.
8. Yes, but "priority" for energy productions should be changed to "use" or something like that. Save priority for protection areas.
9. Yes.
10. Priority levels are backwards and therefore confusing.
11. Yes, but they also need to consider large developments outside LA CO [Los Angeles County] and how much desert and open space will be left in SoCal [Southern California].
12. I believe the tiered zone approach to be a good one.
13. How are you determining what is living in each specific zone. Is it generalized? I worry small samplings will be reflective of large geographical areas.
14. Priorities are confusing- high priority might imply land should be saved.
15. Ok.
16. It is a good approach but wrong location- there is wind and solar energy potential near the city which has been ignored. Solar can be placed on buildings & parking structures.
17. There should be maps including the other elements of concern that can be overlapped, such as flight patterns.
18. Yes and no- need to establish priority of community needs.
19. They are a good approach but I am mystified as to how SEA area can be completely surrounded by high priority areas and areas that have not been prioritized.
20. Map should illustrate all build/no build areas.
21. A bit confusing "high priority" from who's perspective.
22. Make sure new wildlife surveys are performed. Ask for input from local nature groups and bird watchers. People that live in the area are more likely to observe different species on a daily basis.
23. No- does nothing to inform how open spaces will be, need to be protected.
24. Yes, however the entitlement process for each zone to be better defined.
25. Yes, I think it's a good approach. The desert tortoise is clearly endangered and wind energy definitely affects bird life.
26. I like the approach & tiered zones. It needs to be clarified that it is for the transmission zones not 'project' siting zones.
27. Yes. But don't block out areas where the problems can be mitigated.
28. Yes, good approach, but there needs to be further research and input at to the sensitivity of the areas. I feel the green area along Johnson Rd should be purple or orange. I feel wind turbines should not be allowed on ridge tops or near ridge tops. Not only does it disrupt virgin lands to the sites.
29. Yes.

30. "Unknown" presumed to be more sensitive to adjacent unincorporated LA County south of Kress [CREZ] zone. Needs revision to be more accurate.
31. Tiered zones are a good approach; however need better explanation on how the zones were determined, who conducted the studies their affiliations, etc.
32. I have some concerns about the approach.
33. Yes, in my opinion the sensitive areas need to be broadened. Underground utility would be preferred!
34. Less impact on the A.V. area is good. We do not need more houses. We need to utilize our natural resources. Which are wind and sun. The sun shines 300+ days a year.
35. They are part of a good approach. However, the proposed "biological sensitivity" should not be the sole determining factor and possibly not the most important consideration. Also the County should weigh the employment opportunities and whether or not there are any other realistic development opportunities.
36. I agree with this concept.
37. Sometimes I believe that too much study on EIR of ecological 'worries' is overdone. I would only be concerned about population on the extinction list.
38. I think so. Renewable Energy affects us all- humans animals, water, aesthetics- it all overlaps we all live together in community.
39. Tiered zones beneficial, however looks too wide i.e. other areas available.
40. Tiered zone too restrictive- no topography- need other zoning criteria- scenic resource areas not indicated.
41. Yes.
42. Yes.
43. Yes.
44. Yes, they show the areas fine. Should show protected areas such as SEA, etc.
45. Yes but needs to be agreed on by residents and Town Councils.
46. Not realistic - as animals are driven from one area they inhabit new areas, example burrowing owls now prevalent in Antelope Acres after last building booms in West Lancaster.
47. Must cover area fully with suggestion 1 [Impact areas: Site for solar/wind/etc must extend to show the areas that are impacted by projects- visually, aurally, wildlife, safety, property tax impact on residents/business location of schools, homes similar to the way (cities not incl too)]. Incorporated and people population include project population in 20 years. Zone 4 zero priority.
48. With so many overlays it is hard to read the map. Provide interactive map show each larger on the website. There is so much on this one map it is hard to be sure I am reading it correctly.
49. Yes but again, it's difficult to determine exactly where these are- need map just for AV. Tiered zones work-but solar and wind are different technologies not easily intertwined. Is there a proposed map that shows areas for solar and areas for wind?
50. Only as a base, since each area has a variety of biological issues unique to that location.
51. No. Studies are lacking in coverage and information. Lines do not exist in the real world!
52. No this map is not based on real life. What were they thinking when they drew this?
53. No. See comment above [Reconsider use of CREZ (Competitive Renewable Energy Zones) as base. Start with local issues (compatibility with land use; wildlife/environment concern;

