I have been hearing some interesting comments around our community. I finally had to check the source and see if these comments were accurate.

Mis-information: (I would call it what it really is but prefer to give the information purveyor the benefit of the doubt.)

<u>project</u>. There was <u>never</u> a "vote" to "Support" the BMT Solar Project; there was never even a discussion of doing that. From the following email from Supervisor Rowe, we learned that the State had usurped the county's option to refuse a solar project.

From: **Supervisor Rowe** < <u>Supervisor.Rowe@bos.sbcounty.gov</u>>

Date: Mon, Dec 18, 2023 at 9:57 AM

Subject: RE: Solar

To: Newberry CSD < newberrycsd@gmail.com>

Jack,

Thank you for reaching out and I want to assure you that I understand your concerns. In 2019, when I was appointed as a County Supervisor, one of my very first actions was to champion RECE 4.10. Unfortunately, the state legislature recently passed AB 205, a law that takes the authority away from local jurisdictions, including the county, to determine appropriate siting for solar projects. At this time, the California Energy Commission is able to completely override RECE 4.10 and ignore the will of the people and the Board of Supervisors. I actively opposed this bill and urged the legislature to oppose it. Since the bill was passed into law, local jurisdictions have been fighting the state in court. In fact, at my direction, San Bernardino County submitted a comment letter in support of Shasta County while they fight against a project called the Fountain Wind Permit, which the county had denied, and the state overturned.

I will continue to stand by our RECE 4.10 policy and have directed Land Use Services Director Mark Wardlaw to do the same. Unfortunately, the state has the authority to override our decisions to keep these projects out of communities. I encourage you to contact your State Assemblyman Tom Lackey to encourage him to fight against AB 205 at the state level.

Thank you,

Dawn Rowe

Our Board based our appeal on this information. We worked to lessen the effects of the construction that the BMT Solar Project might have on our community. And if the county follows through on what they promised, we have succeeded.

We saw no reason to "demand" from the County what they could not do. We must address our siting concerns with Assemblyman Lackey.

As far as being the CSD's responsibility to stop the solar projects, it is not only <u>our</u> responsibility. I was looking for the hordes of Newberry Springs Community Alliance members to appear and let their voice be heard but I guess they had laryngitis that day.

<u>Director Deel also flipped on the Daggett Solar Project</u>. I was at the Board of Supervisors meetings supporting the protest, where were the hordes of Newberry Springs Community Alliance members. I do not recall "members" at any of the meetings.

As far as the <u>lawsuit</u>, per attorney's orders, we can say nothing.

Burn Permit Increase: Obviously, we did not give enough information for the \$5 increase. We wanted to be able to pay our employees to retain them.

<u>Director Stipend Increase</u>: This was recommended during budget preparation and included in the budget. Research was done as to the stipends received by other districts. Most were over \$100/meeting and not just CSD meetings but all meetings they attend on "District" business. They also use the expense reimbursement provision. Rarely does a NCSD Director request reimbursement for mileage or lunches paid for from personal funds.

Policy Updating: We are required to review our policies.

And finally, the "editor" of the Newberry Springs Community Alliance may not want Director Deel on the NCSD Board but if you look at the election results you will see that the community does not agree with the "editor".