

From: Irene Falor <irenefalor@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 2, 2019 12:04 PM
To: CEQAResponses <CEQAResponses@co.humboldt.ca.us>
Subject: Humboldt County and Non-Fossil Fuel Energy Production

Objective: Reduce Fossil-Fuel Use and Produce More "Clean" Energy!

I have just read the article in this week's North Coast Journal, concerning the proposed "Wind Farm" for Humboldt County. I have lived in this county for 67 years. I was born into a home heated only by burning local timber, and powered only by a windmill. Consequently, I have many life experiences, in Humboldt, to draw upon.

Once upon a time, in the distant past, CA building authorities required that new structures be insulated and use only dual-pane windows. This worked itself into place quite effectively, and reduced our "carbon costs" for heating, simply by increasing the amount of produced heat we could easily restrain from loss. This change in building regulations efficiently reduced the amount of energy we needed to use.

However, at this point in our county, CONSERVING energy is NOT enough! We need to change the SOURCES we use to provide that energy. It is urgent that we drastically lighten our carbon footprint by turning to non-fossil fuel energy sources that can be obtained with minimal costs and result in minimal emissions. We must do more than just efficiently decrease the amount and replace the sources of energy we use, we need a CLEAN way of PRODUCING even more!

The only viable choices we can now easily turn to are collecting, and using, energy produced by the wind or the sun. So, today, in Humboldt we must, hurriedly choose! Which will provide the most energy, net the highest income to our economy, and have the lowest environmental, social, and visual impact to our community? And, most importantly, how QUICKLY can our "solution" be put in place?

After reading the North Coast Journal article, I am not convinced that the recently proposed "wind farm" should be approved. Even the economic perks of (possibly) buying materials and labor locally, and the employment benefits of the "15 permanent jobs", do NOT make the "costs" of the "wind farm" an acceptable solution!!!

160-1

The article states that the proposed "wind farm" would GENERATE enough energy to serve the needs of "40,000 households", but with significant environmental and societal impact. I find that cost, as explained in this article, to be unacceptable. I believe that our first choice should be solar. With the right motivations, it is well established that solar collection could well out pass the needs of 40,000 households, and do so without ANY detrimental impact!

After detailed thought, it is readily apparent that the proposed "wind farm" is NOT the way to go! Putting our political muscle and individual support behind solar initiatives (first, if not last), provides the BEST choice, on all fronts. Such a solar program could, quickly, be put in place by changing building regulations, and giving large tax incentives for the conversion of existing structures. Speed IS of the essence, and rapid solar conversion should be happening NOW!

New buildings regulations should require that all new roofs be equipped to harness solar energy. The owners of all existing buildings should be economically subsidized to the point that purchasing energy, that they've chosen NOT to produce, would be economically fool-hardy!

Under the existing program of government support, for converting to solar, many homes are not large enough to benefit from this assistance. This support program needs to be rectified! Even if a structure is not large enough to collect all the solar power it needs, the owner should still be rewarded for installing as much solar equipment as possible. The government could then insure that their on-going expense for power that they could not produce would be provided at a very low rate.

Facilities who's solar panels collected even more than they needed, would provide an excess of solar power that could be used to provide for their smaller neighbors. Overall, the government would continue to economically reward those who reduced their levels of use and converted to "all electric" buildings. The



power companies would also "purchase" the excess wattage large facilities produced, and store it in a central depository. In many communities, the infra-structure for collection of excess produced wattage, is already in place, and this energy is being efficiently re-directed.

In enacting such an aggressive solar program, our local economy would benefit from the selling of necessary materials, providing the labor for instillation and up-keep, and reap the bonus of creating new, permanent, jobs for managing the program and storing and distributing the energy collected. Not only that, but real estate values would increase, as our properties became better bargains to out of state buyers looking to all but eliminate energy costs, and reduce their "carbon-footprint" as well!

But, best of all, such a solar program would have NO environmental, social, or visual, impact! Excess solar power would further decrease our dependence on natural gas, and vastly exceed the energy needs of the "40,000 homes" promised by the existing "wind farm" proposal! With the right financial incentives, home-owners would begin installing solar IMMEDIATELY! There would be NO re-purposing wild lands! NO timber clearing! NO new access roads to build and maintain! And, best of all, no blighting of Humboldt's natural beauty!!!

If you "follow the money", you will see that ALL solar instillation and up-keep can be done by small businesses that are already struggling in our community. No behemoth out-side experienced "wind contractor" would end-up lining their pockets with our tax dollars. "Solar" is already a commonly used form of technology, and even compared, dollar to dollar, to "wind farming" it may be cheaper, per watt, to generate.

Personally, I believe our societies, across the world, need to do all we can to save the world we are so dependent on. We MUST reduce our "carbon-footprint", and NO price is too great! But, if we can have all financial costs of doing so return to our local economy, without paying the cost without "uglify-ing" the land, disrupting the environment, and blighting local tradition, then why not choose SOLAR?

Let's keep the business of energy "farming" local! We could each have our OWN solar collection "farm". And maybe even benefit, financially, from the excess we produce. The "profits" of "solar farming" would contribute to our Humboldt County economy. We don't need to fund a "wind farm" proposal. We need our government to provide stronger initiatives for each of us to "go solar". We need our government to help us all "afford" to do the right thing!

Finally, please keep in mind this well-worn adage: "The simplest solutions are often the BEST!" Solar is the way to START. Join me in saying NO to this "wind farm" proposal, and turning all our energies to making an All-Solar-Society a Humboldt reality, NOW!!!

Thank you,

Irene Falor
3470 H St.
Eureka, CA, 95503

Sent from my iPad

I60-1
(Cont.)