- adjacency to existing transmission and substations, disturbed land).]. Also tiered zones insinuate that there actually is a priority, but it's been repeated that map doesn't exclude area outside map.
54. That would depend on just how much strength these considerations actually have, but yes biological diversity absolutely need to be considered and it should be understood that we may affect areas in unseen ways.
 55. No, the high priority areas are already in use with transmission lines so they cannot be used anyway.
 56. Yes, but the tiers are not accurate.
 57. Yes, but they're not accurate.
 58. I believe a better approach would be to consider the rights of the local neighbor, consider the value of our people. Not allow permit issuance unless all landowners' (within 1,000 ft) concerns are 100% mitigated, including the landowner signing off with the city [County] that they are satisfied with the mitigation. Let's respect our landowners as well.
 59. Not clear.
 - a. Okay.
 60. It's a good start. Other factors need to be equally measured and weighted.
 61. Afraid that low level areas may actually be a lot more sensitive to environmental impacts and needs to be further explored.
 62. A start but needs expansion and better definitions.
 63. Tiered zones identify better/worse site, but how is the County going to encourage the use of higher priority sites?
 64. I am concerned about the resources used to indicate areas of biological sensitivity. To a degree, yes, it is a good approach. The CREZ map only "indicates," not dictates areas suitable for utility-scale development. How about an "infill" approach so Los Angeles can develop more of their resources so these utility-scale projects are not necessary, or they can be built in city industrial areas. If these projects are "green" why do they destroy so much habitat and viewshed?
 65. Unsure. It's pretty confusing and unclear how this works.
 66. Placement of tiered zones do not reflect biological sensitivity. They need to be changed to provide protection to existing open space, view shed of public parks and rural communities; wildlife connectivity to the Angeles National Forest of existing protected open space; and provide other measures that protect the rural character, dark skies and peace of the rural areas of the Antelope Valley.

3. Other comments:

1. As you develop these areas will you be bringing more public utilities to the area.
2. Very concerned for all plant and animal life and habitats. Lancaster Road should be banned from any power lines. Solar and wind generators is a scenic resource- ie policy C/OS 13.4**
3. Map is not clear regarding status of "unprioritized" areas.
4. Some areas indentified with environmental concerns (known habitats) may not be completely accurate. What about Golden Eagles? There are eagles in the West Valley, but

- no habitat identified. Areas of Valley are very scenic- Lancaster Road should be considered as a scenic highway.
5. Too little input from rural communities. Perhaps specific zoning requests can be made. Some properties have industrial building on them and you are trying to make them rural.
 6. Maybe LA Co isn't suitable for large energy projects such as wind/solar. State needs to be concerned in entirety not just counties.
 7. I think the development of renewable energy is an outstanding use of barren land. It should not be impeded.
 8. Show more roads or towns. Hard to locate things on this map.
 9. Needs more streets.
 10. It is not true - there will be little to no renewable energy jobs once the projects are complete. Development is highly specialized and typically utilized out of state employment.
 11. What companies have already applied to develop and the boundary of their proposed developments?
 12. Rural lifestyle is one of the most endangered things in LA County- please preserve it!
 13. No wind turbines. Protect open areas, rural lifestyle. Visitors from around the world come to see our beautiful California state flower (since 1903) the *Escholtzia californica* (California Poppy) jewel of the AV. Present negative health impacts caused by wind turbines and regrets of communities who allowed it.
 14. More meeting and a better defined entitlement process.
 15. Are the projects in the A.V. intended for A.V. use, or would the projects be generating energy for other areas of SoCal? Would there be a cap on how many projects or megawatts generated would be created in the A.V.?
 16. Much like a 'master plan' project, transmission areas and development areas need to be identified.
 17. There is a new technology just coming available that will utilize the wind for energy with not moving parts. Please make any wind farm company use the latest technology. My impression so far has been that the companies in the permit process right now do not care about our area. They are only here for the money they will make. Please check out Accio Energy for the newest technology of utilizing wind for production of energy without any moving parts.
 18. More focus needs to be placed by government and State initiatives to get renewable on individual home sites.
 19. Goals need to be tied to size of project.
 20. I find the map a bit confusing so I will not comment on it specifically.
 21. The goals, if truly focusing on how to obtain 33% by 2020 are worth supporting. The County needs a larger facility to hold meetings and should require supporters and opponents to share the same tables at these workshops.
 22. I do not want the wind turbines and huge solar plants in the rural areas of Antelope Valley. Continue with the solar construction in town over parking lots, etc.
 23. Not much too comment except we don't want this in our peaceful, beautiful westside! Humans are not considered on this map.
 24. No light on wind mills or in solar facilities.

