

**From:** John Kessler  
**To:** Docket Optical System  
**CC:** David Flores; Mark Hamblin  
**Date:** 10/20/2009 9:36 AM  
**Subject:** Fwd: Re: CESF Visual mitigation

<b>DOCKET</b>	
<b>07-AFC-8</b>	
<b>DATE</b>	<u>OCT 20 2009</u>
<b>RECD</b>	<u>OCT 20 2009</u>

Dear Docket Staff:

Please docket this email to Carrizo (07-AFC-8) and include in the file name, "Robin Bell's Opinion re Visual Mitigation".

Thank you,  
John

John S. Kessler  
CEC - Project Manager  
Office: 916-654-4679  
Cell: 530-306-5920  
Fax: 916-654-4421

>>> "Robin Bell" <[robin@midstateexpo.com](mailto:robin@midstateexpo.com)> 10/16/2009 2:41 PM >>>  
John,

I apologize for taking so long to reply. I like so many others have been out with the flu.

One of the primary reasons we purchased our property was it's spectacular views of the surrounding plain and mountains. We enjoy this view both from our home and while we are using the entirety of our property for outdoor activities. Our lifestyles are such that the majority of the appreciation of our properties scenic vistas are enjoyed while using the extents of our property. The applicants proposal to plant trees a double row of trees near our home would not mitigate their impacts to the outdoor use of our property and would therefore severely detract from a valuable asset of our property. Additionally, trees planted close to our home would limit views from the home of our own property, our livestock and nearby mountains.

Clusters of trees at the projects western boundary would not be as effective as a double row of trees. And while this may be helpful to some neighbors, we are at a higher elevation than the project site which would render the benefits of this type of screening to minimal, if any, results.

The most effective placement of landscape screening would be locations that do not block the expansive plain views from residents property yet offer as much screening as possible to minimize the power plants visual impact. Therefore, for our particular circumstance, I continue to request a double row of trees be planted on the eastern most boundary of our property located at 8410 Highway 58 (our eastern most parcel).

Additionally, the type of trees should be at our sole discretion. We do not want the juniper and cypress combination as suggested by the applicant. The cypress die within 10-15 years and would be a costly removal and the juniper will not get to the required height to adequately block the view of the CESF.

What type of trees really should not matter to anyone. If the CESF can have two (2) 20k sq. ft. buildings standing at a height of 115' and 640 acres of pipe and guide wires standing at a height of 55' on their property it really shouldn't matter what type of tree we select for our property. It would be ridiculous for anyone to suggest a particular type of tree to be planted on our property given the massive power plant they are suggesting erecting on their property. If there is an argument that trees should be indigenous to the area, I argue the massive utility scale power plant they are proposing is not indigenous to the area either.

Of equal concern to us is the screening of the project from Hwy 58. It is imperative that these scenic vistas be preserved, particularly for visitors traveling to the nearby Carrizo Plain National Monument. Massive industrial development at a location so close to a national treasure will detract from their National Monument experience and therefore we also continue to request that visual impacts of the power plant and its laydown area along Highway 58 be fully mitigated.

Best Regards,

Robin Bell

----- Original Message -----

From: "John Kessler" <[jkessler@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:jkessler@energy.state.ca.us)>

To: "Robin Bell" <[robin@midstateexpo.com](mailto:robin@midstateexpo.com)>

Sent: Monday, October 12, 2009 2:40 PM

Subject: CESF Visual mitigation

> Dear Robin:

>

> Does this statement accurately capture your preference for where  
> landscaping could best soften the effects from CESF for your residence  
> located west of the site?

>

> "In August 2008, Ms. Bell indicated a preference for tree planting  
> along her property boundary or the project site boundary, so as not to  
> bisect their property, and at a distance of 100's of feet from their  
> residence (Bell, Robin. 2008)."

>

> The options we are considering to soften the effects, even though we  
> may conclude the impact is significant and cannot be mitigated to less  
> than significant, include the following:

>

> 1) Implement the applicant's proposal to place a double tree line  
> within the property of your residence;

>

> 2) Place clusters of trees along the CESF's west boundary; or

>

> 3) both 1 and 2 above;

- >
- > Please confirm or clarify your preference.
- >
- > Thank you,
- >
- > John
- >
- > John S. Kessler
- > CEC - Project Manager
- > Office: 916-654-4679
- > Cell: 530-306-5920
- > Fax: 916-654-4421