

Comments to the CEC about the funding of a Coal to Hydrogen Facility

CEC Business Meeting Agenda on Wed. 8/26/09

Item# 3. HYDROGEN ENERGY CALIFORNIA (08-AFC-8). Contact: Eileen Allen. (10 minutes)

- A. Possible approval of the Executive Director's data adequacy recommendation for the Hydrogen Energy California project, a nominal 350 MW power generating facility proposed in the Elk Hills region of western Kern County. The project will be fueled by petroleum coke or coal and includes capture of approximately 90 percent of the CO₂ produced for enhanced oil recovery and sequestration.
- B. Possible appointment of a siting committee for the Hydrogen Energy California project.

THIS MUST BE STOPPED! Hydrogen is not clean or sustainable unless it is made from clean or renewable sources, which is the reason for using hydrogen in the first place. There is no such thing as sustainable carbon sequestration. The only sustainable energy or fuel, is a fuel generated from clean renewable non-carbon sources.

Yes I am sure one can find a way to sequester the carbon from this facility. However, if repeated elsewhere, there is not enough safe area and no proven safe method to sequester 3-4 trillion pounds of CO₂ produced from energy every year in the U.S. This is going to be the largest hydrogen fuel facility in the world, and it is all from petroleum and coal coke. There is no proven method of sequestration that can be applied. In Texas a petroleum company wanted to do it, and requested that the state legislature indemnify them because of the significant risk that a leak from underground caverns could occur and leach up from the ground into homes and basements and cause a mass asphyxiation of thousands of people. Algae sequestration is not feasible, as it requires much too much land and bodies of water to sequester. Also, a mass release of such algae organisms into the environment could be disastrous to the environment, especially if the organism is artificially enhanced to sequester it (which we all know will happen), and the by-product is likely to be methane, an even worse GHG. Imagine our coastline covered with green slime due to an accidental release, and the effect on the environment from a mass release of CO₂ or methane.

This also violates the law passed by the California State Assembly that established the Hydrogen Highway and requires that the hydrogen must be generated from at least 33% clean renewable sources. This would violate that aspect of that law.

In addition, I thought the State of California banned the siting of coal facilities for energy. This would also violate that ban.

The whole idea of the hydrogen economy from its inception has been to make an easily useable fuel from clean renewable and sustainable sources that can be easily produced and used upon demand with no harmful emissions, and that it is sustainable because all that you put into it comes back out, hence, nothing is depleted and can last perpetually indefinitely, i.e., eliminate the pollution at its source. Don't generate it and you won't have to abate it (sequestration). Hydrogen from fossil fuels is just more of the same - fossil fuels.

The reason for hydrogen fuel is to eliminate the pollution at the source. If we are not going to do that then why bother.

There are plenty of clean methods to utilize to generate hydrogen for fuel without fossil fuels, methods that would generate more jobs and economic development. Solar, wind, wave, geothermal, etc. That is what you should approve and fund.

When are we going to learn and stop supporting methods that require abatement of pollution, and start choosing methods that eliminate pollution at the source? It is always cheaper, and more effective.

PLEASE OPPOSE THIS PROJECT AND ANY PROJECT THAT GENERATES HYDROGEN FROM DIRTY NON-RENEWABLE NON-SUSTAINABLE SOURCES. VOTE NO TO ITEM #3.

Sincerely,

Paul Staples
707-667-5329

DOCKET	
08-AFC-8	
DATE	<u>AUG 26 2009</u>
RECD.	<u>AUG 26 2009</u>