

From: Joyce Lebowitz <ljleisure@yahoo.com>
To: <smunro@energy.state.ca.us>
CC: <ljleisure@yahoo.com>, <murphyperkins@gmail.com>
Date: 7/3/2008 12:29 AM
Subject: amended comments for docket 00-AFC-14C (ESPRP)
Attachments: PRESS RELEASE (final draft).docx

DOCKET	
00-AFC-14C	
DATE	JUL 03 2008
RECD.	JUL 09 2008

Dear Mr. Munro,

I sent my comments for docket 00-AFC-14C regarding ESPRP Staff Analysis a few minutes ago. I am sending now sending an amended version of those comments. Please consider the comments contained within this attachment instead. I am sending the amended version within this e-mail as well in case you can not open the attachment for any reason.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lisa Lappin
El Segundo resident

Amended version of docket comments to replace comments sent by Lisa Lappin

I, Lisa Lappin, am writing these comments to be included in docket number 00-AFC-14C regarding the ESPRP Staff Analysis. I live within a mile of the El Segundo Power Redevelopment Project that is being considered by CEC for final approval following a workshop on June 25, 2008. I am writing to state for the record that I think it is absolutely inappropriate for CEC to issue final approval of this project while the priority reserve emission credits remain in question. On April 1, 2008 the National Resources Defense Council together with three other environmental groups issued their notice of intent to sue the South Coast Air Quality Management District in court for allegedly selling priority reserve emission credits that cannot be verified. As long as there remains any possibility that the emission credits that NRG will relying upon to begin operation are invalid, how can CEC legally grant final approval to the applicants project? I hereby object to CEC granting final approval until this lawsuit is resolved in court.

Why is the CEC planning to issue a permit to a plant with ESPRP PM10/PM2.5 emissions that have the potential to contribute to an on-going violation of the ambient air quality standards? I object to CEC issuing final approval while the PM10/PM2.5 emission standards are in violation of the ambient air quality standards as shown in Table 7-9 of the staff analysis. Doesn't technology exist that could be added to the plant in order to mitigate this problem and bring the emissions within CA standards?

According to the staff analysis, during start up and shut down there will be VOC emissions increase of 528% from the plan approved in 2005. Since VOC has proven to be detrimental to health, residents living within a mile radius have the right to know when the turbines will be shutting down and starting up since this is the time when they will rain down the greatest amount of chemicals. We have the right to be informed when the emission output is at its greatest. The times could be posted daily on an NRG website with responsibility for checking the projected times falling upon concerned residents who could use this information to refrain from strenuous outdoor activity at peak times of operation. They could also keep their children from exerting themselves outdoors during these times and during times of fumigation.

Finally, I also object to the fact that the CEC did not notify all residents within the critical six-mile radius of the plant regarding the June 25, 2008 workshop. For that matter, they did not even notify all the residents living within one mile of the proposed site. Notification was not posted in the El Segundo Herald and interested parties were left out of the workshop process. Another workshop should be scheduled with the public adequately notified in advance.