

California energy Commission
Attn: Docket No. 07-AFC-6
1516 Ninth Street, MS-4
Sacramento, Ca. 95814-5512
docket@energy.state.ca.us

DOCKET
07-AFC-6
DATE _____
RECD. <u>Jun 08 2011</u>

Comments by Jeff Mastin in the matter of the application for certification of the Carlsbad Energy Center Project.

I was out of the country during the evidentiary hearings in May 2011 and welcome this opportunity to submit my comments in written form. I thank you advance for your consideration of the issues of concern to me. Although I cannot speak for everyone in this community I do know that these concerns are consistent with many other residents of my community who have not provided comments for whatever reason.

I am an architect licensed in California and have great familiarity with larger scale projects, although none of these as large as the proposed energy center. My experience stems from my duties as project architect and project manager on multiple public and private sector projects in the \$10 to \$80 million range. Some of these projects were for the state of California, such as California Developmental Centers; and for California municipalities such as the counties of orange and Alameda. Other projects pertinent to my experience with regard to the energy center include hospitals, hazardous occupancies and large-scale manufacturing plants.

I have intimate experience with projects through the process of public comment revision and ultimate resolution. Some have been approved and some have not. The purpose of the process is not to rubberstamp a proposal. Rather it is to carefully consider the effects of a project, present and future. It is an incredibly complicated matter. But they carefully weigh and consider the effects, both present and future. This requires accurate and honest information. I cannot help but notice that the PMPD is lacking in this regard to the detriment of those having to make the decision and to those residents and others affected by the project.

A primary concern is that the project is not conform to laws, ordinances, regulations and standards pertaining to fire safety. Although the project may be technically under the Jurisdiction of the State Fire Marshal, every project I've been involved with has relied upon the local fire authority, (the specific entity that must control emergency situation should it arise), to set the specific requirements that they require for adequate response while preserving public and personnel safety. In this case the requirements put forth by the local authority pertaining to clearances has been completely ignored. I believe it is standard practice for the State Fire Marshal to defer to the local fire jurisdiction in this regard. In the event of a emergency situation it is the local authority who will be called upon to control the situation. Ignoring the requirements not only puts the public and fire personnel at a level of risk which they have expressly communicated as excessive, they could put the community and the facility at risk by refusing to operate in whole or in part under those conditions.

Another concern is the inaccurate information provided by the applicant in several areas pertinent to whether or not this project should go forward. I fully support the comments made by intervenor Terramar with regard to these inaccuracies such as:

- the foreseeable event of the termination of once through cooling
- assertions of the plant is coastal dependent
- holding out that the plant has "run must run" agreements

In addition, I am concerned for the effects of both construction and operation of the proposed facility. My wife and I have been residents of Terramar since 2006. We live only approximately 2000 feet from the location of the present Encina stack. We are also southeast of the site of the Encina stack and the proposed project. Since the predominant daily wind in our area is from the northwest, we are directly downwind and what happens at Encina and the site of the proposed project directly affect our quality of life. I have been involved with enough projects to know that the daily effects of construction; e.g., earthmoving, dust, diesel and vehicle exhausts, noise, traffic, etc.; can be difficult to bear and hazardous to health. Most considerations for mitigation of construction effects are not based upon such large projects. A typical large construction project might take one year. This project has a stated duration of over two years. Many effects can be endured for normal construction durations but become burdensome and unreasonable for such unusually long schedules, such as this one. Simply put, there are at least twice the negative effects without a corresponding adequate increase in mitigation.

Thank you for considering my comments and concerns.

Sincerely,
Jeff Mastin
5180 EL Arbol Drive
Carlsbad, CA 92008
(949) 439-5095

--

Jeff Mastin
Cell: (949) 439-5095
Facility Access Consulting
mastin.jeff@gmail.com