

RE Calpine power plant.txt

From: Bill Quirk  
Sent: Wednesday, September 16, 2009 1:25 PM  
To: 'peggy guernsey'; 'Daily Review'  
Subject: RE: Calpine power plant

Dear Peggy,

Thanks for copying me on your letter to the Daily Review. I know that what I am saying is politically unpopular, but I feel that it is important to say what I believe and fight for what I think is right. When I look at the environmental benefits of the plant, I feel compelled to support it.

As you know, I am a trained scientist with a PhD. I developed one of the first models of the general circulation of the atmosphere in the world when I worked for NASA in the 1970s. I also worked on climate and energy issues at Lawrence Lab. I have read the technical on Russell City documents, and I have spoken with the technical experts at the air quality district.

I have supported the plant despite the obvious political downsides and very little upside. I have never gotten or asked for a donation for my campaign from Calpine. I do not believe that they have donated to anyone's campaign for council in Hayward. If I run again in 2012, I doubt that Calpine will be making donations, since the plant at that time will either be built or disapproved.

I was not endorsed by the chamber in 2008, in part because of my views on the environment, particularly my championing of green building standards and bringing attention to climate change issues. The chamber endorsed Olden Henson, Barbara Halliday and Anna May. Even with the lack of a chamber donation and support of their mailers, I was able to raise enough money to run my campaign from other sources, so frankly I am not worried about raising money in the future.

We all look forward to the day when we can have pollution-free energy that will not generate greenhouse gases. However, most of the sources of renewable energy that we have available today are intermittent. What do we do, when the sun does not shine or the wind does not blow? We need a bridge to the day when we have such technology and infrastructure in place. The Russell City plant is such an interim step. I support the project because it will preserve the Bay Area's air quality by replacing power generated from plants that produce nearly twice the greenhouse gasses and up to 10 times the amount of other pollutants. Because of these problems, Al Gore has suggested that the nation must embrace nuclear power as part of the solution to global warming.

Carl Pope, Sierra Club director supports natural gas power plants as a method to transition from coal, the fossil fuel that generates the most greenhouse gases. Fifteen percent of California's electricity comes from coal fired power plants that must be replaced if we are to reduce our greenhouse gases. The Russell City plant will not only produce less greenhouse gases and also save energy. The high efficiency of this plant means that it will use 40% less natural gas than the old plants it will replace. Right now 15% of California's electricity comes from coal.

RE Calpine power plant.txt

Renewable resources also have their own environmental issues. Large scale hydropower is the cheapest and most flexible source of renewable power, but no one wants to build more dams. Wind power in the Altamont is being held up, because of bird kills. A proposed large solar farm in the desert south of Los Angeles is being held up, because of impacts on the desert environment and because communities do not want power lines to go through their neighborhoods. A geothermal project in the California Geysers area is being held up because of a fear of earthquakes. Al Gore suggests that nuclear power should be part of our energy future, because it generates very little greenhouse gasses.

As far as plant effluent goes, little will impact Chabot college or others nearby. The stacks are 145 feet high and the wind blows the effluent from the plant into the hills, where I live. If I thought, the plant would adversely impact air quality, I would not have voted for the plant, because I have asthma and I know how I and others would be effected by pollution. The critics talks about how many pounds per year come out of the plant. This would be a problem, if the effluent were to come out at one time and one place. The effluent, however, comes out over a long time and is spread over a large area. For example, the 2.5 micron particles that come out of the plant never reach a density of over 1 microgram per cubic meter. This is the equivalent of a few billionth of a pound in a large room. The trucks on 92 are a threat to the health of Chabot students. The Russell City plant is not.

Bill

Bill Quirk

From: peggy guernsey  
Sent: Wednesday, September 16, 2009 12:38 PM  
To: Daily Review; Michael Sweeney; Barbara Halliday; Bill Quirk; Anna May; weyman@baaqmd.gov; Kevin Dowling; Olden Henson  
Cc: Senator Barbara Boxer; Congressman Pete Stark; Diane senator Feinstein  
Subject: Calpine power plant

Dear Mayor, City Council, Editor Daily Review, Wayman Lee, and concerned friends,

I wish to once more express my very strong objection to the proposed Calpine Power Plant for the City of Hayward's shoreline. It will poison the air for everyone, around the Bay Area and world and it will not reduce our energy bills one bit.

Where is Russell City anyway? If people knew that maybe we'd have more outrage than we are. People are not aware of what is happening because they do not know where it is happening. I spoke with a group of 18 people in Castro Valley Monday night who were from 5 different area cities. Only one of them knew what the power plant was, because her husband was head of the Academic Senate at Chabot

RE Calpine power plant.txt

College and opposed to the plant, and none knew where Russell City was. None thought about poison in their air because the information was unclear.

Due to surgery I have been unable to attend the meetings scheduled, but I have been reading the paper. I especially appreciated the Sept 4th article where Kristine Roselius said "permit approval is absolutely not a done deal". This makes me feel that some one is listening to the citizens of Hayward that are against the building of this plant. I understand Councilman Bill Quirk says that since they (the council) voted for it (the plant) some time ago we must go with it and that with his expert knowledge, based on his career, the plant is safe, so let it go up. I question his and others knowledge about the safety and cleanness of this plant. On Friday Sept 4th Laurie Price challenged his cleanliness with the figures of the plants towers spewing "out nearly 4 billion pounds of carbon dioxide annually 143,000 pounds of particulates and multiple known carcinogens." I believe these are poisons are they not? The Councilmember did not refute or challenge this account, so I am lead to believe Ms Price is correct and the Councilmember is not when it comes to the dangers of this plant.

The Aug 31st the Daily Review wrote that the BAAQM District issued a permit in June stating that "the natural gas-fired plant would not excessively pollute the air". So will we get moderately polluted? How much pollution will it take to kill a new born baby or an aged person? How many billion of particulates will it take to infect the residents and school students near the plant? How long can you live with some more pollution entering your body? The radiation cloud from Chernobyl, Russia explosion traveled around the world, in the air stream we all breath from, several times polluting the rest of the world. How excessively did we get that poison? People in Russia died; many are still dying from that accident. Mt. St. Helens, Washington blew up and ash cloud that killed people, wiped out trees, destroyed property and covered millions of miles as it too traveled the air stream. How many of us have radiation or ash in our bodies waiting to explode into cancer cells? Which one of the "less polluting" molecules will enter your body and be the start of lung cancer or worse? We have been told that "the plant is 40% more efficient than most" and far less polluting than older models", so what? I won't settle for only 40% efficiency.

As a 37+ year resident of Hayward I don't want ONLY 40% more efficient or less polluting than older models, that MAYBE taken offline (no promise or guarantee) in my city, my library, my neighboring cities, my county, my school districts, my East Bay area or anywhere. I want engineers that can build CLEAN and non-polluting plants and when you bring me that model I'll go for it. I'm sorry Judith M. Harrison supports the power plant because they will donate \$10 million to help build a new public library and she doesn't think volunteers can raise enough money to build one. All I see is an unfinished project (remember they will only help not completely build) and dying children, men and women, wild and beloved animals. What will the dirty air do to our Wildlife center or any other refuge or park along the bay waters? Who will be responsible for the cleanup, our Mayor and City Councilmember's? If they don't have the money to build a library what makes anyone think they can pay to clean up the mess?

I'm saying don't issue a permit to pollute Hayward or the Bay Area. Wait until it is 100% clean and produces 100% clean. We can wait for it.

Sincerely,

RE Cal pi ne power pl ant. txt

Peggy L. Guernsey  
25236 Del mar Ave.  
Hayward, CA 94542