

Docket Optical System - FEEDBACK/COMMENTS TO THE PROPOSE GUIDELINES- SEP ARRA CEC

From: edwin figuerres <edwinf1604@gmail.com>
To: <sep@energy.state.ca.us>
Date: 8/6/2009 9:02 AM
Subject: FEEDBACK/COMMENTS TO THE PROPOSE GUIDELINES- SEP ARRA CEC

1.WITH RESPECT TO ELIGIBILITY- The undersigned respectfully request- THE INCLUSION OF THE WORD INDIVIDUAL IN THE ELIGIBILITY ASPECT ,in order not to exclude, discriminate- individuals who have not yet set up their entity pursuant to these SEP ARRA projects, but who has the ability and technical know how to run and implement such solar, wind, geothermal projects.OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE, the undersigned is suggesting that- in the ELIGIBILITY ASPECT- the phrase- NO RESTRICTIONS be written in lieu of the existing public or private entity. these will ensure- GREATEST PARTICIPATION OF THE PUBLIC HERE IN CA.

2.there are cities here in ca, TO BE SPECIFIC POMONA- which do not have any energy program.it will be hard for the project participants to collaborate with programs which do not exist in the first place. SO MY suggestion is even if the SUPPOSE project is not able to collaborate with existing programs of a particular city or county- AS LONG AS IT IS ENERGY RELATED, LABOR INTENSIVE- which can generate substantial employment to the said city or county- then the PROJECT should be considered for funding.

3.DOUBLE PARTICIPATION- these SEP ARRA PROJECTS are all over America. There are companies which are California Based companies, who are already participating and DIRECTLY FUNDED BY THE DOE- THOUGH THE PROJECTS ARE LOCATED OUTSIDE OF CA.Specifically, i am referring to the following ca based companies- who already have a slice of the pie- California Independent System Operators,Folsom ,California; Idyllwild Municipal Water District,San Diego,Ca; SPG SOLAR,Novato,Ca.

For your consideration and guidance.

Respectfully,
 Edwin C Figuerres

DOCKET

09-OII-1

DATE	AUG 06 2009
RECD	AUG 06 2009