

To: City and County of San Francisco
Commission on the Environment

From: CALifornians for Renewable Energy, Inc. (CARE)
C/o Michael E. Boyd, President

Ref: Siting of Williams Electricity Peaker Plants in South East San Francisco

Jared Blumenfeld,

CARE wishes to object for the record procedurally to scheduling such an important topic at the same time as when the affected Hunters Point and Potrero Hill community have scheduled a meeting of the Restoration Advisory Board dealing with the shipyard.

Many of CARE's members are not able to attend because of the schedule conflict created by this meeting. Irrespective I am here to protest and object to the continuing efforts of the City to site the four Williams Peakers in the Southeast sector of San Francisco.

As you probably aware CARE has brought a civil rights complaint (file#03-003-HQ) against the City and County of San Francisco with the US Department of Energy Office of Civil Rights and Diversity for actions it has taken to date to site the four Williams Peakers in the Southeast sector of San Francisco. This complaint has been taken seriously enough by the federal government for them to turn it over to the US Department of Justice. I've spoken to the attorney coordination this matter a Mr. Sebastain Aloat (202) 305-9349 and he has assured me the US DOJ is taken this matter very seriously. I also informed him of recent efforts to site the peakers at the Mirant power plant site.

CARE in behalf of our San Francisco members, objects to the siting of the Williams Peakers in the Southeast Sector because it will allow the continued perpetration of disparate impacts on the affected community which violates the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 28 U.S.C. § 1447, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1971, 1975a–1975d, 2000a– 2000h-6.

CARE has spoken with PG&E about the need for these peakers to support reliability for San Francisco and been told that their position is that the Jefferson Martin transmission upgrades will provide adequate voltage support to meet San Francisco's reliability needs without the need for these peakers in the Southeast sector, and without

the Bayview Hunters Point power plant which can be shut down once the upgrades are complete.

So PG&E doesn't need the peakers for reliability so the only reason I can see you want this for is so the City can some how get in on the Enron bonanza, or get in the power business for profit. Now if this is the case your getting onto a real slippery slope here because these peakers are tied to the Settlement between the State of California and Williams that is before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission under the same docket EL00-95 et al., that we filed our Civil Rights complaint against you at the FERC. I've attached a copy of our objections, protest, contesting this settlement. Williams ripped us off for over two billion dollars on their long-term energy contracts alone. So you know the old saying, beware of Trojans bearing gifts.

This is true for the Mirant property also, they haven't formally withdrawn their proposal for their Unit 7 upgrade at Potrero Hill, they have merely suspended the project. Like Williams, Mirant ripped us off too, but only about half a billion dollars on their long-term contract. I know because we've filed a claim against them in the Bankruptcy proceeding. And because of the bankruptcy it is highly unlikely that the City could gain site control for the property in time to meet the construction milestones the City is contractually obligated to meet as one of the terms to the City's own contract utilizing these peakers with the DWR.

Irrespective we don't oppose the City siting these peakers at the airport where the CEC has already issued a permit to El Paso Energy. I contacted El Paso's attorney in the FERC proceedings and they seemed interested in some sort of lease or purchase arrangement with the City for their permit. We do require that the city install SCNOx emission control for the peakers where ever they are located but specifically at the airport, because as a closed system there is no emission plume from the project which creates an aircraft turbulence hazard. SCNOx is being used on the same size and type of turbine as is in operation in Redding California.

By 

Filed Electronically 12-4-03
Michael E. Boyd – President, CARE
5439 Soquel Drive
Soquel, California 95073
(831) 465-9809
E-mail: michaelboyd@sbcglobal.net

Verification

I am an officer of the commenting corporation herein, and am authorized to make this verification on its behalf. The statements in the foregoing document are true of my own knowledge, except matters, which are therein stated on information and belief, and as to those matters I believe them to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on this 4th day of November 2003, at Soquel, California.



Michael E. Boyd – President, CARE
CALifornians for Renewable Energy, Inc. (CARE)
5439 Soquel Dr.
Soquel, CA 95073-2659
Tel: (408) 891-9677
Fax: (831) 465-8491
E-mail: michaelboyd@sbcglobal.net