

## Energy - Docket Optical System

---

**From:** Jennings, Jennifer@Energy  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 02, 2012 10:57 AM  
**To:** Energy - Docket Optical System  
**Subject:** FW: hi -Saul Gomez referred me to you

Dockets,  
Please docket this in 11-AFC-03 and forward it to webworks for posting under public comments. Thank you.  
Jennifer

Jennifer Jennings, Public Adviser  
California Energy Commission  
1516 Ninth St., MS#12  
Sacramento, CA 95814-0027  
[Jennifer.Jennings@energy.ca.gov](mailto:Jennifer.Jennings@energy.ca.gov)  
916.653.5898

California Energy Commission

**DOCKETED**  
**11-AFC-3**

TN # 67428

OCT 02 2012

---

**From:** Nicole Capretz [mailto:[nicole@environmentalhealth.org](mailto:nicole@environmentalhealth.org)]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 01, 2012 12:54 PM  
**To:** Allen, Eileen@Energy; Jennings, Jennifer@Energy  
**Subject:** hi -Saul Gomez referred me to you

Hi Eileen and Jennifer,

Saul Gomez in Commissioner Peterman's office referred me to you both for a question. I am not a party to Quail Brush but have been actively involved in the proceeding locally and at the CPUC. When I spoke at one of the first hearings in the Mission Trails Regional Center and discussed the "need" for the plant, I was quickly told by Commissioner Douglas (?? First name Karen) that the CEC does not address need, that was the purview of CPUC, and I should stick to the land use, public health and environmental issues.

At the recent City of SD hearing on whether to initiate a process to change zoning for the plant, the CEC sent in a letter discussing the "need" for the plant using CAISO projections. The CEC letter to the Council and Planning Commission concluded that the plant was needed based on these projections. As you may know, that CAISO study is under discussion at the LTPP proceeding at the CPUC and is being challenged by many parties for multiple reasons. The CPUC has not yet issued a PD and thus no affirmation of the validity of the CAISO study for the need for Quail Brush has been determined.

My question is how the CEC can write a letter to the City of SD suggesting that need for the plant has been determined affirmatively. Not only did it seem outside CEC jurisdiction, but it also would appear to mislead the local elected officials and public.

Any clarification is greatly appreciated.

Nicole

Nicole Capretz  
Associate Director  
[Environmental Health Coalition](http://www.environmentalhealthcoalition.org)  
2727 Hoover Ave., Suite 202  
National City, CA 91950

(619) 474-0220 x 105  
Mobile (619)490-6248



\_\_\_\_\_ Information from ESET NOD32 Antivirus, version of virus signature database 7536 (20121001)

\_\_\_\_\_ The message was checked by ESET NOD32 Antivirus.

<http://www.eset.com>