

April 19, 2012

Mr. Eric K. Solorio  
Project Manager  
Siting, Transmission and Environmental Protection (STEP) Division  
California Energy Commission  
1516 Ninth Street, MS-2000  
Sacramento, CA 95814

<b>DOCKET</b>	
<b>11-AFC-4</b>	
DATE	APR 19 2012
RECD.	APR 20 2012

RE: Quail Brush Generation Project

Dear Mr. Solorio,

I am writing to formally oppose the Quail Brush Generation Project (the "Project") located in San Diego, California (near Santee, California).

I believe such a plant would be detrimental to public health and the environment. The proposed site for the Project is located in the hills of eastern San Diego, California. The proposed location sits just below the peak of a hillside and there is not enough air flow to disperse the pollution generated from the Project. The pollution from the Project will hang in the air of the valley below the plant. This will cause health problems for the residents in the valley. I am surprised the developer/operator would even want to put a polluting power plant in that location. I would anticipate future lawsuits from residents whose health has deteriorated from the pollution caused by the Project.

I read through Section 3.0 of the Project's Application for Certification (the "Application") regarding Alternative Project Sites. In Section 3.1 of the Application, some of the Project's objectives are described as developing a site that has compatible zoning, compatible adjacent land uses, and is located away from sensitive receptors. I would argue that the proposed site selected for the Project is in violation of all three criteria. The proposed site selected for the Project is zoned as open space and not industrial so there is not compatible zoning. The proposed site selected for the Project is adjacent to Mission Trails Regional Park which is not a compatible use with a power plant. In addition, the Project is across the street from a high school and residential areas, both of which are considered sensitive receptors. Section 3.4.3 of the Application acknowledges the closest residence is 2,400 feet. Section 3.4.8 of the Project's Application acknowledges that the Proposed Site (and alternatives) is located within one mile of sensitive receptors.

It seems strange to me that all the Alternative Project Sites are located so close together. Why didn't the developer/operator look for other alternatives that are not located so close to schools, residences, and parks? The proposed site and alternatives are all poor choices for a polluting power plant. The Application mentions one of the Alternatives is currently being considered for mitigation of another development. I feel this is a sign that the surrounding area should be conserved and not developed. There are several areas in the City of San Diego that are used for industrial purposes and surrounded by commercial properties. It seems logical to put a polluting power plant in those types of locations as opposed to a location surrounded by parks, schools, and residences. I can think of one area off highway 52 that is next to another landfill and is surrounded by commercial uses. The surrounding buildings have

ventilation systems that would filter out the pollution. This would be less hazardous than the proposed site where children of all ages play outside at the park and high school located across the street. The park across the street from the proposed site has baseball fields where young children play little league. In addition, at the high school, teenagers are playing/practicing sports outdoors every day. The pollution from the power plant will be hazardous to their health. I believe polluting power plants have no place next door to schools, parks, and residential neighborhoods.

Another issue with the proposed location is the increased risk of fire hazards. The proposed location is in the eastern hills of San Diego. The proposed site is located in a very high fire hazard severity zone. These same hills caught fire and burned during the Cedar fire of 2003. The entire area surrounding the proposed location (including all the way over the hills and towards interstate 15) was blackened after the fire was extinguished. The Project could potentially cause a fire that would rage out of control due to the brush on the surrounding hills. I doubt firefighters could reach the site in time to prevent a wildfire. This could bring another potential lawsuit against the developer/operator. This is another contributing factor as to why the proposed site is not an appropriate site for a power plant.

In regards to the type of power plant being considered, I realize the goal is to provide SDG&E with electricity during times that renewable power may be unavailable. Therefore a renewable power plant does not meet the Project's objective. However, I believe that eastern San Diego is the ideal location for renewable power sources due to its location in the City. This area of San Diego has sunshine for about 90% of the year. The area is often sunny even when other locations of San Diego are foggy. It would be a waste to put non-renewable power plants in this area. Non-renewable power plants should be placed in areas where it is not feasible to generate renewable power.

I realize tough choices have to be made when it comes to providing energy to Southern California residents. However, I believe the Project is the worst possible location for a power plant. There are other industrial areas of San Diego that should be considered before even thinking about putting a power plant in a very high fire hazard severity zone across the street from parks, a high school, and residential areas. I do not believe we have gotten to the point where we need to consider a site for a power plant that should be categorized as absolute last resort.

Thank you for time on this matter. I sincerely hope you take this opposition and others like it to heart and reject the Project in its entirety.

Sincerely,



Amy Pope  
Santee, California