

**Docket Optical System - IEP for 2012**

**From:** <f.brandt@att.net>  
**To:** Suzanne Korosec <Skorosec@energy.state.ca.us>  
**Date:** 4/9/2012 3:50 PM  
**Subject:** IEP for 2012  
**CC:** ed johnson <edwn.johnson@comcast.net>

<b>DOCKET</b> <b>12-IEP-1</b>
----------------------------------

<b>DATE</b>	<u>APR 09 2012</u>
-------------	--------------------

<b>RECD.</b>	<u>APR 10 2012</u>
--------------	--------------------

Comment to IEPR docket number 12-IEP-1

Dear MS Korosec,

It would be nice if you could forward these thoughts about the new IEP for 2012 to the commissioners in charge..

As the new IEP for 2012 is being formulated I hope the commissioners will consider a complete overhaul of the document instead of just upgrading the 2011 version. I believe they should give more consideration to the comments of the many dissenters at the various workshops. For a change the commissioners should take an objective look at California's energy future from a fresh viewpoint instead of just promoting the legislature's and governor's concepts of what should be done.

The legislature's decree that man made greenhouse gas is responsible for global warming is subject to objective review. It is not only kooks that question this view.

Their decree that the only way to reduce GHG is to use solar, wind and other non standard energy sources to produce electricity should be reviewed objectively. It is difficult to generate reliable 24/7 electricity with unreliable energy sources.

Apparently the CEC is committed to meet the ever increasing demand for reliable electricity in the state by increasing the number of gas (fossil) fired plants in the state. How this policy serves to reduce GHG production should be considered.

Does the state have sufficient in state reliable electrical capacity? Some of the people commenting at CEC meetings say yes while others say no. Is it wise for the state to import a large portion of its electricity? The IEP should plainly state what the situation is and then state a policy to deal with the situation.

The CEC ambivalence about nuclear energy is untenable.. If nuclear energy is unacceptable the current nuclear plants should be shut down immediately. If nuclear energy is acceptable then more plants should be built to provide reliable 24/7 electricity with meaningful reduction in GHG production. The state cannot have it both ways.

Frank Brandt  
San Jose, CA