

From: Jon Rubin <rubinjon@gmail.com>
To: <CHoffman@energy.state.ca.us>
Date: 12/6/2010 12:00 AM
Subject: Concerns about items not included in recent Mariposa CEC Staff Assessment

Dear Mr. Hoffman,

I attended the evening session of the recent Mariposa public workshop that was held at the Byron Bethany Irrigation District on November 29th. I have been a resident of Mountain House for 6+ years. I am concerned about some items that were not part of the CEC Staff Assessment:

1. There was no analysis of what effect an inversion layer would have on trapping particulates from Mariposa in Mountain House. Inversion layers are very common throughout much of California, and especially in the Central Valley. During summer months they can lead to very hazy days that make it difficult to see the coast ranges and Sierras, and during the winter the valley is often plagued by Tule fog that lasts for days on end, trapped by an inversion layer that keeps the fog sealed in. I have often witnessed the temperature on my car's external gauge plummet as I drove down the Altamont Pass to Mountain House, with the coldest temperatures being in Mountain House itself. It is as if all the cold air descends and collects within Mountain House. This makes me wonder what effect having a power plant at the base of the Altamont would have on the air quality in Mountain House during a strong inversion layer. Would all the particulates from the plant collect within Mountain House, the same way that the cold air does? Would the particulates accumulate as the inversion layer lasts for days on end, not able to escape, just as the Tule fog lasts for days (and even weeks) on end? A lot of emphasis has been placed on the wind in Mountain House, but what about the stagnant air that exists under an inversion layer at other times of the year? I think some analysis and modeling needs to be done to see what the effect would be on air quality within Mountain House.

2. A study has been cited that concluded that a power plant similar to Mariposa near a community like Mountain House would result in real estate values going down by 5%. Assuming an average home price of \$300,000 in Mountain House, this mean that the average homeowner would lose \$15,000 in equity. I did not hear any discussion as to how this economic impact would be mitigated. When Mountain House broke ground, the initial infrastructure (i.e. storm water and waste water facilities) was funded by the developer, Trimark, and is now being paid back by residents in the form of pledge components on our water bill. These pledge components add approximately \$100 per month to an average water bill. Mitigation in the form of paying off this infrastructure debt would go a long way in mitigating the equity losses that Mountain House homeowners would suffer if Mariposa was to come to fruition.

It is my hope that there will be another workshop to discuss these and other issues that were not covered in last month's session.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Jon Rubin

DOCKET	
07-AFC-3	
DATE	DEC 6 2010
RECD	DEC 6 2010