25. Solar belongs on rooftops, parking lots, etc. Miles of power lines huge substations being built in West AV light up for miles. People consciously choose rural areas LA County is losing what little it has left.
26. Perhaps not quite as negative to those who live near major electrical plants but given the sensitivity of the desert a comparable (percentage) level of impact should be considered especially for homes, schools, hospitals, etc. 20 years is a long time.
27. I would like to see a Countywide map showing other areas within LA Co. that have planned areas for renewable energy- utility scale.
28. SEA areas were put there for a reason. Why are we even considering utility scale construction even close to these sites?
29. Some species such as the Peregrine falcon, tri-colored blackbird (-tricolored black birds are expected to be classified as "endangered"), bald eagles, Swainson's hawks, and many more will be negatively impacted in addition to local residents quality of life and home values for pitifully little return. This project is not economically sound and will ultimately fail.
30. Quality of life will decrease. Endangered species will be impacted dramatically. More people will leave the area. This is going backwards not forwards.
31. Note the current transmission lines on map. Existing substations need to be listed. Not addressing wildlife for other areas- Lake Hughes & Elizabeth Lake area & Poppy Farms (condor/eagle/tri colored blackbird etc).
32. Please make a line showing the placement of the Pacific Crest Trail.
33. Mapping is a good idea, just not sure use of CREZ is best base. Priority for mapping should start with local concerns then overlay State planning.
34. Encouragement of localizing resources should be promoted, due to many reasons, one being higher efficiency due to inductance loss in the course of transmission.
35. Every place on earth untouched by man is sacred. These places are too precious to lose. Man has no right to take any more from this earth than he already has.
36. The map looks good, but I am hearing a lot of concern about the accuracy of the boundaries.
37. These are a good start, but I would have hoped for more accuracy and further along.
38. I recommend a buffering zone around all state parks of at least [a] 5 mile radius.
39. Process of approving a project is way too long (environmental issues, power availability, etc.)
40. Must measure cumulative impact of the potential development(s).
41. Community impact on what they experience in their environment should be gathered and incorporated. People living in the zones know what animals etc their properties contain as well. Also as to soil disruption, etc.
42. In the presentation Planning said we don't know the effects of the projects. If we don't know we don't proceed with any projects until we have a complete grasp on the effects.
43. Is the County considering areas that are less desirable for typical development such as flood zones, etc?
44. I appreciate the layout and presentation of the map (tiering and zoning presentation). I do not believe the map and its presentation (understandability) are a major concern.
45. More area should be preserved for humans.

Draft Goals and Policies

Please see accompanying handout titled, "Review of Draft Goals and Policies."

PART III: MAP, POLICY, AND ORDINANCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Directions: If there is a map approach, policy direction, or development standards different from what is being proposed that you would like to recommend, please describe it below.

Map

Is there a different approach you would like to recommend in developing a map that will be used to guide development of future utility-scale renewable energy projects?

1. Exclude SEAs for utility-scale renewable energy production. Restrict use of wildlife corridor (see linkage maps).
2. No.
3. Concerned if vanity flood zones.
4. Current procedure seems to exclude too much land, for protection of Swainson's hawk particularly.
5. Flood zones. Needs more detail of maps to identify areas more easily. Scenic areas.
6. Get local maps/zoning from the local communities to overlap with all of the other concerns. Supply maps to the communities and let them write in the zoning they would like for each parcel.
7. More landmarks. Connectivity.
8. Map centered on A.V. Not L.A. area. More cross streets.
9. Simplify, make a map of only the concerned area. Show where there are communities.
10. Use different language to identify tiers.
11. Make the main focus areas that should be preserved as open space. Put environmental/ecological values as the highest priority.
12. Work with Audobon California on better placement of projects [to]avoid key foraging and breeding habitat for birds.
13. The grid should be included as well as the substations.
14. I would like to see alternative areas that have already been disturbed and the feasibility of placing renewable energy projects at the alternative areas rather than disturbing untouched, undeveloped land.
15. Show transmitting lines better and roads so we can better see the areas.
16. Identify existing reserves and sanctuaries.
17. The map should be available online in an interactive GIS [Geographic Information System]format to better access the information.
18. Identify current uses (reserves, preserves) etc housing. Landmark roads, aqueduct, etc data on usage.
19. The approach was easy to understand as were the colors.
20. Identify corridors for the transmission of the power. Identify habitat corridors. Identify development areas. Have the large scale maps broken down into closer views to see landmarks. Possibly overlaid on a photo.
21. Water- electric-gas-phone s/o aqueduct to be addressed.
22. There needs to be more detail - roads, residential areas. Acreage in an area, topography.

23. 1) Water south of aqueduct must be addressed in all land use plans. 2) "Utility" scale needs subdivision ie 50 acres, 100 acres, more than 100 acres.
24. With the use of computer technology - show "virtual" impacts – ie virtual map. Comingle land use and energy map.
25. More detail would be helpful. I would love to see the same map posted online with more detail and zoomed in.
26. Map was too vague to make accurate conclusion.
27. Place an APN overlay map with the color coded Renewable Energy Production Priority Map. It is unrealistic to expect stakeholders to make informed decisions when the specific location cannot be determined. Clearly the project area needs to be expanded significantly.
28. I see no military involvement the Palmdale and Edwards area are major flight zones - do they have concerns?
29. Zoning needs to be incorporated.
30. Show existing wind and solar sites that have been built and approved.
31. Solar roads, Calif. Aqueduct, shadow of existing overhead transmission lines. No new development of wind turbine unless directly adjacent to existing facility. Identify scenic resource areas.
32. No.
33. No, the map is a nice approach.
34. The SEA zones should be visible on the map. Pproperty zones should not be changed on a large scale to accommodate utility scale project.
35. Include the communities, the people that live in the areas the projects are affecting. Shouldn't the map be made so that if you are not familiar with the area the map should easily picture the realistic look. Show the springs - site specific.
36. County need a density requirement for solar and wind energy. No eminent domains of property. Must pay 10 times fair market cost whichever is higher.
37. Specifically designate areas for wind and solar. Show streets so we can fully understand. Create map for entire County showing all areas (not just AV) box out AV.
38. Provide a map that depicts where solar would be proposed and have wind locations on same map. They are not location compatible. Show local parks (outside of incorporated city) such as Apollo park, and the mountains. We know they're there, show them.
39. Show where communities lie in conjunction with the various zones. On-line interactive map?
40. Yes, real life in the field studies not plotting data on a map.
41. It is a good approach but doesn't seem to take into account all wildlife (especially fowl-condor/eagle/tri colored blackbird etc).
42. Reconsider use of CREZ (Competitive Renewable Energy Zones) as base. Start with local issues (compatibility with land use; wildlife/environment concern; adjacency to existing transmission and substations, disturbed land). If the base of the map isn't local, then reconsider using a map at all. Map does not consider small utility-scale projects (less than 20). CREZ focused on wind, solar thermal and biomass.
43. One that only allows for production within 25/30 miles of use (majority) of the electricity being produced. When consumers are negatively affected, and conscious of their impact, lower consumption/greener practice is encouraged.
44. The wildlife corridor is represented by a line instead of an area. You need at least 3 points.

