

**Energy - Docket Optical System**

**From:** f.brandt@att.net  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 19, 2012 6:31 PM  
**To:** Energy - Docket Optical System  
**Cc:** Korosec, Suzanne@Energy; Jennings, Jennifer@Energy  
**Subject:** comment to Docket No. 12-IEP-C

TN # 66276

JUL 20 2012

**Categories:** Ready to Docket

Docket No. 12-IEP-C

Frank Brandt comments to June 22, 2012, Lead Commissioner Workshop on Electricity Infrastructure Issues in California

Pity the poor attendees of this workshop who had to sit through hours of talks. Pity the poor reader who has to wade through 290 pages of the transcript recording the workshop. Question, was it worth while?

It must disturb the CEC Commissioners to sit on the dais and hear panelists taking them to task because they are not promoting the wishes of the panelists. They listen to panelists who are more interested in promoting their own ideas than in helping to solve the state energy problems. The real problem is that the CEC conducts workshops as dog and pony shows to satisfy the state legislature that they are heeding the advice of a lot of people, then they turn out IEPs that strictly reflect their own agenda, which is to satisfy the legislature's concepts of how to solve the state energy problems.

This workshop was interesting to the transcript reader in that it dealt with the many real problems aside from those of integrating bad energy sources into the grid that are caused by bad state policy. New fossil powered electric power plants are undesirable despite the fact that demand for electricity is growing and that energy sources other than nuclear cannot do the job. A bunch of small plants is deemed better than one large plant despite the fact that they increase the cost of electricity to the ratepayer and cause real control problems for the ISO. Nuclear plants are deemed bad despite the fact that they offer the only way to reduce greenhouse gas production by meaningful amounts without causing all sorts of expensive problems that the previous workshops on integrating solar and wind illustrate. What was the rationale for having only anti-nuclear panelists? They were making irrational statements that required rebuttal.

The CEC has little interest in informing the legislature and governor that these policies are not sustainable and the new IEP will show no substantial change from the previous ones. This is sad because a revised IEP would improve the state electric power situation, help the state economy and reduce the burden on taxpayers and ratepayers.

As stated in my previous comments the following problems should be addressed by the CEC.

1. How much electric power should the state import ?
2. If Nuclear is undesirable force SONGS AND DIABLO to shut down but only if other energy sources that can provide 24/7 electricity without GHG are available.
3. If Nuclear is desirable mandate that all new plants shall be nuclear.
4. Remove mandate that energy sources that can't generate 24/7 electricity shall be used.

Frank Brandt, private citizen  
San Jose, CA