

Energy - Docket Optical System

From: Rodolfo rudy Reyes [rreyes2777@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 02, 2012 11:04 AM
To: Jennings, Jennifer@Energy; rickneff@cogentrix.com; Read, Maggie@Energy; Adams, Stephen@Energy; jkaup@allenmatkins.com; Allen, Eileen@Energy; aprabhala@biologicaldiversity.org; barry.mcdonald@tetrattech.com; e-recipient@caiso.com; camarin.madigan@bingham.com; connie.farmer@tetrattech.com; dhouser@cox.net; Douglas, Karen@Energy; ella.gannon@bingham.com; Energy - Docket Optical System; Energy - Public Adviser's Office; hriley@allenmatkins.com; Hungerford, David@Energy; jchine@allenmatkins.com; jbuse@biologicaldiversity.org; johncollins@cogentrix.com; lzpup@yahoo.com; Lemei, Galen@Energy; lorziebart@cogentrix.com; McAllister, Andrew@Energy; mkush@ci.santee.ca.us; mindy.fogg@sdcounty.ca.gov; mdye@sandiego.gov; Nelson, Jennifer@Energy; Phil Connor; Renaud, Raul@Energy; roslindv@gmail.com; Rodolfo rudy Reyes; sarah.mccall@tetrattech.com; Solorio, Eric@Energy; savefanita@cox.net
Subject: RE: Quail Brush - Data Requests1-16 of Reyes.

Importance: High

Categories: Ready to Docket



1. Considering that the Applicant's studies conclude that sound impacts to residential neighborhoods will not exceed 35 to 40 dBA, and impacts to non-residential parcels adjacent to the Project site will rarely exceed 50 dBA – levels well below noise thresholds established by the City of San Diego, please explain in detail the basis for the conclusion that "[t]he analysis provided in the AFC indicates that the project will exceed the City's threshold for noise in all land use categories."

The Noise Pollution and its mitigation analysis in the AFC is misleading, it is conjecture and not scientific fact because the properties of the Noise Pollution and Mitigation Measures used in the modeling software were not verified by an independent third party, for example ASTM. The modeling is based upon an engine manufacturer's data and have not been verified by a certified independent testing agency. From the AFC:

4.3.5 Mitigation Measures

As with any large, complex project, the information available during the initial engineering phases is only at a conceptual level and does not allow design details to be finalized for specific mitigation measures. Vendor information has been incorporated into the Project's acoustical model when available."

Therefore, in this case "conceptual level" really means, conjecture. Additionally, and contrary to the assertion that suggests large scale complex projects are permitted by authorities based upon conjecture is misleading and makes an attempt to hide the fact, "vendor information" is not certified and authorized data. In this case, allowing Quail Brush Project to be certified based upon conjecture, could lead to significant negative impacts and violating LORS, and thresholds for Noise Pollution being only one of the significant negative impacts for an AFC based upon conjecture.

2. Please provide any data and studies used to reach the above conclusions.

From the AFC: 4.3.5 Mitigation Measures

As with any large, complex project, the information available during the initial engineering phases is only at a conceptual level and does not allow design details to be finalized for specific mitigation measures. Vendor information has been incorporated into the Project's acoustical model when available."

3. If applicable, please provide the names, titles, credentials, and work addresses of each expert who conducted the studies noted above.

AFC

4. Please provide any studies, data collected, and methodologies used for arriving at the conclusion that the project will blight the region through property values, rather than anecdotes and research articles about other residential regions.

Study A "Clark and Allison (1999) analysed whether public knowledge of spent fuel storage at power plants, and any local adverse risk perceptions that may have occurred, affect the sale price of single-family residential properties. They presented evidence from the Rancho Seco, California, plant on residential property values using a hedonic modelling framework, and included a large number of control variables, data with a high level of spatial detail and a number of public information variables in order to model property market effects within a 15-mile radius of the plant. Their findings indicated that proximity and visual reminders of the plant have some influence on local property markets, and that there is a small media coverage effect on single-family home sale price."

Study B <http://faculty.haas.berkeley.edu/ldavis/pp.pdf> "Across specifications the results indicate 3-7 percent decreases in housing values and rents within two miles of plants with the semiparametric estimates suggesting somewhat larger decreases within one mile. In addition, there is evidence of taste-based sorting with neighborhoods near plants

experiencing statistically significant decreases in mean household income, educational attainment, and the proportion of homes that is owner occupied."

Study C <http://www.aere.org/meetings/documents/0608pp-Davis.pdf> "The results provide a rich description of the impact of power plants on housing markets. Relative to neighborhoods farther away, housing values and rents decrease by 3–5% when plants open, implying an average housing market capitalization within two miles of a plant of \$14.5 million. Estimates of MWTP respond predictably across a variety of alternative specifications."

5. To the extent you rely upon the Davis articles to answer Data Request # 4, please provide additional documentation and explanations to establish that the analysis is applicable to housing prices currently and in the immediate future.

Above

6. If applicable, please provide the names, titles, credentials, and work addresses of each expert who conducted the studies noted above.

N/A

7. Please provide any studies, data collected, and methodologies used to support the conclusion that "a truly renewable source" of energy could provide "a reliable power supply void of disruptions."

