

**DOCKETED**

<b>Docket Number:</b>	19-BUSMTG-02
<b>Project Title:</b>	Public Comment on California Energy Commission Business Meetings
<b>TN #:</b>	230679
<b>Document Title:</b>	Claire Ann Warshaw Comments - 2019_11_13 after the meeting comment on community solar share part of the solar mandate, Item #6
<b>Description:</b>	N/A
<b>Filer:</b>	System
<b>Organization:</b>	Claire Ann Warshaw
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Public
<b>Submission Date:</b>	11/13/2019 7:56:41 PM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	11/14/2019

*Comment Received From: Claire Ann Warshaw  
Submitted On: 11/13/2019  
Docket Number: 19-BUSMTG-02*

## **2019\_11\_13 after the meeting comment on community solar share part of the solar mandate, Item #6**

After listening to item number six at today's meeting, I wondered:

1. If the commission votes against the community solar option, will there be new some low-rise residential without the best solar roof profile, due to roof position, small multi-units, & shading? In order to have solar panels on roofs in my townhouse complex, the idea would have to first be vetted by our volunteer elected community board/management. Then, a majority of the 111 unit owners have to vote yes and for the large trees removed - expensive, plus solar panel costs added to association dues.\* There are many on fixed income. I might guess the idea could be made more renewable than rooftop for this not new situation. I realize the mandate is for new low rise. A vote against, could be a vote against low income, densely occupied situations and multi-housing owner occupied housing.

2. Why is the old solar share program going in this mandate and not part of SMUD's portfolio for the entire region? I get that developers are to carry the costs - desirable, keeping rates lower. Distance and additional land are expensive. Will they be asked to use underground transmission - which makes building more expensive and possibly earthquake prone?

3. Can they keep the transmission investments in California? It would be historic if the commissioners voted against transmission sources, because of perceived badness of utility traditional processes - due to wildfires and other issues. Right?

4. Also, this dude passed a note. Please see attached.

5. Plus, at last month's California Energy Commission Business Meeting, a small community asked to be exempt due to cost.

\*Sad to remove trees, but even I as a past Botany major, could accept some tree removal ideas. The trees out front my unit shade my unit in wonderful ways though and provide some aesthetics from the bold asphalt street. I prefer trees for shade more often than cinder block walls, and some other man-made shade ways. One research item to consider: Trees, plants and some algae/bacteria might be more useful for transpiration than we are aware of, not sure; it seems it would be extremely desirable to know this, but likely never enough investment dollars in botanical research are available and may not prove reliable transpiration science values. The last many years have been hard on California plant lovers. Might be useful to remind ourselves of our natural California landscapes, with books like "Cadillac Desert" by Marc Reisner, though, before fretting too much.

*Additional submitted attachment is included below.*

Cost Effectness test  
→  $10-109(K)$  is a  
Position Pill that kills  
both options