

Energy - Docket Optical System

From: Sheila Bowers [sheila@sheilabowers.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 08, 2012 4:01 PM
To: Energy - Docket Optical System
Subject: DRECP Alternative Scenarios of July 25, 2012

Dear DRECP members:

I have to express my enormous disappointment at the overreaching and excessive industrial energy development zones contained in your most recent “alternatives” which were also very poorly publicized.

In contrast to your ill-conceived plan, the NREL recently published a study showing more than 76,000 MW of solar capacity just on the rooftops of California’s existing structures (not including parking lots, medians, brownfields, and future structures which easily could add several thousand more MW capacity). So, the fact is that NO desert needs to be slaughtered for Big Energy profits. That should be your starting point, yet it appears that there is some political motivation surrounding your process which uses “we must destroy millions of acres of healthy ecosystems for energy industry profits” as the starting point. I completely disagree, and the facts are on my side.

Not only is killing wilderness for remote energy production akin to eating our seed corn, as these open spaces are very urgently needed for both GHG sequestration and mitigation of climate change impacts, but it is completely wrong to pretend that you understand what the future holds and how to best plan for a warmer planet, and laughable to assume that massive, massive industrialization of the few open spaces we have left is a smart or sustainable idea. As a desert-loving environmentalist and clean-energy advocate, I am embarrassed that you are taking this awful position, frankly, and more than a little angry.

So, now that we all know that no desert needs to be killed for Chevron, BP and Goldman Sachs to get even richer, and now that we all know that the PEIS is just a scam to pimp out taxpayer-owned wilderness for cash, can we get serious about the CONSERVATION part of your job? You need to stand up for all the places and the plants and creatures who do not have a voice in this process, and stop the destruction. We don’t have the time or the money or the water or the “spare” nature to waste on making more Big Energy profiteers more money in lateral moves from one lousy centralized, deadly, unreliable power system to another one. The planet is frying and our rooftops are baking and sprawling while you fiddle around trying to maximize energy industry profits.

It is hugely dishonest to greenwash ecosystem slaughter, and no, the ends do not justify the means when there is a faster, cleaner, fairer, cheaper and FAR more effective way to get clean green electrons into the grid. Nevada legislators who forced through thousands of acres of Big Wind are now complaining that none of their greenwashed industrialized wind produces even 10% of its rated capacity - It is unconscionable, and this is exactly where we are headed if we get stuck with your alternatives.

PACE/AB811 loans need to be restored immediately and a legitimate feed in tariff (not the Re-Mat garbage the CPUC has been wasting our time with) needs to be put in place for local point of use solar systems <100kW in size. 100% of successful renewables programs all over the world use generous FITs and again, it is embarrassing to be stuck with a government who is in the Stone Age with respect to energy policy and that the WORST aspects of the fossil fuel industry are being embraced in your “renewable” plan, by focusing on killing the maximum amount of wilderness with the minimum amount of energy, economic and environmental upsides.

If there is anyone at all on your committee who cares about the environment, the economy, the desert, global warming, the water crisis, air quality, property values, jobs, biodiversity, history, democracy, energy independence, grid reliability or common sense, please will you stop the killing of our precious places and turn the focus to the built environment, where it belongs?

In case I have not made myself clear, none of your alternatives are acceptable. CEQA insists that you look at the legitimate, feasible, cheaper and faster built environment renewables plus efficiency alternative, and so do I.

Thank you, I look forward to a dramatic improvement in your plan in the short term,
Sheila Bowers