Subject: CEC record Docket #11-AFC-03 Quail Brush Power Generation Siting Case

Laura Tenhunen [laura.tenhunen@cox.net]

Sent: Sunday, April 29, 2012 1:25 PM
To: Solorio, Eric@Energy
Cc: gail.ramer@asm.ca.gov; assemblymember.jones@assembly.ca.gov; senator@boxer.senate.gov; JDale@ci.santee.ca.us; JMinto@ci.santee.ca.us; JRyan@ci.santee.ca.us; RMcNelis@ci.santee.ca.us; RVoepel@ci.santee.ca.us; senator@feinstein.senate.gov; CA52DHima@mail.house.gov; susan.davis@mail.house.gov; anthonyyoung@sandiego.gov; CarlDeMaio@sandiego.gov; davidalvarez@sandiego.gov; JerrySanders@sandiego.gov; kevinfaulconer@sandiego.gov; loriezapf@sandiego.gov; martiemerald@sandiego.gov; SherriLightner@sandiego.gov; toddgloria@sandiego.gov; dianne.jacob@sdcounty.ca.gov; Senator.Kehoe@sen.ca.gov

My name is Laura Tenhunen, and I live on 656 Live Oak Drive, El Cajon, CA 92020, and I **Oppose** the Quail Brush Power Plant Project! I request that the CEC stop the project by **choosing the "No Project Alternative."**

The park was a 2000 acre gift from the Federal Government to be used for open space supporting the residential community, and it should remain as such. The city of San Diego should stop this project and instead support the federal government's mandate to move away from fossil-fuel based energy and look to solar energy. Solar panels on rooftops will harness the abundant sunshine our city enjoys year round, and can provide us with environmentally friendly and plentiful power*.

I OPPOSE this initiative and demand the CEC choose the No Project Alternative. It would be wrong for the CEC to vote to approve this permanently damaging change so that a power company can place their plant in a convenient, cost effective location so they can increase their gross profits at the communities' expense in every conceivable way.

Sincerely,

Laura Tenhunen

*Regarding placing solar panels on private rooftops, in my opinion, as an early purchaser of solar panels for my house (year 2001), it would be much more efficient to place them on large buildings or parking structures, or, better yet, set aside a dedicated acreage (in an appropriate area that would be near cities, but not impact habitat for wildlife). Whatever the location, SDGE or another electricity provider would be responsible for maintaining the systems.

Note that home owners who privately purchase solar panels do not, in most cases, have them checked out annually or semi-annually to make sure all the panels are still functioning (many will not notice the decrease in power production that results from a faulty panel or group of panels). Nor do they make sure they are kept clean (yes, the panels must be hosed and wiped down every couple of months outside of the rainy season in order to maintain maximum efficiency). Also, once the 5-7 year warranties on these panels run out, the private owner is entirely responsible for all repairs, something that can be very expensive. A couple of years ago, right after my warranty ran out, I paid some $600 to diagnose a problem that caused an inverter to fail. It turned out the inverter was fine, but had a loose screw! The $600 was the cost of the labor involved in diagnosing and repairing the problem. If I had it to do over again, I would NOT purchase solar panels, and this is what I tell everyone who asks me.

A couple of years ago, SDGE invited me and other solar panel owners to a forum. SDGE, it turned out, was considering supplying the inverters to solar panel owners, and **maintaining** them, repairing or replacing them if necessary, and generally checking out the system to make sure it was working at

maximum efficiency. To my dismay, apparently most of my fellow solar panel owners were opposed to this (one SDGE guy told me they didn't want their privacy invaded!). However, none of their warranties had run out, so all they had to do, if they had a problem was give their installer a call. If they had had my experience, perhaps they would have been more receptive to SDGE's idea. (My installer went out of business!)

Another problem with the private purchase of solar panels is that the money is in installing them, **not in maintaining and repairing them.** If we are to continue promoting the private purchase of solar panels (something which I **strongly oppose**), then the state should allocate funds to subsidize solar **maintenance** businesses. Otherwise, good luck in finding anyone who will promptly come out and service your panels for a reasonable price.

I called the California Department of Energy a couple of years ago, warning that the "million solar roof" initiative was flawed. In my message I pointed out that the power production efficiency of privately owned solar panels would likely decline, due to lack of maintenance, and regular cleaning, that the burden of repairing the systems would fall entirely upon the solar homeowners, once their warranties expire, and importantly, there is an insufficient number of businesses dedicated to maintaining and repairing photovoltaic systems. (I predict many homeowners will simply not repair their systems if it's too expensive). I stated that if individual ownership of solar panels continues to be promoted by the State of CA **and the installers of the panels**, along with misguided environmental groups, the CDOE needs to encourage the creation of small businesses that strictly exist to maintain the million solar roof systems. (I received no response from CDOE).

Based on my personal experience as a very early purchaser of solar panels (most people's warranties have not yet run out)**, it would be far better for SDGE and other electricity providers to purhase and operate large solar panel facilities--either on parking roofs, or large building roofs, or in an already degraded area near a city. That way high efficiency would be maintained through frequent checkups, regular cleaning and immediate repair and replacement as necessary. Government grants facilitating this would be very appropriate and a much better use of taxpayer dollars than subsidizing private homeowners whose systems will ultimately degrade due to inadequate and/or prohibitively expensive upkeep.**