- "a truly renewable source" <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/05/26/us-climate-germany-solar-idUSBRE84P0FI20120526>" German solar power plants produced a world record 22 gigawatts of electricity per hour - equal to 20 nuclear power stations at full capacity - through the midday hours on Friday and Saturday, the head of a renewable energy think tank said."

<http://www.newscientist.com/article/mg21028062.500-the-sun-is-our-only-truly-renewable-energy-source.html> "HUMANITY has a voracious appetite for energy. We currently extract it from fossil fuels at a rate of about 17 terawatts, so we had better find an alternative before supplies run out or we wreck the global climate. That will require all the resources of modern engineering. But we will also need to pay close attention to a branch of physics born in the age of steam power."

8. Please provide examples of any existing "truly renewable source[s]" of energy that currently provide "a reliable power supply void of disruptions," or, if you are aware of none, please provide a detailed description of the basis for your implied conclusion that such non-intermittent renewable resources will be commercially available and operative in the local San Diego region by summer 2014 when Quail Brush is scheduled to come online.

Above

9. If, in the above statement, you are implying that 7-11 permanent jobs is not appropriate for the Project, please explain in detail what amount of permanent jobs would be appropriate, and provide evidence and data to support this conclusion.

-For the impact of the project upon the local community I believe the 7-11 jobs are too little compensation to the area for the impact placed on community.

10. If, in the above statement, you are implying that 7-11 permanent jobs does not provide a positive impact to the local community, please explain in detail how the addition of up to 11 permanent jobs does not provide a positive impact to the local community.

- I believe the 7-11 jobs would not be worth the health, destruction, and blight of the proposed project. Beyond the day-to-day dangers of burning coal to produce energy, there is the devastating impact of plant malfunctions. In December 2008, the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) reported the failure of a holding pond used by a coal-fired electric plant. When heavy rains washed away the holding-pond dike, more than 2.2 million pounds of hazardous waste flooded 300 acres in east Tennessee. Even after the best cleanup effort, the area will remain polluted with dangerous byproducts for decades.

It remains impossible to quantify the amount of poisons released by the above incident, but in one year, this plant reportedly produced 45,000 pounds of arsenic, 49,000 pounds of lead, 1.4 million pounds of barium, 91,000 pounds of chromium, and 140,000 pounds of manganese, much of this held in the holding pond and all of which can cause cancer, liver damage, neurological trauma and more. The TVA, in conjunction with the EPA, warned that pets and children should avoid contact with the toxic materials.

The EPA reported that high levels of arsenic, lead and thallium were found in samples taken from downstream water sources, where hundreds of dead fish were found. While the authority is using heavy construction equipment to address the cleanup efforts, officials cannot predict how long it will take nor the final costs involved.

11. Please provide documentation regarding all conversations with the District Attorney regarding alleged possible "illegal acts", including all communications from you to the District Attorney's office, and all communications from the District Attorney's office to you.

-Legally i am not required to provide this information

12. Please explain the specific acts and instances of those acts that you allege are possibly illegal.

-Legally i am not required to provide this information

13. Please explain the relevance of such possibly illegal acts to the Energy Commission's review of the Quail Brush Project's AFC.

-Potential federal charges

14. Please provide any studies, data collected, and methodologies used to support the conclusion in your public statements that significant cultural and archaeological resources are located within the proposed Project area,

The Study done by applicant shows a large find of lithic and shard, also the "Confidentiality" request shows a Significant find on location. My knowledge of the cite is due to Pre-historic and historic knowledge of the area's past, As I have degrees in Local Archaeology.

15. Please provide documentation that the studies noted above were undertaken on private land with the landowners' permission.

16. Please provide the names, titles, credentials, and work addresses of each expert who conducted the studies noted above.

your men and South Coastal Information Center

From: Jennifer.Jennings@energy.ca.gov
To: rreyes2777@hotmail.com; connorphil48@yahoo.com
Subject: Quail Brush - Data Requests Directed at You
Date: Tue, 2 Oct 2012 17:03:13 +0000

Phil and Rudy,

I have not heard from you about the data requests that Cogentrix submitted to you. I just want to remind you that you have until tomorrow, Oct. 3, to notify the applicant if you are unable to provide the information or object to providing the information. You can also state that you are unable to provide the information by the Oct. 13 deadline and will provide it at some future date.

Here are the relevant code sections, Title 20 CCR Section 1716 (f) and (g):

(f) Any party requested to provide information pursuant to this section shall, within 20 days of receiving the request, notify the requesting party and the committee in writing if it is unable to provide or objects to providing the information requested of it. Such notification shall state the reasons for the inability or the grounds for the objection. Absent such an objection, the party shall provide the information requested within 30 days of the date that the request is made. The dates specified in this section may be changed by mutual agreement of the parties or by committee order.

(g) If the requesting party or agency is unable to obtain information as provided in this section, such party or agency may petition the committee for an order directing the responding party to supply such information. A party petitioning the committee for an order to provide information must do so within either 30 days of being informed in writing by the responding party that such information will not be provided or within 30 days of the date the information was provided or was due. The committee may set a hearing to consider argument on the petition, and shall, within 30 days of the filing of the petition, either grant or deny the petition, in whole or in part. The committee may direct the commission staff to supply such of the information requested as is available to the staff.

Please call if you have any questions.

Jennifer

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