



May 9, 2009

John Kessler
Project Manager
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

DOCKET
07-AFC-8

DATE	MAY 09 2009
RECD.	MAY 11 2009

Re: 07-AFC-08

Subject: Clarification of CARE May 7th Migration Corridor Study and
Alternate Sites Letter

Dear Mr. Kessler,

It has been brought to my attention that a person unfamiliar with CARE's staunch opposition to the construction of the CESF may misconstrue the intent of alternative site suggestion in CARE's May 7th letter. I am writing to clarify the intent of the letter which suggests Section 35 be reviewed as an alternate site.

The May 7th letter was in no way meant to offer support to the construction of the CESF. But rather, should CESF be built despite our opposition, this site was suggested to ensure all mitigation measures be investigated to facilitate its construction with the fewest possible impacts to the environment. This particular site was recommended because, according to the current baseline condition maps, it appears to be in a less sensitive area of the corridor in regards to the Kit Fox and Pronghorn Antelope migration. The recommendation was made at this time to allow the site to be considered in the context of the current migration corridor study.

Care remains adamantly opposed to the construction of the CESF project for many reasons including such important issues as: impacts to the environment, visual resources, noise, and water resources. Our reference to water availability on Section 35 does not imply that we agree with CESF's claim they will not impact water resources. The intent was rather CESF could use the same Arco information to justify their claim. The letter in no way was meant to imply we agree with CESF's claim they will not impact water resources.

While locating the plant on Section 35 would reduce visual impacts to residences simply because there are substantially fewer residences in close proximity, this alternate site would in no way minimize the degradation of the overall beauty and

majesty of the plains caused by the immense industrial appearance of the CESF power plant. Additionally, while fewer residences would be impacted by this alternate site, we in no way support impacting any residences. This site only reduces the number of impacts, it does not excuse them.

Please be assured, CARE steadfastly remains opposed to the construction of all utility scale power plants on the Carrisa Plain.

Sincerely,

Robin Bell
Carrisa Alliance for Responsible Energy