

03-IEP-01 , 02-REN-1038, 03-RPS-1078 and 04-DIST-GEN-1

COMMENTS, QUESTIONS, SUGGESTIONS
Response to Energy Commission Workshop Aug. 27
On Accelerated Renewable Energy Development

This compilation of comment is a sample of public response. CREED, Coalition for Responsible and Ethical Environmental Decisions Sun Power Focus Group viewed/listened, via computer, the Energy Commission August 27 workshop, via the web. These comments are offered by CREED participants in that session, and/or respondents to the staff white paper.

Our focus group is exceedingly grateful for the electronic opportunity to participate. Lacking the level of staff-industry-utility expertise, we provide typical spectrum of public opinion on California energy matters.

We are residents of rapid growth southern California, and aware of public resistance to both old and new transmission lines---and proposals to run the lines through multimillion dollar residential zoned land. We have such transmission corridors, and urge power generation that reduces the need for more, ever more, lines.

Why do we promote and enable the building of large generating facilities at great distance from the energy demand, when we could give incentive to produce the power on the roofs, walls and parking structures of industrial and commercial structures, hospitals, schools, and government buildings? We need PV and other on-site renewables so that we can meet our 20% by 2010 goal.

There must be incentives to encourage investors to partner with owners to , in effect, rent roof-tops of block-long industrial and commercial buildings instead of attempting to site new power plants or repower old ones on billion dollar coastal sites that would be better re-developed as hotels or ocean view office or residential buildings.

We suggest a policy of "terrorist world---small energy generation installations are better." Please design regulations that will allow us to sell our roof-top solar energy to utilities who will get double credits reward. Most of our PV units have inverters that will serve additional solar panels. For fast-track solar, now, establish the fund proposed by the Environmental Protection Agency staff by increasing rates 30-40 cents per month. Then make no-interest loans for the whole spectrum of solar and other distributive energy installations. Pay the utilities or banks from the fund to pay for the accounting. Pay them enough to make the inconvenience profitable.

Several of our participants offered individual suggestions:

Doris Andersen, past president of American Association of University Women, Capistrano Bay Branch, noted that our general public does not know about the peaking crisis we will face next summer. They don't even know what a peaking crisis or peaking plant is. She asks the Commission to provide a list of technical terms and initials, so that we can educate ourselves. Doris is a resident of San Juan Capistrano. She attended our web/workshop monitoring on August 27.

Marylou Hamaker, past president of Soroptimist International of Capistrano Bay. Who participated in conducting a Soroptimist/San Clemente Mayor co-sponsored Sun Power Town Forum in June, suggests that an educational, informative community forum in the Capistrano Bay area presented by Energy Commission staff would be helpful in promotion of solar roof-top generation, co-generation and other distributive energy systems. She suggests that the forum be designed and publicized to serve the planning needs of industrial and commercial property owners.

Ric Nicol, former planning commission member, and CREED liaison to Rotary, suggested that a Rotary lunch meeting, expanded to co-sponsorship with other appropriate chamber of commerce members to inform industrial and commercial property owners, builders, architects and planners, might stimulate PV planning in the Capistrano Bay area.

In response to the CEC request for identification of barriers to reaching the 20percent by 2010, Marilyn OBrien noted that the dearth of inadequate public information is a major hinderance to wise choices of energy generation and delivery systems in the immediate projected high energy demand years in California and in the years beyond 2010. Marilyn, is an American Association of University Women, Capistrano Bay Branch past president. She said that we need comprehensive cost analysis of the renewables, and of fossil fuel and nuclear generation. Marilyn asks the Commission for "comparative data for a 25 year productive life span, and for a second 25year repowering/rebuilding span for both the clean, abundant energy generation and the fossil fuel and nuclear generation,"

Dorothy Boberg, environmental researcher and author, cautioned that comparisons must include both the standard production costs and the governmental subsidies that have given citizen tax and rate money for billion dollar research, insurance, regulation, gifts of precious natural resources, clean up costs , ongoing costs of pollution, and thousands of years of monitoring and containing of dangerous wastes from fossil fuels and nuclear generation. She noted that the Commission can protect the public by refusing to guarantee funding and profits of "stranded investments." A retired realtor, Boberg noted that a balanced cost estimate must include assessment of costs of siting for various installations and various need for transmission

equipment, maintenance, and transmission siting, including loss of electricity in transmission from remote generating sites. Boberg lives in the San Fernando Valley.

Marianne Sue Brown, retired hospital administrator, participating in the focus group monitoring of the August 27 workshop, cautioned that an assessment of costs must include the immeasurables, and suggested that some medical costs might be given token monetary value. She said that the assessment must include impacts on the environment, dependability, physical and mental health and quality of life. Brown recommended that the League of Women Voters, respected for its impartial Pro and Con presentations of voter initiatives, be asked to edit and format the Commission data.

Official Orange County Historian Doris Walker, resident of Dana Point, placed the time mark on the Commission's update. She seconded the request for the second 25 year, or repowering option cost assessment. She said that this is an area where conjecture by the generator can result in tremendous costs to rate payers and tax payers. Both Edison and PGand E have submitted applications for permit to purchase new steam generators for their aging reactors---the first step in the second 25 year cycle of potential repair and replacement expenditures that will lock us in to the un-wise buy-in to stranded investments. Doris said that the wild and unacceptable repowering/rebuilding by Edison, of San Onofre Unit I, cost us repayment of Edison's stranded investments for four years after Unit I was no longer producing electricity.

Compiled by Lyn Harris Hicks for CREED Sun Power Focus Group 949 -492 5078

I would like to underscore the urgency of the Energy Commission update. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is granting licensing renewals to nuclear generating facilities without safety assessment of the aging plants, and are proposing Federal over-ride of state permits requirements for closing and decommissioning the plants, and for override of state legislation that rejects further construction of nuclear power plants in California until permanent repository is provided.

Legislation on the Governor's desk awaiting signature (section 400.09 d) provides Reasonable opportunity to fully recover from all customers of the electrical company "a return of and a reasonable return on" reasonable investment in utility owned generation, transmission and distribution resources. Section 400.05.b provides for stranded investments by enacting the right to "fully recover both:
1. initial capital investment, and 2. full cost of contracting for other generating resources. Lyn Harris Hicks