Docket Optical System - Docket No. 08-IEP-1F

From: <[redacted]
To: <docket@energy.state.ca.us>
Date: 9/29/2008 5:36 PM
Subject: Docket No. 08-IEP-1F

DOCKET
08-IEP-1F
DATE SEP 29 2008
RECD SEP 29 2008

Docket No. 08-IEP-1F

October 9, 2008
Notice of Committee Hearing on Committee Draft 2008 Integrated Energy Policy Report Update

Public comment
I have sent another version of this comment but it has not appeared in the public comments so here is a revised version that I hope you will accept and publish,

This is a public comment to the referenced 2009 Integrated Energy Policy Report .

It is frustrating to make a rational comment ln an "Alice in Wonderland" scenario where the CA State Legislature mandates a marginally possible energy policy and where the CEC staff spends time, effort and taxpayer money to try to justify that policy. The CEC creates a draft report about this and solicits public comment which it ignores if doesn't reflect the party line.. The only hope for commentators who don't agree with the party line is another fairy tale, "The Emperor's New Clothes" where the public hears and finally accepts the child's comment that the Emperor is naked.

I have just read the CEC Report CEC 100-2008-104 Proposed Final Opinion Summary.
When one reads this report along with several other CEC reports dealing with energy policy with respect to AB 32 one is struck with an anomaly. No where does the policy statement consider nuclear energy as a viable source of clean energy to generate electricity.

The state legislature presumably looks to the CEC for advice on energy policy and I believe the CEC is remiss in not telling the legislature that it is a serious mistake for them to not allow nuclear energy in the list of clean energy sources suitable for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) production by the electric industry.

When the governments of France, Japan, China, India, England, Finland, Germany Italy and others all recognize the value of nuclear energy as a viable clean energy source:. when Wisconsin has removed its roadblocks to additional nuclear plants. when there are many states with operating nuclear plants (including California,}, it makes one wonder what is going on in the minds of the CEC staff as they continue to ignore the only source of clean energy that can make it possible to meet a mandate for 80 or even 30 percent reduction of greenhouse gas production by electric generators in California.

I realize that accepting nuclear energy is anathema to many members of the legislature and to much of the staff of the CEC but in totally ignoring it as a policy decision is certainly not only a costly mistake but also sabotages the only way to achieve the projected goal of an 80 percent reduction in GHG by the electric power industry.

The CEC workshops on nuclear energy have all been arranged to emphasize the supposed faults of nuclear energy and the resulting workshop report, presumably directed to the legislature, are designed to

maintain the roadblocks erected against nuclear

This policy decision is a serious and costly mistake that should be changed immediately. The policy report should be changed with a section devoted to the reasons for using nuclear energy to reduce GHG.....Back it up with a workshop to demonstrate why nuclear energy is the only efficient and practical clean energy source that can generate the 24/7 electricity that the people and industry of California need.

Frank Brandt
San Jose, CA
408-264-2135