

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	15-AFC-01
Project Title:	Puente Power Project
TN #:	205924
Document Title:	Katie Davis Comments: Deny the Puente Power Project - Heed warnings about not putting power infrastructure on beaches
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Katie Davis
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	8/28/2015 4:43:11 PM
Docketed Date:	8/28/2015

Comment Received From: Katie Davis

Submitted On: 8/28/2015

Docket Number: 15-AFC-01

Deny the Puente Power Project - Heed warnings about not putting power infrastructure on beaches

I traveled over an hour to attend the Aug 27th meeting in Oxnard, but I didn't get to comment as the meeting ran too late.

I live in Goleta and also own a condo in Mandalay Shores. Our many friends and neighbors in both Oxnard and Goleta strongly oppose polluting power plants in our neighborhoods, but the problems with this proposal go well beyond local pollution.

First off, if you go to coastalresilience.org and look at the "Flood and Sea Level rise" map for Ventura, you'll see immediately why it's a terrible idea to put another power plant at Mandalay Bay. These maps do not agree with NRG's assessment of sea level rise not being an issue. We know about the rising tides and fierce storms to come. It's not so much a prediction as a guarantee, and the Oxnard area is particularly vulnerable. (I know I've bought flood insurance there.) I've also trained with Al Gore's organization The Climate Reality project, given dozens of talks on climate change and researched the local impacts, and I frankly can't think of a worse spot to locate new power infrastructure than Mandalay Bay.

Your "worst case" scenario for sea level rise should actually be worst case, using the latest studies that indicate sea level rise is not necessarily linear, and sea level rise could be much higher than IPCC predicts. Consider James Hanson's July 2015 publication in "Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics" predicting positive feedbacks that increase melt rate (e.g., 10 feet of sea level rise this century):

<http://www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/15/20059/2015/acpd-15-20059-2015.html>

If approved, you will not only face lawsuits but scorn. Every land use planner familiar with climate change in the world is urging governments not locate new power plants on beaches. You should set this as policy.

Consider a "no project" alternative. We shouldn't be building new fossil fuel plants anyway. According to the IPCC, climate change has already reduced certain grain yields globally. It's already starting to impact our ability to feed ourselves, and we've only begun to see the impacts of the carbon dioxide already in our atmosphere. We have executive orders from 2 consecutive governors and state climate bills calling for an 80% reduction in emissions in the coming decades. How are we going to achieve our moral and legal obligation to quickly reduce emissions, eventually to zero, if we continue with the old build and burn energy policies?

Start building the future we all want to live in, the clean, green one. The Feds just made a billion dollars in additional loan guarantees available for distributed energy projects utilizing innovative technology and making this available to states. California needs to get out front on this. The CA Energy Commission should be leading the way, not approving massive gas burning plants on our eroding beaches.