
From: Francis Brandt [f.brandt@att.net]
Sent: Wednesday, December 10, 2014 4:54 PM
To: Raitt, Heather@Energy
Subject: Mix up on comment list

me
To
Heather Raitt
Today at 4:52 PM
Hi MS Raitt,

California Energy Commission

DOCKETED

14-IEP-1

TN 74182

DEC 10 2014

I have been looking at the list of comments on the 2014 draft IEPR and I find there is a mix up. My comments to Chris Kavalec's :CEC -200 2014 -009-SD are shown on the comment list for the draft 2014 IEPR. Here are my comments to the draft 2014 IEPR . Can you send them to the draft 2014 IEPR comment list. Thank you.

Senate Bill 1389 (Bowen, Chapter 568, Statutes of 2002) requires the California Energy Commission to prepare a biennial integrated energy policy report that: 1. assesses major energy trends and issues facing the state's electricity, natural gas, and transportation fuel sectors and 2. provides policy recommendations to conserve resources; protect the environment; ensure reliable, secure, and diverse energy supplies; enhance the state's economy; and protect public health and safety (Public Resources Code § 25301[a]).

The Energy Commission prepares these assessments and associated policy recommendations every two years, with updates in alternate years, as part of the Integrated Energy Policy Report

I have amended the Bowen request slightly to aid my comments. The 2014 IEPR is true to item 1 but fails to meet the requirements of item 2 which is the important one because it gives guidance to the legislators. Incidentally slight consideration is given to RELIABLE. In addition the Bowen request was made prior to AB32 but the CEC must consider it in the IERP

First of all the document is 200 pages too long. Editing to remove the many repetitions would help but it really requires a fundamental revision to the message to make it more useful for the intended reader who I presume is a legislator. I believe that most of the data gathered for Bowen requirement 1 would be more useful in the appendices. I doubt that any legislator has the time or inclination to plow through the reams of data provided in the body of the report. Item 2 wants the CEC to analyze the data and make recommendations to the legislator that he can use for legislation. This where the CEC simply doesn't try to provide useful information in the IEPR.

As a citizen I would like to know whether there is enough RELIABLE electric generation in the state to avoid brownouts and enough to cover for the deficiencies of the state mandated "renewable" energy sources. Now that there is a good chance that the AEC will open Yucca mountain the CEC should recommend adding nuclear to the mandated energy sources. Is it wise to rely on natural gas plants to accommodate the ever increasing demand for electricity? How is the legislature going to obligate the citizenry to purchase electric or hydrogen fueled vehicles? Sure the sales have increased but I invite you to walk around where you live and observe what percentage of the new vehicles are electric. I would like to buy a Volt but my wise wife points out that there is nothing wrong with our 12 year old Impala.

The CEC can spend many man hours of effort getting data for the appendices but they need to devote more man hours to asking more useful question about how to reduce GHG in an economic way instead of blithely assuming the taxpayer is always willing to pay the bills.

Frank Brandt