45. No, that's fine.
46. I believe we need to acknowledge the rural lifestyle of the residents. There is much talk about animals but what about the people of the area? Let's look into more desolate places for renewable energy. Let's not destroy the appeal of the Antelope Valley as the last rural area in Los Angeles county, with the incoming rush of developers and commercialism. Let's avoid the "bull's eye effect" of the map. Let the developer do the footwork of where they can develop with minimum impact on residents/habitats.
47. Yes, don't develop renewable energy. Topographical map would be better or combo.
48. We are located at 250 Street East and Avenue P. We would like a map to specifically cover our area. On the big map, it is difficult to find our area.
49. Include environmental and residential/zoned areas in "layers" on map. Also proposed transmission lines categorized with above and below ground. Categorize SEAs and number with specific protected concern.
50. The map should show and label some significant county lines and major highways and streets to make it easier to determine boundaries of CREZ and impact areas.
51. Include present and proposed zoning changes.
52. None other than suggestions listed in other sections.
53. Validation process to ensure accuracy of information, legend, layout of map. Online map, more detailed, user-friendly. Google maps can take you down to property level, possibly something along those lines.
54. Intensive community input to change areas that seem to be dictated by CREZ. More detail regarding affected rural communities. More detailed overlays to show communities affected.
55. A more detailed map (roads, etc.) is necessary.
56. Production Priority map needs to reflect geographic areas and land forms. Existing map does not reflect this. Existing map is hard to understand due to lack of recognizable land marks. Planning does not reflect expertise of local environmentalists or consultation with state park representatives or other holders of protected open space. The Land Use element of the Town and Country plan recognizes the importance of Scenic Resource Areas but these areas are not identified or protected by the existing map.

Goals and Policies

Are there additional utility-scale renewable energy project related topics that need to be addressed in the goals and policies? If yes, please specify.

1. Delay current projects until policy is ready. Do not developers exploit the present policy vacuum as [?] utility-scale facilities, siting.
2. No
3. Policies must state that urban improvement such as extensive landscaping and paved roads are neither necessary nor appropriate for utility-scale renewable projects.
4. If water is need (cooling or cleaning), it should be recycled water. Transmission lines in Southwest Valley (Poppy Park) adversely affect the scenic resources. They should not be allowed.

5. Need a policy for people input.
6. Encourage more distributed generations and conservation
7. None
8. Goal to put utility scale projects closer to the end users. Remove from important bird area.
9. There should be a separate but related community workshop discussing energy efficiency in homes as well as lifestyle of end users which could help reducing our energy usage.
10. Make it easier for homeowner as individual to obtain permit.
11. The actual efficiency of the project- the energy return.
12. Promote businesses (including industrial) and residents designing solar features directly into their buildings to decrease major scale industrial size.
13. Transmission lines
14. Not at this time.
15. Clustering of projects, as much as possible.
16. Water s/o aqueduct.
17. The County should be sure that companies wanting to build utility scale renewable energy projects are using the most up to date technologies and their equipment be replaced when better technology comes along.
18. Covering California aqueduct with solar is worth studying further.
19. More emphasis on local consumption of large scale energy projects versus transmitting power long range.
20. Water use and availability concerns.
21. The Antelope Valley has too major resources, wind and sun. If we harness this we could lead the world in renewable energy.
22. Yes please provide accurate information that honestly describes the actual amount of land that can be developed within the project area and the resulting economical impacts.
23. Maybe our population.
24. All lines should be underground.
25. Any requirements that are already law in the area be related i.e. if there is a definite amount of renewable energy that must be generated from the Antelope Valley.
26. Screening of facilities and noise from mills close to residences.
27. The impact peaker plants will have on air quality. Water usage and areas of water availability for non-PV [photovoltaic] development.
28. All the proposed projects should be shown.
29. Our rights of owners of our land.
30. Yes no expansion of existing corridors unless they are undergrounded.
31. Encourage use of state-of-art technology.
32. Address proximity to existing utility lines and substations.
33. Private energy companies should not receive government funding. Edison should not be private. It should be run by the government.
34. Sustainability – what guarantees do we have that these projects, once started, are here for the long haul and not just fly-by-night?
35. All major projects should have an EIR. No projects should go forward until the plan [Antelope Valley Area Plan Update] is adopted.
36. We don't agree with rezoning to please the developer. Equal development standards (one house per twenty acres RL20=one wind turbine/solar panel per twenty acres).

