

Kerry Siekmann  
5239 El Arbol Dr.  
Carlsbad, Ca. 92008  
siekmann1@att.net  
760.438.5611

<b>DOCKET</b>	
<b>07-AFC-6</b>	
DATE	MAR 10 2009
RECD.	MAR 18 2009

Mr. Ben Haddad, Chairman  
San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce  
402 W. Broadway, Suite 1000  
San Diego, Ca. 92101

March 10, 2009

Dear Mr. Haddad,

Today I received an email from the California Energy Commission. Attached to the email was a copy of the press release dated February 26, 2009, sent out from your Chamber in support of the Carlsbad Energy Center Project.

I receive these documents because I represent my neighborhood, Terramar, as an intervener with the CEC in regard to this project. As a result of studying this project for over a year, I would like to provide you with more detailed information. The Chamber may wish to use this to reevaluate your decision.

1) The press release states that the new CECP "*would replace an existing plant*". NRG is not removing the old Encina facility. They are shutting down the three smallest units but they are not removing them. NRG plans to continue to run the two largest units at Encina for years to come. Therefore, we will have two power plants running. NRG has made no statement in their application that they will remove any of the old Encina facility.

2) The release states "*with a more efficient and lower profile facility*". With the widening of the I-5 all of the existing trees and berm will be removed. Civic leaders have stated that the view will be similar to "Long Beach". This will destroy the aesthetic of the coastal corridor, as the power plant could be as close as sixty feet from the freeway. A new proposed switch yard will be constructed right next to the freeway as well, with one hundred foot poles and lines. Not only will it be in full view to the public, but at the workshop in January the California Energy Commission voiced a safety concern about terrorists or an out of control semi hitting the plant. The Carlsbad Fire Dept. fears that safety is such a concern for this project that they have sent the attached letter to the California Energy Commission.

3) The press release states that there will be “*lower greenhouse gas emissions*”. The new plant can emit up to 845,000 tons of CO in a year. This is equivalent to the carbon footprint of a 60k+ population city and vastly more than the Encina plant emitted last year. The CECP may have a better footprint per megawatt produced than a coal fired plant; but with run-away emissions occurring, how can we accept such an enormous footprint, while there are over 8,000 MW of power licensed by the CEC where the plants are not yet constructed?

4) The release states the new plant will “*create over 350 construction jobs*” but nowhere does it state that any of those jobs will come from this region. Also, when the plant is built the jobs will go away. The CECP application states that there will be no new jobs once the plant is built.

5) The press release also states that the CECP will “*meet growing power demands and provide the region with a reliable source of energy for years to come.*” Ask NRG about their contract with SDG&E. As of this date, where is the contract with SDG&E?

These are a few of the reasons that I strongly encourage the Chamber to reconsider your decision. This plant is a step backward for our region’s future economically, environmentally and aesthetically. With the current economic crisis, we have the luxury of time to become informed and carefully consider the lasting effects of this proposed project.

Sincerely,

Kerry Siekmann

Enclosure