

DOCKETED

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Docket Number: | 12-AFC-03 |
| Project Title: | Redondo Beach Energy Project |
| TN #: | 201576 |
| Document Title: | William and Susan Lippert Comments: Comments from from the 12-05-13 Business meeting |
| Description: | N/A |
| Filer: | System |
| Organization: | Public William and Susan Lippert |
| Submitter Role: | Public |
| Submission Date: | 1/21/2014 11:24:18 AM |
| Docketed Date: | 1/21/2014 |

Comment Received From: William and Susan Lippert

Submitted On: 1/21/2014

Docket Number: 12-AFC-03

Comments from from the 12-05-13 Business meeting

Additional submitted attachment is included below.

William and Susan Lippert
811 North Maria Avenue
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
Phone: 310-372-6580

I am a 65 plus yr resident, and my family has lived in Redondo for over 90 yrs.

I am against building a new power plant, and feel that just because AES owns this outdated—and in a few years, inoperable power plant, that they are, in some way, vested in being able to build a new power plant.

I really question the need for this new power plant. AES has stated that if a financially better use for the land materializes, they will jump at the chance to make more money. Does this mean that they really don't think that we need this power plant? Or does it mean that we only need it if there isn't a more valuable usage for this land that they own.

If for some reason, you grant AES permission to build a new power plant, I'm concerned about health issues and aesthetics issues. We would like to gain back some of our ocean view that has been lost to development over the past decades, including the building of the Tech Center, just east of the southern part of the power plant.

I'm not a pollution engineer, so maybe I didn't understand one of AES points at the last meeting. On AES graphs, they showed their emissions at 20% annual capacity. Since this has been shown, I would ask that as a mitigation factor, you limit their use to 20%, so that the data that they are showing us is relevant. What protection will we have if this capacity Factor rises from the proposed 20% to 80 or 90%??? The graph showed that the emissions would be just too harmful to those of us living close to the power plant.

Historically you should take into account that the Tech Center was given a General Plan change to allow it to be as high as 65 ft instead of 45 ft, so that it acts as a buffer between the surrounding residential areas and the AES plant. This General Plan amendment took away some of the views from many homes in order to protect us from this power plant. Please mitigate this new plant from hurting us health wise, noise wise, and aesthetically, by requiring any new plant to be built directly West of the Tech center.

Another reason for having the new plant built at the southwest section of the property (where the Whaling wall is now, is that it will be farther away from all of us living east of the property. In addition, if it is built as proposed, it will actually be taller than the measurement shows, in relationship to the old plant, since the new location is at a higher elevation than the old plant's location.

AES showed a repositioning of the Whaling Wall, showing it directly west of their new proposed plant. If it is moved to this location, then any commercial, retail, or residential usage between it and Harbor Drive will block it from being seen by the public. If for some unfortunate reason the new plant is build where they are proposing it be build, then why not

Lippert page 2

have the Whaling Wall placed East of the new plant , and facing East where it can act as a screening device for the residents east of the plant, and also be visible by all who are entering our city by coming down 190th St.

We need you to mitigate for us the pollutants, the noise, and the aesthetics and view blockage that this new plant will cause. We citizens only have you to protect us, so please protect us from more years of harmful health, noise, and view blockage.