37. Determine most economically feasible and with least negative overall impacts. Rack and stack projects – proven technologies, most power generated for area used, establish ranking criteria.
38. Keep them off SEAs.
39. How zoning is addressed. People bought properties in these areas with certain expectations and both goals can and should be met. Don't steal our agricultural designation.
40. Fire access, screening, and required improvements.
41. Transmission lines (tie-ins) of renewable energy need to be planned and laid in best design to keep short haul and safe transmission.
42. I see conflicts between conservation and open space protections and the promotion of utility-scale energy. Promote distributed generation. Also the dark skies ordinance.
43. All of them need to be looked at to provide opportunity for those affected by these utility projects to have their own solar system.
44. Considerable attention is being placed in Australia and Europe on both the audible noise created by multiple wind turbines and as well as low frequency vibrations that disturb both humans and animals. With the present climate of uncertainty about these issues it is not appropriate for the Antelope Valley to become the testing ground for these technologies. It is impossible to predict the effect that local conditions will have on the noise and vibrations created by these 50 story towers.

Ordinance

Solar development standards that should be addressed:

1. As part of the CUP [Conditional Use Permit] process, require developers to conduct a public program. The County's notifications process is insufficient to ensure the public's concerns are heard.
2. Clear, consistent policies should be established related to landscaping, roadway paving, etc. recognizing that energy projects occur in non-urban settings.
3. No eminent domain should be used for this type of project.
4. Fencing.
5. Fences, to six feet, only simple barbed wire. Must contact local groups.
6. Put native plants under and around the panels. Allow wildlife access through the fences. Little or no lighting.
7. Move projects closer to end user.
8. Permit should be issued "over the counter" for homeowner and not have to go through regional planning.
9. Limited size. Efficiency and cost of various technologies. Solar requirements for new housing, business buildings.
10. Any changes should involve meetings with appropriate community.
11. Directly into new buildings (industrial and residential). Tax breaks for those who choose to retrofit older existing buildings.
12. Use of land under facility, fencing, ground dust, weed control.
13. Encourage them (solar panels etc) as all new construction.

14. Local control of what happens in their area.
15. Make sure companies are using the most up to date technology.
16. State wide standards. Today standards for home solar vary from fire department to fire department. You're lucky you're not a builder and have to deal with the mini fiefdom.
17. Blind lumping of light agriculture in residential is bad. Also doesn't belong in "industrial" should be its own category.
18. Wildlife corridors (fencing), fire, land disturbance, glare.
19. Less utility scale, more local solar. Alcon[?] habitat as much as possible not to be altered or disrupted.
20. They make take up a lot of area.
21. Project should be approved that do not clearly and unequivocally have significant negative impacts that cannot be mitigated.
22. Reflection-concentration, removal loss of natural plant life and ground cooling.
23. Setbacks regional planning fees.
24. Landscaping around projects.
25. Solar roads, California Aqueduct, shadow of existing overhead transmission lines. No new development of wind turbine unless directly adjacent to existing facility. Identify scenic resource areas. Setbacks, fencing, landscaping, wildlife access.
26. Screening.
27. Prefer powerlines sent underground in utility corridors.
28. Should be in the cities where the power will be used. Solar panels can be put over parking lots, etc.
29. All of them. Please post to web for [service?].
30. Fencing should be minimal, not like a prison fence as I have seen with a currently proposed project. Decommissioning plan must be required.
31. Perfect technology for existing paved lots, not disturbance of wildlife and improves quality of life for customers by having shade. Could consider solar in parks on roofs of pavilions.
32. Inflation adjusting decommissioning bonds.
33. Appropriate site location: 1) disturbed; 2) proximity to transmission; 3) compatibility with zone and adjacent land use.
34. Support home use, electrical production.
35. No solar projects should be allowed on undisturbed soil.
36. Maintenance and cleaning standards (chemical concerns). Reflective interference (glare). Construction air quality concerns.
37. Low photovoltaic. Use of portable water, clean and maintain cells and landscape. Use appropriate ground cover and maintenance – no chemicals. Away from preserves and scenic and sensitive biotic areas - 5 mile buffer radius.
38. Increased community awareness of projects through website. Hold on all permit issuance until completion of Town & Country plan. Equal development standards.
39. Higher standards.
40. Height of solar or other renewable structures, use of radio frequencies. Ensure no negative impact to Edwards Air Force Base or Plant 42 operations.
41. Dust control, maintenance, and security.
42. Reflection concerns for airplanes and vehicles. Aesthetic design of plant for neighboring areas. Water consumption use for cooling. Use of designs that do not use water.

