

Fw: Seismic Study evidence for the record
Dan Buckshi to: cr_board_clerk Clerk Recorder
Cc: Kristi Gutierrez

10/29/2012 02:42 PM

----- Forwarded by Dan Buckshi/Admin/COSLO on 10/29/2012 02:42 PM -----

From: "Dr. C. Hite" <aaaptly@gmail.com>
To: dbuckshi@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 10/29/2012 02:03 PM
Subject: Seismic Study evidence for the record

Mr. Buckshi;

For the record:

RE: Conscientious objections to further seismic study on the Central Coast
I am pleased that information from the public is showing up on the County web-site on the important issues surrounding the PG&E Seismic Survey.

Attached: 10 16 12 web deadline.wmv (video)

I am disappointing about inclusion of the public.

I am disappointed that the County web-site has NO new posting prior to 2am on Monday, October 29, 2012, the deadline date for public comment with the Coastal Commission. (See below)

I am disappointed that the public must first *know* there is an agenda item, and must first search for this agenda item to access this information.

I am disappointed that the information hub on the County home page, regarding the Seismic Survey, failed to alert the public of the October 30, 2012, agenda item on the Seismic Study and deadline of October 19th for the submission of information.

I am pleased, that now that the County has produced the Staff Report, and the County will accept public information beyond the Friday Oct. 19th deadline.

I am disappointed that the Staff Report for October 30, 2012, fails to include any information submitted by the public.

It was implied that at least some information from the public would be included in the Staff Report for October 30, 2012, if the Oct. 19th deadline was met. The only mention of the public's input in the staff report, (beyond the location for web postings); is that the public will have an opportunity to comment on "this important community safety issue."

I am disappointed that the Staff Report for October 30, 2012, fails to note the dates and number of times the public *has* spoken with concern and in opposition to the proposed seismic testing, during Board Business agenda items, Consent agenda items and general public comment.

I am disappointed that the County of San Luis Obispo made endorsements and permits were issued prior to the County providing a hearing opportunity to the people of the Central Coast of California, their stake-holder groups, and the many environmental experts.

I am disappointed that as the County Representative on the issue of Seismic Study; Dr. Gibson did NOT continue to see to it that the public had a Skype com link, for self representation, beyond the one link for public comments before the California Lands Commission.

I am disappointed that our County Representative, on the issue of the Seismic Survey, does NOT appear to be a neutral, un-biased representative.

I am disappointed that as the public record will bear out; the public has been interrupted and criticized for opposing Dr. Gibson.

I am disappointed that Dr. Gibson has telegraphed his position on the issue of public comment on the Seismic Study by being verbally dismissive; stating there were *inaccuracies* in the public's comments.

I am disappointed that Dr. Gibson attempts to emasculate men, who bring forth an opinion; critical of projects Dr. Gibson supports.

I am disappointed that women appear to be singled out, disproportionately, as unpleasant or rude.

I am disappointed that when other Board members state their opinion on issues to which Dr. Gibson has a vested interest; Dr. Gibson at times, does NOT wait to be recognized by the Chair and attempts to interrogate and emasculate his fellow Board members.

I am disappointed that at times, Dr. Gibson gives staff direction as if he were the Chairman of the Board and overriding the concerns of the Chairman of the Board.

I am disappointed that Dr. Gibson has suggested giving PG&E equal opportunity by inviting PG&E for the October 30, 2012 agenda item, when this is NOT a *hearing*.

I am disappointed that the Staff Report for October 30, 2012, identifies this "discussion" as an opportunity to provide the public with updated information about the PG&E project to conduct 3-D seismic survey studies in the waters off Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant.

I am disappointed because PG&E is NOT an applicant with the County.

I am disappointed because this is NOT a *hearing* , as the press reports, and there is NO presentation nor rebuttal time allowed to any expert in opposition of PG&E.

I am disappointed because at NO time did the public request an opportunity *to be further educated by PG&E* .

I am disappointed because there is NO shortage of information about PG&E's ever changing plan found on County web-site, on PG&E Diablo Canyon web site and in the press.

I am disappointed because the County does NOT represent the corporate interests of PG&E, but represents the interests of its constituents, the resident stake-holders of the Central Coast of California.

I am disappointed because to truly represent those interests, the County of San Luis Obispo could or should have invited the expert opinion in the field of Marine Biologist and Estuary Eco-systems.

I am disappointing that the County did NOT take Supervisors Mechum's direction in providing an expert to answer Board questions other than in the field of Geophysics or Seismology.

I am disappointing that none of the questions that Supervisor Mechum would pose were included in the Staff Report for Oct. 30, 2012.

I am disappointing that the County believed that hiring an expert in Seismology represented the interests of the people, rather than hiring an expert in Marine Biology and Estuary eco-systems.

I am disappointing that the County believed having a politician represent the peoples interests was satisfactory to the interests of the people.

I am disappointing that the County does NOT recognize that the people are the County and that the County employees and elected officials are *public servants* .

I am disappointing on behalf of myself and does 1 - 20, as the County is well informed.

#

<http://agenda.slocounty.ca.gov/agenda/sanluisobispo/Proposal.html?select=1563>

Here are the results based upon your query, limited to 20 items.

<u>Type</u>	<u>Agenda Item Number</u>	<u>Agenda Item Subject</u>	<u>Department</u>
<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>795/2012</u>	<u>Board discussion of PG&E's CDP application to the CA Coastal Commission</u>	<u>Administrative Office</u>

Item Document (Public)

[Generate zip archive](#)

Review Status Pre-review
Type Agenda Item
Published

on 10/18/12
 Description Discussion regarding PG&E's Coastal Development Permit application and a consistency certification to the California Coastal Commission to conduct a 3-D seismic imaging survey offshore of the Diablo Canyon Power Plant.
 Resolution Number N/A

Attachment	Extension	Item
Diablo Canyon updated project description 9-28-12	pdf	
Exhibit 2	pdf	
Exhibit 3	pdf	
Exhibit 4	pdf	
Exhibit 5	pdf	
Exhibit 6	pdf	
Correspondence - Posted 10-23-2012	pdf	
Correspondence - Posted 10-25-2012	pdf	
Correspondence (Video by Dr. C. Hite) - Posted 10-25-2012	wmv	
Correspondence (Video by Dr. C. Hite) - Posted 10-25-2012 (Video does not play)	wlmp	
Correspondence (Video by Dr. C. Hite) - Posted 10-25-2012	wmv	
Correspondence - Posted 10-25-2012	pdf	
Correspondence (Video by Dr. C. Hite) - Posted 10-25-2012	wmv	
Correspondence (Video by Dr. C. Hite) - Posted 10-25-2012	mov	
Correspondence - Posted 10-25-2012	pdf	
Correspondence - Posted 10-25-2012	pdf	
Correspondence - Posted 10-25-2012 Part 1 of 4	pdf	
Correspondence - Posted 10-25-2012 Part 2 of 4	pdf	
Correspondence - Posted 10-25-2012 Part 3 of 4	pdf	
Correspondence - Posted 10-25-2012 Part 4 of 4	pdf	
Correspondence - Posted 10-26-2012	pdf	

Review History

[Meeting BOS - 38/2012 on 10/30/12 9:00 AM - Board of Supervisors](#)



10 16 12 web deadline.wmv