

1/21/09

Statement to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District From Diane Zuliani, Chabot College Instructor:

The Russell City Energy Center stands to negatively impact the fertility of Chabot College's learning environment. It threatens to do so by introducing into our atmosphere several criteria pollutants, pollutants specifically identified by the EPA as harmful to human health, the environment, and property. By their power to harm human health, these pollutants have the potential to impede the ability of students to achieve their educational goals. They also threaten faculty retention, which in turn threatens student success. Yes, we understand that Calpine must legally seek mitigation of these pollutants, but we also understand that mitigation in the form of pollution credits and a fireplace retrofit will *not* decrease the toxicity of the actual criteria pollutants emitted, in the amount of hundreds of tons annually, from the Russell City Energy Center.

We have seen the California Energy Commission's Public Health map. Its isopleth indicates that the "maximally impacted receptor center" for cumulative acute hazards emitted by the Russell City Energy Center is Chabot College itself. We are stunned that anyone would seek to dump toxins on us or any other institution devoted to public service, and we are deeply alarmed by this potential breach of our educational environment. Yet unbelievably, while Chabot College is "ground zero" for this plant's falling pollutants, the impact assessments upon which you are relying inexcusably and completely ignore us. The impact of the Russell City Energy Center on "schools" was assessed, but the Center's impact on Chabot College was **not** assessed, because by the CEC's definition a "school" is a purveyor of K-12 education only. In other words, while Chabot College is this plant's maximally impacted receptor center, we are nowhere near adequately evaluated in the impact assessments. Again, we are deeply alarmed.

In your parlance, "significant risk" and "insignificant risk" are legal terms, but in ours they are relative terms, and when applied to human beings—our students—to whom we as Chabot faculty, staff and administrators are committed, your legalism offers insufficient reassurance. We members of the Chabot family have dedicated our lives to educating socially and economically overlooked people, people the impact reports call "sensitive

receptors.” The introduction of criteria pollutants into the teaching and learning environment where these sensitive receptors—that is, people, our students—are to learn, threatens Chabot’s ability to meet its core mission, the mission for which our were created in the first place: to ensure our students’ success, and thereby ensure the future success of the Bay Area and beyond.

We appreciate the difficulty of the decision before you. As you deliberate, we ask that you consider this: your organization will do a painful disservice to the Bay Area if your actions undercut Chabot’s ability to meet it’s educational mission. You, like us, have an obligation to improve the quality of life in the Bay Area. We ask that you take your obligation as seriously as we take ours. You are the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, after all. We urge you to follow the recommendations of the California Energy Commission’s staff scientists and reject the Russell City Energy Center.