

CPUC PUBLIC MEETING COMMENT SHEET

Name: Richard and Sandy Baldwin
Address: 233 Heron Dr.
Pittsburg, CA
Telephone: (529) 473-1781

Comment: The concerns about PG&E and the power plant in Pittsburg exist on more than one level, the most dramatic and certainly the one that pertains to the most people relates to the impact on our environment and more specifically the impact on the health of the citizenry that live within close range of the plant. I am convinced that the studies have not covered this with enough of a microscope to assure us that all bases have been covered. I am very worried about it, but I will leave the details of studying this to those more expert than myself. My concerns have to do with social responsibility and lack of same that has gone into the study of the problem.

Pollution comes in many forms, my concern has to do with sound pollution and what the roar of the plant has done to my serenity, how it has impacted my life and living system.

I have lived in Marina Park for almost 2 years and our primary concern when we chose to purchase here was the neighborhood, how stable was it. The diversity of people in the community was a draw for us because we had felt so isolated in suburbia. We were missing out on exposure to other cultures and people with divergent issues, divergent ethnicity. We have been very content with that part of the experience. The pain has come with the deafening roar of the power plant. [Begin V1]It robs us of an outside life, patio pleasure, of sleep that is sound and uninterrupted; of serenity in our own home because of the silt that accumulates on tables; in curtains, on tables, disguised as dust.[End V1] [Begin V2]But most importantly, the continuous roar and when I hear of expansion and the fact that the Pittsburg plant is not state of the art and that more and more pressure is going to be placed upon it, that means to me, more roar, more silt and a lack of concern that PG&E is willing to give it.[End V2] [Begin V3]We have a community here, there is plenty of open, unencumbered territory for use as land for a power plant. It was suggested as an alternative at the meeting. Why? Why? Why? Must the little guy who is not a corporation, who doesn't come with credentials that/will make a dent in the large, very large, utility. WHY...must he bite the bullet and endure? I don't think so, I believed that that there are alternatives and I am confident that PG&E has the resources and the willingness to explore them, to assure that the people who daily rely upon them for their power source, will also be able to find some common ground to solve the problems that so trouble the residents of Marina Park. [End V3]

[Begin V4]

I look forward to future discussion and will not give up in an effort to get the problem solved. The quality of life for the citizens of this area and for that matter, all citizens, should be first and foremost on the minds of the utility that serves us. Social responsibility begins with them. It must.

[End V4]

INDIVIDUAL(S)

V. RICHARD AND SANDY BALDWIN

- V1 The Pittsburg Power Plant has been in operation since 1954. This EIR does not address the environmental effects associated with construction and operation of the Pittsburg plant; rather, it addresses the potential environmental changes that would result from PG&E's sale of the plant and continued operation of the plant by a new owner. As an example, the EIR examines the projected increase over existing noise levels from the Pittsburg Power Plant that would potentially occur with the sale of the plant to another operator. The analysis concludes that, while operation of the plant could increase under the project, which could result in increased noise levels to some degree, the potential change in noise levels would not be significant. Projected increases in PM-10 (dust) would also be less than significant. Please refer to Sections 4.5 and 4.10 of the DEIR, and the response to Comment W1, for additional information on these impacts.
- V2 Please see response to Comment V1.
- V3 The commenter appears to be advocating that the Pittsburg Power Plant be closed and a new power plant built at another location to replace the generation of the Pittsburg plant. Such a scenario is not a true alternative to the sale of the Pittsburg Power Plant, which, if not sold, would continue to be owned and operated by PG&E (a scenario analyzed as Alternative 1 in Chapter 6 of the DEIR). Furthermore, the Pittsburg plant is designated a "must run" plant by the ISO for reliability purposes, and could not be closed until it is no longer needed for system reliability. For these reasons, the DEIR does not and need not evaluate the potential environmental effects of closing the Pittsburg Power Plant and building a new plant at a different location. As noted elsewhere (see responses to Comments B6, B15, and O1, as well as Figure B6), several new power plants (PDEF and DECP) are proposed to be located in the Pittsburg-Antioch area. Even with these new plants, the Pittsburg Power Plant is expected to continue operation.
- V4 Comment noted.