43. Not in SEAs at all. Consider cumulative effects of all major projects per CEQA. Not in wildlife corridors, IBAs [important bird areas], prime farmland. EIRs required for all "commercial" projects.
44. EIRs are needed for all large scale projects.
45. Solar is a much better solution for the need to create alternative sources of energy. Ordinances should encourage solar panels on roofs and parking lots, particularly on the large roofs of warehouses and "big box" stores. Industrial solar facilities should be created in a balanced manner that does not disturb the scenic views and the rural character of the Antelope Valley. Adequate mitigation needs to be implemented to compensate for lost habitat. An EIR should be required for EVERY project.

Wind development standards that should be address:

1. Federal guidelines for wind farms.
2. No eminent domain should be used for this type of project.
3. Fire. Wildlife protected. Wildlife. Viewshed.
4. No strobe lights, few red lights.
5. Little or no lighting. No development on ridges or SEAs.
6. Pacific Crest Trail impact not considered.
7. Permit process and noise.
8. I do not believe wind energy to be a viable option.
9. No wind out west of 90th west.
10. Enormous size detrimental to aesthetic value of western AV negative health impact surrounding neighbors - physical distance how far away is safe? And enormous size - the winds here are not consistently strong enough to operate blades continual basics how often will it be idle?
11. Keep in windy canyons, noise issues.
12. Examine potential for joint use, such as off-road vehicle use.
13. Keep the wind where it is, do not establish on the valley floor. The canyons are more appropriate.
14. Local control of what happens in their area.
15. Wind turbines are so inefficient as they exist and the current utilities really don't want the wind turbine energy - they call it dirty energy. I feel it needs to be developed further before it's utilized by companies.
16. Statewide standards. Today standards for home solar vary from fire department to fire department. You're lucky you're not a builder and have to deal with the mini fiefdom.
17. Remote areas only.
18. Visual blight, fire, noise, decrease property values.
19. Same as above, not within 2 miles of existing residences. Not in environmental corridors or areas with diverse habitat and beauty. Not on ridgelines.
20. What will be enough to be efficient.
21. Expand the ability to develop wind opportunities and allow those low impact wind projects to be developed, absent a clear and convincing reason to do otherwise.
22. Psychological impact. Removal.
23. More ordinances? I suppose height and raise would need to be addressed.

24. Should be only allowed near non-residential high density.
25. Noise.
26. Prefer powerlines sent underground in utility corridors.
27. They should be addressed in an area where they will not affect the surrounding areas and life like the middle of Nevada, on the way to Las Vegas.
28. The impact on people! You/they take our water, takes our country peace away by placing the solar and wind and we are left with land that is useless. Wow we don't teach this our children – shameful.
29. All of them. Please post to web for [service?].
30. Develop a red, yellow, green map similar to one in Kern County in conjunction with everyone using this area for flight corridors- China Lake, Pt Magoo, EAFB, Plant 42, FAA to predetermine appropriate areas that won't conflict with their missions to flight test, etc.
31. Away from people- but protect the mountain views. That's part of the character of the AV.
32. Inflation adjusting decommissioning bonds.
33. Wind is just not feasible.
34. Get rid of corporate subsidies.
35. No wind projects should be allowed on undisturbed soil.
36. Maintenance standards (safety/fire hazard). Construction air quality concerns.
37. This is not a sustainable project. 1/3 of the costs are on the backs of taxpayers.
38. Increased community awareness of projects through website. Hold on all permit issuance until completion of Town & Country plan. Equal development standards as defined earlier (RL20 one house per 20 acres = one windmill per 20 acres).
39. Forbid over 40 feet.
40. Wind is not the way to go.
41. Bad in our area from a visual perspective.
42. Wind development near Edwards Air Force Base or within flight areas should follow red, yellow, green mapping limitations.
43. Size and lighting and spacing.
44. Noise, visibility, and destruction of our more beautiful scenery in the valley.
45. Height. Obstruction to local industry and aerospace (Plant 42/Edwards Air Force Base). Noise factored [into] new homes and businesses design. Should be uniform/similar for aesthetic reasons.
46. Not in scenic resources areas, near scenic roads or highways as outlined in Scenic Highway Plan 1974, IBAs [important bird areas]. Not in SEAs.
47. There should be no windmills here.
48. Industrial wind turbine installations are not appropriate for the Antelope Valley. It is not possible to buffer existing communities and existing protected public places to protect against the damage to the view shed, night sky, peace and quiet and to plants and animals created by these 50 story towers. Placement in high fire hazard areas (such as Portal Ridge) would create a horrific fire danger to residents and public parks.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS OR COMMENTS

