Docket Optical System - FW: response to quail brush

From:Rodolfo rudy Reyes <rreyes2777@hotmail.com>To:<docket@energy.state.ca.us>Date:2/7/2012 12:56 PMSubject:FW: response to quail brush

Respect and love

Rudy Reyes



From: rreyes2777@hotmail.com To: mediaoffice@energy.state.ca.us; publicadviser@energy.state.ca.us; esolorio@energy.state.ca.us Subject: response to quail brush Date: Tue, 7 Feb 2012 20:22:40 +0000

Rudy Reyes Quail Brush Generation Project Hearing Feb 12,2012

Commissioners, my name is Rudy Reyes, Candidiate for the San Diego County Board of Supervisors.

I represent more than thousands of citizens and businesses and are actively involved in advocating for projects and policies that benefit our region.

We thank you for this opportunity to weigh in on Cogentrix Energy's

Quail Brush Project.

Cogentrix Energy gave a presentation to citizens and politicians a month ago. While the County has not yet formally supported the Quail Brush Project, the Community was NOT very

supportive of the project and its FAILED outreach to the local community. Cogentrix also has failed to provide any mitigation options regarding

"Significance Determinations:

As stated in the Preliminary Review, additional analysis andlor mitigation is required to support the AFC's detenninations of significance in numerous issue areas, not mentioned below. However, based on the information provided to date, the following sections clearly do not comply with the Ci ty's significance thresholds.

Section 4.2 Land Use

The AFC cannot conclude that impacts to land use are insignificant and do not require mitigation. Until the Ci ty's Land Use entitlements are obtained, the project conflicts with the applicable land use plan, pnlicies and regulations of the City o[San Diego and also conflicts with the applicable habitat conservation plan as previously identified.

Section 4.3 Noise

The analysis provided in the AFC indicates that the project will exceed the City's threshold for noise in all land use categories.

Section 4.5 Visual Qua I i ty

The visual effect of the project was not analyzed relative to landform alteration. The total amount of grading required to implement the project could significantly impact the existing landform. Detailed grading plans should be included.

In addition, the visual quality analysis does not support the conclusion that there is no significant impact of

Section 4.6 Socioeconomic Impa c t s This section does not contain enough information and analysis to support the conclusion that the project does not have a growth-inducing impact. Please provide evidence that the plant merely responds to current and anticipated electrical needs in the service area based on adopted population projections such as those provided by SANDAG.

Section 4.7 Air Quality and Global Climate Change Page 3 of 4

Please also include a discussion of Greenhouse Gas Emissions which would foreseeably result from the project in a separate Global Climate Change section.

Section 4.9 Hazardous Materials

The parcel is identified as a former artillery range and mortar range of Camp Elliott. The analysis recommends that prior to commencement of construction, a project-specific survey for OE and UXO should be conducted. The mitigation measures proposed for hazardous materials impacts do not include this as mitigation.

Othe r Sections: Ar cheologic a I Re sour c e s, Paleontological Re sour c e s, Biology, Wa t e r Re sour c e s, Wa s t e Management, Tr a f f i c and Geologic Impa c t s.

The AFC does not document the project's conformance with the City's Significance Determination Thresholds and/or does not specify adequate mitigation at this time.

Mitigation

Section 15126.4 of the CEQA Guidelines states that mitigation measures must be fully enforceable through pe rmit conditions, agreements, or other legally binding instruments. This AFC fails to document how the mitigation measures are incorporated into the project itself for project-level impacts." THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

and

...

The City of Santee provides these written comments on the Application for Certification submitted by Quail Brush Genco LLC to the California Energy Commission ("CEC") for the construction and operation of a 1DO-megawatt electrical generating facility in the City of San Diego ("Project") and within one mile of the City of Santee. Given that the CEC is the designated Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act, and will analyze the proposal in an equivalent process, the City of Santee submits the following comments pertaining to the Project's visual and aesthetic effects, the short term and long-term noise associated with construction and plant operations respectively, comments on water and biological resources, and clarification as to Santee's emergency response role" CITY OF SANTEE

We believe, projects like Quail Brush, are unnecessary. Would Blight the region, visually and through property values.

Our businesses depend on a reliable power supply void of disruptions, the county would like to see this to a truely renewable source. The quail brush project is NOT!

Natural gas peaker plants would NOT allow us to use clean power without

experiencing any negative effects related to intermittency. Creating a water draw of over a million gallons from a environment where water is rare!

The project claims to also creates temporary and permanent jobs, yet these jobs are only 7-11 permanent jobs!

Thus, the I asks the CEC to remove/reject the Quail Brush Project

from the approval process.

Thank you for your time.

Respect and love

Rudy Reyes

Respect and love

Rudy Reyes