ORIGINAL

Tammy Russ

L-00000BB-01-0118-00000 04

From: Jeanne Williams [jeannewilliams30@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2007 11:09 AM
To: Gleason-WebEmail
Cc: pirwin@vtc.net; TandDCollazo@aol.com
Subject: Bowie Power Plant

Dear Chairman Gleason:

We're glad the Commission will be examing SPG's application to switch from natural gas to gasification of coal. This is the letter I just sent our Board of Supervisors. Surely this is the time to insist on carbon capture and sequestration.

Mr. Paul Newman

Board of Supervisors

Dear Supervisor Newman:

Thank you for slowing down the rush to approve the Bowie power plant. Ypu are so right that more time and study are needed before such adecision is made.

The proposed Bowie power plant involves infinitely more than a simple land use problem. It affects not only the soil but the air we breathe and water that nurtures life for miles around. The issue affects all the county, not just Bowie where the jobs will be.

The Board is to be applauded for seeking an outside consultant but the integrity of such advice would be utterly compromised if one of the 3 consultants proposed by the company and paid $50,000 by it. "Whose bread I eat, his song I sing," is more truth than melody. Please either seek further or hire one of the people suggested by the state.

It would be an irretrievable mistake to hurry the approval process before a lot more matters are cleared up. What's to prevent SPG from saying, once it's okayed, that IGCC process is too costly, that they didn't get the huge grant they hope for from the government, etc? Take a look at what happened to Minnesota with the Mesaba Project. An energy company conned the governmemt into giving them $36 million for such a plant, promising clea air through carbon capture, cheap power, jobs, lots of tax revenue. When forced to testify to the Public Utility Commission, the company admitted that it wouldn't capture carbon till federal requires that, and also the power is not cheap at all.

Your consultant, among other things, needs to pin the company down about when it will capture carbon and how it will be used. The GAO says it costs 20% more to build an IGCC plant a conventional one. The following information is adapted from a long article by Dick Kamp, a former consultant on the plant who now lives in Santa Fe.

Instead of an estimated 5500 acre-feet of water being pumped to cool the power station,with a "wet" system that evaporates 90% of the water, less than 200 acre feet would be utilized with a dry cooling system combined with IGCC, says dry-cooling advocate Bill Powers of Powers Engineering in San Diego. "It's very cost-competitive with wet-cooling over the long term." For comparison, the city of Santa Fe, New Mexico consumes about 10,000 acre feet of water. Agricultural use of the land the plant would be on has been as high as 12 000 acre feet says Stan Barnes.

Land surrounding the SPG site has sunk or subsided at least 5-6 feet between the 1950s and 1970s from overpumping, says Ray Harris, a State geologist. The Bowie-San Simon history of earth subsidence and fissures that fuel and natural gas lines are sitting on is extremely worrying.

Dry cooling is common at Mexico power plants, and global interest in it is growing rapidly. One such plant is located outside Juarez, a new coal fired plant near Grants, New Mexico will be dry-cooled, as is a new Las Vegas, Nevada, power plant

Large scale experimentation with CO2 removal and usage at power plants is in an early stage. However, IF-- under pressure from the new Congress or a new president--the U.S. begins to tax emissions of carbon from power plants and IF private carbon emissions trading markets grow successfully enough to make it profitable to capture CO2: than a CO2-capturing IGCC Bowie plant may be quite competitive.

One recent technological innovation has been pioneered by the Massachusetts-based GreenFuel Corporation and converts CO2 into biofuel. In a 10 million dollar project by the Palo Verde Nuclear power plant , Arizona Public Service (APS) and GreenFuel hope, by January, to be utilizing 80% of the CO2 emissions –during the day when the sun shines and plant photosynthesis takes place--at the 1040 MW natural gas-fired Redhawk plant.. Wastewater from the power plant and sunlight produce algae that release biofuel as a conversion product from what is known as a bioreactor. The biofuel can be solid fuel, methane, or liquid transportation fuels such as biodiesel and ethanol.

The GreenFuel could ultimately produce as much as 1/3 of the fuel needed for the turbines, according to APS. The algae could also produce animal feed as a byproduct.

This is a challenge to SWG to lead the way in truly clean energy, and no less a challenge to you supervisors, entrusted with the well-being of the whole county, to insist on all safeguards and beneficial uses possible.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Williams

Portal