1. Are you guys interested in buying property with a house on it 10 acre lot?
2. Concerned about cost policy for energy (Edison). At what cost are we saving, especially if we have to look at all the plants i.e. solar/wind.
3. ?? "resources available in North LA County - or Antelope Valley" What does this mean to plan update personnel?
4. Key factors: reasonable, clear and consistent development standards, where possible, projects should be able to implement standard conditions rather than negotiate mitigation measures.
5. Job creation is only temporary, these types of projects, especially PV solar, require very little long term jobs. Even though not open to the public Shea Castle is a significant resources (historical, cultural & scenic).
6. I want resident and business small turbines for winds and solar several panels on homes or business.
7. Hire and train local residents for these jobs.
8. Addressed this in other comments. Land Planning meetings should be local not Downtown.
9. I am concerned these large renewable companies are doing this just to mitigate carbon used by investors in these companies.
10. If we have a good source of wind and solar we should use it.
11. The west Antelope Valley/Leona Valley. HCES 50' of the population of the So. Cal tricolored blackbird a species of special concern that is pending reclassification as federally endangered; this is the type of large scale plan impacts their breeding and foraging habitat. Projects need to be addressed together with cumulative impacts; current & pending proposals cover 15,000 acres of land in the important birds area. Disturbed farmland is TCB habitat. Not enough time to write all of my comments- I will send additional commentary in the near future.
12. Wind power for individual homeowners should be subject to regional planning. All of this is moot- the existing power companies are going to have the last word anyway! Protect the integrity of the Pacific Crest Trail! Next time use a larger facility. Typical county policy to make map as hard to discern as possible to create miscomprehension.
13. Renewable energy projects tend to do just the opposite of what they are trying to accomplish. Instead of preserving and protecting what we already (still) have, we look to areas that have not been developed, not touched and areas where wildlife is still present and undisturbed. There must be alternative sites where these projects can be located – places where the land has already been disturbed and wildlife impact is minimal.
14. Adopt a policy that states that local contractors have priority and preference to building contracts. Define areas on map that better indicate the build/no build areas as in a legend.
15. Next meeting control the noise, couldn't hear people at our table.
16. Zoning not allowed resid [?] open space zones. R-1 R-2 permitting heavier industrial zones, heavy ag, indust. Calif Environmental Quality Act. Map id optimal areas for utility scale renewable energy projects does not preclude any areas environmental sensitivity. June 2008 community vision mtgs 20 yr process will reassess solar energy thrive instead of wind farms. Impact on birds habitat loss, lack of jobs. In 20 years will we regret decisions to

- allowed projects to be built now (for future generations) to protect rural lifestyle, tranquility of our open spaces & reserves (Poppy Reserve) of which people come to enjoy- they come from many countries. The AV Calif Poppy Reserve chosen site from our entire state to preserve for many generations- how can destruction to such an area be regretted in 5, 10, or 20 years?
17. Does this input have any affect on the zoning put into the next county general plan? Please continue to have meeting that apply to the A.V. up here in the AV. A larger room would obviously be a benefit if attendance continues at this level.
 18. Need to have more and earlier public meetings in the Antelope Valley on projects. Not just as a part of the CEQA process.
 19. State, Federal, Legal subsidy for individual and small project (tax breaks). Cover aqueduct with solar panels. Would have no impact. Loss of water thru evaporation and dumping into aqua. People first not squirrels. We can see what the delta smelt has done to water in California. 10 year contract instead of 20-30.
 20. I am doubtful of [Department of Regional Planning] DRP's ability to make an impact on the renewable energy process. Since 2007, Town and Country meeting have been underway, recommendations have been made, but action by County agencies have been zero. Specifically, Elizabeth lake (pop 2000+) does not have a community park, not bike lanes. I forsee the tear up of my area from renewable energy will happen without any sway from DRP. The renewable energy steaming roller is moving. Step back.
 21. 1) Water availability must be considered in all land use plans. Land without water must have viable used of it constitutes a taking. Litigation over water rights currently will impact solar policy. 2) would like to see 10 year contracts instead of only 20 years.
 22. Try to locate consumption of locally generated power as opposed to transmitting to other locations. Ease of use of website (DRP). Night skies was not addressed-preservation. Need larger revenue for those meetings/workshops.
 23. I recommend the County work with the State (DRECP) to work together so the policies of siting alternative energy development are coordinated an effectively maximized to achieve the State mandate by 2020. The map as presented eliminates most of the high wind areas - too restrictive.
 24. Incentives for pursuing wind and solar power, rather than utility scale projects so that the power is at the source-use of power, rather than transmitted from one district or location to another. This would have less of an environmental impact - large banks of solar or wind will destroy a natural area's habitat and migrating corridor foraging and the balance of life, etc. Thank you. To best understand my comments "utility scale" the term as applied in my comments are stand alone utility projects- not personal use alternative energy, and not projects on existing buildings such as solar banks on costco, example.
 25. Expand the project areas where wind and solar can be developed. The "proposed" area is ridiculously small for this large area with so much renewable energy potential.
 26. Many renewal projects from dams to windmills can/will become obsolete in time (6 transistor radios & mechanical adding machines). It is imperative that when long longer productive- transmission lines - power producing unite and support facilities be removed and restored to near original condition. (Plants & wildlife) (creeks & streams)
 27. Not enough time to discuss. Room too small to accommodate us. Too noisy cannot hear each other or even think. Send out or make available on line before meeting these

handouts to complete so when we get together we can have more productive meeting-discussion.

