

Docket Optical System - comment to docket number 11-IEP-1A , Draft 2011 IEPR

From: <f.brandt@att.net>
To: <docket@energy.state.ca.us>
Date: 12/20/2011 3:38 PM
Subject: comment to docket number 11-IEP-1A , Draft 2011 IEPR
CC: <Lynette.Green@energy.state.ca.us>

DOCKET	
11-IEP-1A	
DATE	Dec.20 2011
RECD.	Dec.20 2011

This comment was submitted to: mediaoffice@energy.state.ca.us which apparently was wrong destination. It is submitted again.

This is a comment to the CEC document
 LEAD COMMISSIONER DRAFT REPORT 2011 INTEGRATED ENERGY POLICY REPORT
 Number: CEC-100--2011-001-LCD. docket number 11-IEP-1A , “Draft 2011 IEPR”

As I have commented previously the CEC seemingly has little concept of how to properly advise the legislature on regulating electrical energy in California. This draft report is much too long and really does not address the real problems of electrical energy regulation in the state. It is simply a restatement of bad energy policy from previous policy reports.

The real energy problems of the state are:

1. The state has insufficient in-state electrical generating capacity. Additional electric power is purchased from out of state sources. The report should discuss this and detail why this policy is the proper one or state why it should be changed.
2. The state policy has mandated that reliable 24/7 energy sources be replaced with non reliable energy sources such as wind and solar to generate electricity. The reasoning is that wind and solar don't generate greenhouse gas. They must be backed up by reliable gas fired generators. If one reads the draft document carefully it shows that this is a bad idea but it blithely promotes this as good policy. The report should openly discuss this to encourage the legislature to change to a better energy policy..
3. The report is ambivalent about nuclear energy. It admits that the 2 nuclear plants in CA are valuable but then goes on to discuss all the warts of nuclear energy thus supporting the legislature's view that nuclear is unacceptable. This is strange because nuclear is the only reliable 24/7 energy source that can make a meaningful reduction in greenhouse gas production. The report should encourage the legislature to accept that if it is serious about greenhouse gas reduction it must remove restrictions on nuclear.

This report should offer the legislature a rational approach to changing state energy policy instead of meekly supporting the status quo. It is a lost opportunity.

Frank Brandt, private citizen
 San Jose, CA