

From: Judi Ravetti [mailto:judi.ravetti@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 03, 2013 5:12 PM
To: Solorio, Eric@Energy; Douglas, Karen@Energy; McAllister, Andrew@Energy
Subject: CEC Docket 11-AFC-03, the Quail Brush Power Generation Siting Case

Mr. Solorio, et.al.

After reviewing the transcript of the December 10, 2012, status Conference, I strongly feel the public comment of those in favor of the Quail Brush Project fell short of many of the issues. Where were the facts and figures and from what studies are they getting their data? I read about their "druthers." Yes, we need power, but by renewable sources.

A few short decades ago the "Save the Trees" movement lead to an overuse of petroleum based plastic shopping bags. Those are now being banned in several municipalities. Production and disposition of plastic bags have proven quite harmful.

Petroleum based energy has not been the way of the future for years. The destruction in the procurement of it (fracking) and in the conversion to useable energy has long been documented, as dozens of opposition letters have proven.

The applicant wants us to lose our park land and recreational areas by rezoning, visually pollute our landscape and destroy our air quality. Then, to boot, they will take their profits back east to a privately help entity. Is there such a thing as "negative benefit"?

Cogentrix is fond of saying "when the wind doesn't blow. Well, just this week an environmentally friendly wind farm came on line in Maui. This wind farm uses a 4.4MWh (440,000kWh) battery bank to buffer wind power when wind speeds fluctuate, and to back up the farm during low-wind periods.

In the well respected 2013 California energy plan, the CEC has taken steps to promote solar and other renewable (not sustainable) forms of power. Please continue this stance and deny Cogentrix application for the Quail Brush Plant.

Kindest Regards,
Judi Ravetti