

January 23, 2009

Mr. Weyman Lee, P.E.
Senior Air Quality Engineer
BAAQMD
939 Ellis Street
San Francisco, California 94109

RECEIVED
09 JAN 27 AM 12:15
BAY AREA AIR QUALITY
MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

Dear Mr. Lee,

This letter is a response to the issue of permit for the construction and operation of the Russell City Energy Center (RCEC) planned to be located at 3862 Depot Road in Hayward, on the shores of San Francisco Bay.

I was in attendance at the meeting held in Hayward on Wednesday, January 21, 2009 at Hayward City Hall. I listened intently as many citizens spoke passionately about the concerns of this power plant being built in the proposed area. As I looked around the room at the attending crowd, including children, I wondered how many of us would end up a cancer statistic.

From 1988 through 2005, 474,406 new cases of invasive cancer were diagnosed in the SF Bay Area. Also, 183,234 deaths occurred due to cancer during this period. As mentioned, the Bay Area is already at risk for its air quality, or lack thereof. The California EPA Air-Resources Board has just provided a Health Update stating that the impacts of exposure to fine particulate matter from residential wood burning are an increased risk for mortality and asthma exacerbations. "Yet, the components of particulate matter that may be most responsible for these health effects are not known." There is much to learn.

In the Statement of Basis for Draft Amended Federal "PSD" Permit, the Health Risk Assessment Results state that the RCEC emissions will cause less than (>0.7) one risk in one million for cancer, which is stated to not be significant. However, if you are the one in a million, then my guess is that would be pretty significant to you. Take that >0.7 and ADD it into the 474,406 new cases of cancer and NOW you have a very significant number. How dare anyone pretend that emissions from RCEC are a significant risk to the Bay Area and to the valleys east and north. Also, on top of that, the risk to the environment at which is already failing at a drastic and critical rate, can only underscore the severity of this project's impact. There is much to learn.

The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health has just extended their public comment period for the Hexavalent Chromium Document. NIOSH considers all CR(VI) compounds to be potential occupational carcinogens. An increased risk of lung cancer has been demonstrated in workers exposed to compounds. There is much to learn.

Researchers in Los Angeles have just released information stating that over the past two decades, "cleaner air adds 5 months to lives." Reducing pollution translates to longer lives. The law is widely credited with improving the nation's air quality. There is much to learn.

The information regarding RCEC power plant emissions is just for this one plant. Take those emissions, and ADD them into the industrial area of Hayward, which is already overdosed with toxins, particulate matter, and who knows what all. The Bay Area has trucking companies, chrome plating businesses, painting and finishing businesses, numerous oil refineries, dumpsites, etc. Our air is loaded with thick black sooty grit. This is what we are forced to breathe in every moment. I clean up this grit weekly from my home, my yard and plants, and my vehicle. It blows in my open windows. There are three large airports, major

ways, shipping ports, trains, and a host of pollution producing engines, all following a western wind into a major metropolis. I guess this is why we can't burn wood in our fireplaces.

With this planned energy center to be located in the San Francisco Bay Area, there is also great concern for the at least 11 well-known bird sanctuaries and nature preserves that exist along the delicate shores of San Francisco Bay. Trails, Interpretive Centers, and a host of other educational facilities will be at risk from this project. It has yet to be discovered how much of a risk is at stake. There is much to learn.

The RCEC would not be operated using renewable energy. What good is a power plant if it is using up natural resources? There is not a critical timeline on this project. Communities will learn to cut back, use less, need less, and use wisely the resources California does have. Imagine how the funds for this project could be redirected in the education field, teaching the world about control of overpopulation, the main cause of our environmental downfall. If anyone is really concerned about the environment, they should start dealing with the real problem first.

Governor Schwarzenegger just sent a letter to President Obama stating that California and a growing number of farsighted states have sought to enforce a common-sense policy to reduce global-warming pollution. The EPA made what is believed to be a fundamentally flawed decision to deny California's request for the Clean Air Act waiver necessary to enforce regulation. It appears that by trying to authorize permit for the RCEC, you are placing the "cart before the horse." Air quality regulations and standards MUST be researched and updated BEFORE a project like RCEC can be permitted. There is much to learn.

With all the technology and research available, and agencies that are responsible to permit, there should be a way to prevent any further harm to California, its environment, its population, and its credibility as a leader. See if you can find a way to help move us in the right direction. Do not permit the RCEC until the current Presidential Administration has time to reinstate the necessary regulations to prevent further deterioration of our environment. I breathe to live and live to breathe. Please view the following: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=42E2fAWM6rA>

Respectfully,



Debra Weiss
P.O. Box 11
Alameda, CA 94501

- Cc: California EPA
Congressman Pete Stark
Al Gore
Speaker Nancy Pelosi
Senator Diane Feinstein
Senator Barbara Boxer
SF Mayor Gavin Newsome
Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger
President Obama