

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	15-AFC-01
Project Title:	Puente Power Project
TN #:	215992
Document Title:	Richard Neve Comments: Clean, Cheap, Reliable Alternatives Already in Use - No to P3!!!!!!!
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Richard Neve
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	2/13/2017 7:28:55 PM
Docketed Date:	2/14/2017

Comment Received From: Richard Neve

Submitted On: 2/13/2017

Docket Number: 15-AFC-01

Clean, Cheap, Reliable Alternatives Already in Use - No to P3!!!!!!!

My name is Richard Neve, I'm a long time Ventura resident. Currently, my wife and I live in the Pierpont neighborhood approximately five miles from the Mandalay Generating Station. I am writing this evening to add my voice to the opposition to the Puente Power Project.

Completing this project would hinder California's efforts to achieve its mandated green house gas emissions reductions targets contained SB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act, SB 350 the Clean Energy and Pollution Reductions Act as well as the social, ethical, and moral commitments set forth in AB 197.

An alternative exists. Battery storage facilities are already in operation in southern California. They can be fed by the glut of power generation which already exists and the projected increases in renewable generation detailed in the most recent CEC Renewable Energy Tracking Progress report. Battery storage is clearly a feasible and cost-effective option. I assume the Mira Loma facility would not have been built if SCE still has lingering questions regarding its reliability and frugality for rate-payers. Paying for batteries is clearly a better use of rate-payer dollars than a natural gas peaker plant we will hardly use.

Renewable generation paired with battery storage is the direction the energy industry in California is headed. The CEC clearly agrees. In a press release dated January 13th, 2016 the CEC announced \$6.2 million in grant funding for battery storage research. From the press release, "Battery storage system can help increase performance, lower cost and help when energy demand is variable." Battery storage systems are here, ready to go and are a proven alternative to natural gas fired peaker plants.

I know the local iron workers union has voiced strong support for P3. We certainly need to support our labor unions as they help ensure high paying jobs for hardworking local residents. The last thing anyone who opposes P3 wants is to put fellow community members out of work. So let's ask them to build the renewable infrastructure needed to ensure our power supply for years to come. As I overheard their leader tell them outside the meeting on February 7th, and as one of their members testified that night, they can build the renewable energy infrastructure. They just do not think it will be here for 8 to 10 years. Let's prove them wrong and create high paying jobs for our local unions. Dismantling the Mandalay Generating Station is the first step.

I urge Commissioners Scott and Douglas to rethink how they approach their decision. We've been looking at P3 backwards all along. Rather than the community having to prove why we don't want a reconfigured plant, the burden of justification should be on the CEC, SCE and NRG to demonstrate without a doubt that P3 is a better option than battery storage. I seriously doubt that case can be made. Updating the FSA to seriously account for battery storage as a viable option is a good first start.

Finally, I urge Commissioners Scott and Douglas to recall the wording of SB 32 as it sets a moral, legal and democratic baseline for energy policy decision-making moving forward. We must "achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective green house gas reductions..." "...in a manner that benefits the state's most disadvantaged communities and is transparent and accountable to the public and the Legislature." The public and the Legislature have spoken. It is now your turn to oppose the Puente Power Project.

Richard Neve, Ph.D.