<b>Docket Number:</b>	15-AFC-02
Project Title:	Mission Rock Energy Center
TN #:	211322
<b>Document Title:</b>	Charles J. Spink Comments: Renewal Energy, not more Natural Gas
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Charles J. Spink
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Public
<b>Submission Date:</b>	4/30/2016 6:43:16 PM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	5/2/2016

Comment Received From: Charles J. Spink

Submitted On: 4/30/2016 Docket Number: 15-AFC-02

## Renewal Energy, not more Natural Gas

## California Energy Commission:

(The following letter, written by me, has been shared with other Santa Paula's who may have submitted this, wholly or in part, with my permission. I ask that you also consider this as an addendum to earlier letters of concern I submitted earlier):

I would like to voice my disapproval of Calpine Corporation's proposed Mission Rock Energy Center site, an unsuitable location for placing a 50MW gas-fired power plant. First, it is squarely in the 100-year floodplain of the Santa Clara River, which for critical infrastructure of this type should be an immediate disqualification. Secondly, we have viable, increasingly cheaper renewable energy options that are replacing these fossil fuel choices NOW. Building more solar infrastructure is a greater need, one that solves energy problems at multiple levels, including security. Indeed, this is a mandate for California to be 50% renewable by 2050, and we need to do this sooner rather than later. Happily, the development of massive battery storage options is quickly becoming a reality. Batteries will soon be the new †peaker plants'! So, why continue to invest in this old technology?

The Union of Concerned Scientists has pointed out that our over-reliance on gas-fired energy solutions -in California specifically- is the unexamined  $\hat{a} \in \text{Clean-energy}$  option  $\hat{a} \in \text{TM}$  we continue to embrace. As it turns out, looking at the life cycle environmental impact for natural gas fuel, it proves to be little better than coal! It still pollutes  $\hat{a} \in \text{Cmot}$  as much at point of use- but gas extraction is a horrendous producer of uncontained methane (a potent green house gas). The potential for explosions and storage leaks (San Bruno, Aliso Canyon) is ever-present, with gut-wrenching results. And fracking, integral to natural gas production, has finally been shown by Stanford scientists to positively infiltrate ground water.

I think the sooner we move away from fossil fuel energy production, the sooner we will find renewal energy solutions that will be our future. Please vote not to build this old technology solution.

Thank you