

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	12-AFC-03
Project Title:	Redondo Beach Energy Project
TN #:	200592
Document Title:	Alexander Whittemore Comments: I am strongly opposed
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Alexander Whittemore
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	9/26/2013 11:25:32 AM
Docketed Date:	9/26/2013

Comment Received From: Alexander Whittemore

Submitted On: 9/26/2013

Docket Number: 12-AFC-03

I am strongly opposed

I'd like to register my strong personal opposition to replacing the existing Redondo power generating facility with a new natural gas facility. I'll admit I was very excited to hear of the planned demolition of the old facility - to call the three generating facilities on the LA coastline eyesores is an understatement, but more than that the seaside, upwind positioning of them assuredly contributes significantly to LA's smog problem.

Of course, my real opposition to the proposed facility is neither that it would be an eyesore (it would be) nor that it would contribute to smog (it would, though certainly less than the current facilities - natural gas is incredibly clean-burning compared to coal, both in terms of pollutants and in terms of CO2 emission per unit energy produced).

The real source of my opposition is natural gas itself. How could that be, if it's so much cleaner than coal (it is)? Methane itself is a greenhouse gas roughly 21 times as potent in the atmosphere as CO2. What this implies is a roughly 2% leakage break-even point for environmental impact, coal vs CO2. That is, if >2% of the natural gas used to supply a particular end-use leaks to atmosphere before delivery, you may as well have run the end-use on coal. Current estimates of worldwide natural gas production place leakage, mostly at wellheads and through cast iron pipelines, at a MINIMUM of 3.5%, with realistic figures as high as a 10% overall industry average. See <http://www.nature.com/news/methane-leaks-erode-green-credentials-of-natural-gas-1.12123>

Not only is the Redondo generating station footprint in a populated, upwind, economically expanding location poorly suited to hosting a power plant or other heavy industrial site, the proposed replacement is significantly worse for the environment overall.