

DOCKET	
04-AFC-1	
DATE	OCT 18 2005
RECD.	OCT 18 2005

**BEFORE THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION
AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**

Application for Certification
For the San Francisco
Electric Reliability Project

Docket No. 04-AFC-1

**Comments of Lynne Brown to the Preliminary Staff Assessment
Workshop**

In behalf of CALifornians for Renewable Energy, Inc. (CARE) and my neighborhood in Bayview Hunters Point in San Francisco I provide the following comments on the CEC Staff's Preliminary Staff Assessment (PSA) on the City of San Francisco Peaker combustion turbine project proposed to be located on the other side of PG&E's Hunters Point Power Plant right outside my window where I can see it. Now you want to put another one there not to shut down PG&E's plant but now its because the City is claiming it's going to get Mirant to shut down the Potrero Plant, and that is a lie just like the first Application by the City was a lie that the Peakers where going to shut down PG&E's Hunters Point power plant when the first Application was filed. This lie was repeated over and over again in the alternative, air quality, transmission, and biological resources sections with out any evidence to prove it. This project has nothing to do with reliability so its very name is a fraud. It is about the City wanting to be like Enron and Calpine at my expense. The PSA didn't talk about liquefaction of the project site during an earthquake or that the serpentine soil is filled with asbestos dust.

First as regards to Mirant, they are still in Bankruptcy and therefore anything you say about Mirant is bull because of this, and since CARE is a Party in the Bankruptcy court proceeding if you mess with us we can tell the Judge on you so don't forget this unless you have real evidence otherwise you can't say anything that will harm Mirant's position on the Potrero power plant's future let alone say that the City's Peakers will shut Potrero down.

Second I participated in the CPUC evidentiary hearings on the Jefferson Martin 230KV transmission project, and had meetings with PG&E to get CARE to agree to support the line in return for PG&E shutting down their PG&E Hunters Point power plant when the line is done in 2006. I have a transcript from the hearing where they said that they didn't need the City's Peakers to shut down Hunters Point or Potrero in fact that they had enough transmission capacity once the Jefferson Martin and other transmission projects were completed without existing in City generation. Now PG&E owns the line not ISO or the City so who you going to believe them or PG&E that owns the lines?

Third while I'm talking about PG&E lets talk about my electric bill, now I'm a poor black man living in public housing in Hunters Point I've got a wife and six kids and I can't afford to pay my PG&E bill right now. Now I have all these other charges on my PG&E bill in nuclear decommissioning, and DWR surcharges. Now isn't the City's Peakers going to increase my DWR surcharge, or is it just going to show up on my bill as a surcharge by the City of San Francisco? Either way I can't afford this and I don't want these plants in my neighborhood period.

Fourth, the PSA referred to a new criterion I never heard of before, and the PSA provided no reference to any form of evidence for this beyond hearsay of a so-called California Independent System Operator (Cal ISO)

requirement for generation to be “north of Martin Substation.” The Jefferson Martin project was approved in August of 2004, and the evidence from this case has the exact opposite conclusion and Cal ISO was a Party and didn’t raise this when they had an opportunity to do so. I contend this new criteria is because the City doesn’t want to put the Peakers at the airport because this is a more affluent Caucasian neighborhood than mine.

Finally, I brought a civil rights Complaint against the City and County of San Francisco in June 2003 with the US Department of Energy Office of Civil Rights and Diversity alleging that the City was siting these Peakers in my neighborhood because I’m poor and black and to the degree the CEC Staff is supporting the City in their efforts to discriminate against me you are also discriminating against me. Now I understand the US DOE has dropped their investigation of Cal ISO but I know they haven’t finished investigation the City and CEC. The fact that the PSA didn’t push for SCONox emission controls, the airport site, instead of putting the Peakers in my neighborhood shows the CEC is discriminating against me and my neighbors because we are poor and black.

Respectfully submitted,



Lynne Brown- Vice President, CALifornians
for Renewable Energy, Inc. (CARE)
Resident, Bayview Hunters Point
24 Harbor Road, San Francisco, CA 94124
E-mail: l_brown123@sbcglobal.net

October 18th, 2005

Verification

I am an officer of the Intervening 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 18th day of October 2005, at San Francisco, California.



Lynne Brown- Vice President,
CALifornians for Renewable Energy, Inc. (CARE)
Resident, Bayview Hunters Point
24 Harbor Road, San Francisco, CA 94124
E-mail: l_brown123@sbcglobal.net

SF Peaker Mitigation Proposal CARE

Use Tree Money from Mitigation program \$500,000

Use \$500,000 for light bulb program

House needs 20 light bulbs changed runs light bulbs 6 hours a day;

Cost to run old light bulbs \$408.00 a year

Annual dollars Saved \$230 to 380

Lifetime dollars \$1,000 to \$1700

KWH Saved 1,700 to 2,800

Total Bulb Purchase Price \$ 150 to \$250

Source PGE energy Calculator

<http://www.energyguide.com/ha/LightCalcResResults.asp?referrerid=154&zipcode=94102&cmode=1>

Retrofit 2,000 homes with 20 bulbs each

Tree money	$\$500,000 / 250 = 2,000$ homes
Money Savings yearly	\$460,000 to 760,000 a year
Lifetime of bulbs	\$2,000,000 to \$3,400,000
Kilowatts Saved	3,400,000 to 5,600,000

Administration Costs?