

# San Francisco Chronicle

THURSDAY, JULY 24, 2008

## 'Progressive' power play

San Francisco Supervisors Aaron Peskin, Sophie Maxwell, Bevan Dufty and Jake McGoldrick all claim to be “progressives”; all claim to be interested in “green” energy; all claim to be advocates for what's in the city's best interest. So it came as a bit of a surprise and disappointment to learn that this gang of four just slipped a proposition onto the November ballot that would effectively kill the city's hard-won fight for a green solution to that filthy Mirant power plant in Potrero Hill.

Rather than retrofit the Mirant plant to run on cleaner power until the Public Utilities Commission can finish the groundwork for the next generation of power production, the four supervisors want to build more fossil fuel plants.

They refuse to let go of that bad idea to build three new “peaker” plants at the Mirant site. Three new peakers equals another 30 years of polluted air for the residents of southeast San Francisco, and another 30 years that the so-called green city is tethered to expensive and damaging fossil fuels—when other alternatives have been clearly specified.

What's their defense?

“The process of closing the Hunters Point and Potrero Hill polluting power plants has dragged on for years, because the city doesn't have control,” said Bevan Dufty. “I am supportive of public power, and I think it would be better for the city to have access to its power.”

We share the four supervisors' frustration with the outrageously long delays in closing the Mirant plant. But it makes no sense, in economic or environmental prudence, for the city to make a multimillion-dollar long-term investment in a technology based on fossil fuels—unless, of course, there is another agenda at work.

Some supervisors seem to believe that these new peakers will give the city an entree into the public power business. Putting aside the fallacy of that business plan—why would they want to subject San Franciscans to pollution and health problems simply so that they can have an ideological victory? Is the religion of “public power” really more important to them than San Franciscans' health and the city's goals about reducing greenhouse gas emissions?

Had enough? Let them know.