28. What about the Joshua Trees? How will they be preserved?
29. Good start. Because of current applications and projects pending timing is necessary.
30. I do not want the wind turbines on Portal Ridge or in the AV. The [telocopies?] have been destroyed, the height that are [immodated?] at night are very annoying, very stressful. Put solar panels where the power will be used, in town, over parking lots, roofs, etc. and a better engineered product that actually produces more power than the ones that are now used. Eminent domain should not be used to further the development of other's private interest.
31. When I RSVP I did so for 10 people, I was not contacted further for more info on these reservations. When I arrived I only had 1 seat reserved, I should have been contacted so I could have gotten all 10 seats I should have been contacted so I could have fixed my reservations for the entire 10 seats. If you could only do one RSVP at a time that should have been stated in original email. Thank you.
32. Is there any such thing as individual property rights? This will provide shade - why not cover parking lots with solar? Line the corridor of the 14 fwy with wind towers. Place the wind towers away from communities. Why not all the open areas on the way to Las Vegas? Love the idea of sharing but will they really be considered. The people are clearly saying no solar no wind in our rural areas. Thank you. Is there such a thing as individual property rights? These projects make one feel like there is not.
33. Tax the companies like you tax the residents to discourage development. Building energy plants in LA County should be less acceptable not the norm.
34. Impacts not just mitigatable- becomes "move away" or "get used to it" attitude.
35. We need better maps with named streets to understand the full scope of the plan. Utility scale companies should provide a "use tax" to provide a benefit to the community where their project is located as we are giving up decreased potential income from any other use. They must contribute to the grid connection point. Please hold a follow up meeting to today's meeting.
36. Need another map. Map provided difficult to read and to determine location. If this is AV plan, show map of AV for clarification purposes and provide bigger labels. Big concern around table.
37. For time and clarity it would have been good to have access to these worksheets 1 to 2 weeks prior to this workshop.
38. Public safety; fire hazard. Quality of life; home values, the view of our rural communities, wildlife. We are a unique community which many endangered species we cannot abandon this treasure for future generations (now even more than ever) for corporate greed.
39. Follow the money. The State plan for renewable energy is out of balance and not feasible. Do not let us be victims of an out of control bureaucracy.
40. My concerns are how will this affect existing hiking and horse riding trails as the Pacific Crest Trails? Can the PCT be added to the map? Will the PCT go through these areas? I help to maintain the PCT and use it as an equestrian. This is a famous trail running from Mexico to Canada and people from around the world come to hike or ride it. Will there be any chance that the PCT will be re-routed?

41. Kern County has developed a significant amount of programs/process/mitigation/conditions of approval that address several, if not all, issues raised during workshop. I am aware that RRG's EIR for a project in both Kern and Los Angeles County recently published their RTC, so I am sure you are aware of Kern's requirements, but I encourage you to take best practices from neighboring jurisdictions. Bring utilities into the discussion! Have you reached out to Southern California Edison? Bear Valley? Los Angeles Department of Water and Power? Pacific Gas & Electric Company?
42. - I recommend that these utility-scale companies change into companies that produce small units people can put on their homes, and businesses can put them on their parking structures and rooftops. As for wind power, why not put jet-like turbine generators alongside the freeways and use the wind from the constant traffic to generate electricity.
43. You say we are stakeholders but we are never notified and when decisions are made; it doesn't matter what the majority says. We do not live in a communistic community. Why do we have to remind you of this.
44. Put these questionnaires on the internet before the meeting. Too noisy to concentrate on these questions.
45. We have had several solar offers. Is there anywhere in County that can help us determine if the proposal is a fair one without coins to a high-priced "Philadelphia lawyer"?
46. Since 1981-1983 Los Angeles County designated Significant Ecological Areas. The value of these areas has not changed. They should be respected. The monumental effort to place 90 or more turbines along Portal Ridge will destroy this SEA. Why did the County set them up? Post these questionnaires on the [inter]net first.
47. Need to make sure communities affected are compensated for the loss of their standards of living and impact on their homes and environment. Talk about the real issue zoning, etc.
48. A full third party study concerning the impact at all buildout such as: interference to radar, reflected light, excess shading in the desert. The effect of the increased electromagnetic fields over most of the north and west Antelope Valley.
49. Require environmental impact reports prior to ground break. Require contractors higher a certain percentage of local community for personnel to construct and maintain facilities.
50. Require construction contractors build on time and on cost or be penalized. Require work to be up to standard not subpar to meet the timeline. Possibly require contractor to warranty work for reasonable period of time to ensure quality work. Mandate timelines (and enforce) for correction of any violation during construction or during operation of plant.
51. Post worksheets online prior to meeting so we can have more time to review and formulate ideas prior to meeting. Better surveys of sensitive areas and mitigation monitoring. Don't permit if studies have not been done specifically for a project. Don't use "feasible."
52. Goals and policies are not easily understood. Would like more clear cut interpretation of these. It doesn't sound like they are feasible.
53. Local State Park representatives should be included in discussions over revision of the Production Priority Map and County energy policies. There should be better coordination between goals stated in the Land Use Element of the Town and Country Plan and the energy component of the Conservation and Open Space Element. An EIR should be

required for all projects. Utility scale wind turbine installations should not be a part of our County energy plan.