

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	15-AFC-01
Project Title:	Puente Power Project
TN #:	212459
Document Title:	Comments on Puente Power Plant Proposal in Oxnard
Description:	Hearing and Workshop in Oxnard
Filer:	Raquel Rodriguez
Organization:	Vicki Paul
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	7/25/2016 3:56:27 PM
Docketed Date:	7/25/2016

From: [Vicki Paul](#)
To: [Pittard, Shawn@Energy](mailto:Pittard_Shawn@Energy); [Energy - Public Adviser's Office](#)
Subject: Puente Power Plant proposal in Oxnard
Date: Saturday, July 23, 2016 10:38:11 PM

cc: publicadviser@energy.ca.gov
Planning Department, City of Oxnard
Citizens' Climate Lobby--Jan Dietrich

Thank you for your steady attention to managing the hearing/ workshop in Oxnard on Thursday evening, July 21st. I made comments around 10.30 p.m., in hopes of returning the panel's attention to the Big Picture of comments from the evening.

Naturally, many remarks were made about the choice of location with inferences that it was chosen due to the community's lacking an English-speaking base whose people had time to consider public issues. I pointed out, however, that the panel was moving forward with fractured assumptions. The fallacy that natural gas is a 'transition fuel' is a negligent assertion. It is not. It is a fossil fuel that is a significant greenhouse gas that is raising earth's temperatures, and there are many alternatives.

I was surprised that the **Air Quality** report put the CO₂ emissions in *metric tons*. Why? They are larger than a regular ton so the every-day comprehension of the data is distorted. The 290,000 metric tons converts to **319,670.28 tons** annually x 30 or **over 91/2 million tons of Carbon Dioxide** emitted during the likely life of the plant. [9,590,108.4]

That would seem to be enough in **contrast with zero** CO₂ emissions using a renewable source of power that the NRG concept should be scrapped and the commission should start over. This reality explains some of the emotional rhetoric you heard about location, and more attention needs to be paid to this aspect of the double Whammy. [location & pollution]

I realize that it is difficult to distance yourselves from the acquaintance of people who have put in hard work in your organization, but if the assumptions are faulty, the problems get lost in the report. My father did "comparables" for rural real estate, but had his standards been anything like the "alternatives" report suggested, he could not have stayed in business. This unimaginative section of the report read as almost negligent in its scope with a lot of disconnection to the Oxnard area and its concerns.

The AQ statistic jeopardizes the validity of the report. In Oxnard, you were not getting an ear-full of *Not In My Backyard* comments. The effort of those addressing you were really attempting to jump-start **Conscience** being used by the Commission. Approving a project that will place **nearly 10 million tons of CO₂ into the atmosphere** is more than a shame. The potential lapse of conscience to approve this project anywhere, anytime, is a dreadful reflection on the excuses we provide for ourselves when we just do our jobs without acknowledging the ripples drifting outward from our actions.

My plea is really to implore you to direct the commission to **reject** the Puente project application and to start over to find a better solution to create electricity if it is really needed.

It is extremely important that utility companies and public entities overseeing them observe that profit is no longer an acceptable motivator to approve works that sustain the *status quo*

and put Americans on a course of extending dependence on antiquated technology. Rubber stamping this highly suspect effort is irresponsible. Please remember it is not the backyard; it is the drought, air, ocean temperatures, and people's health at great distances from Oxnard and acting to perpetuate damage to the atmosphere when we have the tools to reverse it.

Thank you.

Vicki Paul, Ventura County resident