

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	15-AFC-01
Project Title:	Puente Power Project
TN #:	216778
Document Title:	Jan Dietrick Comments Puente Comment Letter
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Rincon-Vitova Insectaries, Inc/ Jan Dietrick
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	4/3/2017 12:24:09 PM
Docketed Date:	4/3/2017

Comment Received From: Rincon-Vitova Insectaries, Inc/ Jan Dietrick

Submitted On: 4/3/2017

Docket Number: 15-AFC-01

Puente Comment Letter

Additional submitted attachment is included below.

Jan Dietrick, MPH, President Rincon-Vitova
Insectaries
805-746-5365

I am small business owner, local leader for Citizens Climate Lobby and Californians for a Carbon Tax and coordinating team member of VC Climate Hub and Friends of Central Coast Power. I respect that certain aspects of the siting are the purview of PUC, not CEC. It is the PUC decisions made in late 2015 that I have long called into questions. PUC has been notoriously reported for corruption and boondoggling with SCE. Do you expect people here to respect any decision by the PUC at that time the PUC made its first decision March 2015?

I have had questions about needs forecasting since summer of 2015. There is no transparency and no answers to these questions raised in 32 pages of Testimony by Bill Powers, P.E., on April 8, 2015 for Center for Biological Diversity to the California Public Utilities Commission as to the failure of SoCal Edison to conduct the RFO in a transparent and fair process. Have his questions been addressed as to how the need was calculated, the dismissal of 200 MW of preferred projects in LA area, the scheduling of the RFO over the holidays with only 90 days for bidders to prepare proposals, the blatant injustice of SCE choosing Orange County to do preferred resource demonstrations instead of Ventura County, Edison's failure to renew over 600 MW of renewable contracts in first 6 mths of 2015, the continuing decline of Edison peak demand. Meanwhile we have SB350 and the opportunity to invest in ee. Has there been an analysis of the comparative MW from investment in ee and distributed gen or from working with the top ten industry ratepayers to cut their peak demand?

The California Environmental Justice Alliance also submitted a brief asking similar questions and I have seen no answers. Meanwhile San Onofre closed, SB350 was enacted, the climate has become significantly more threatened, with very little local investment to win public engagement in how businesses and homeowners can do more to transition away from polluting fuels.

If planners think we need more MW in Ventura County, there must be transparency in the forecasting and a sincere priority on renewables.