



www.NoProp7.com

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

October 2, 2008

CONTACT:

Kathy Fairbanks, (916) 443.0872  
(916) 813.1010 cell

## ***In Case You Missed It...***

### ***Bakersfield Californian, Orange County Register, and Victorville Daily Press latest to Oppose Prop. 7***

***Californian calls Prop. 7 “flawed”***

***Orange County Register warns Prop. 7 is “economically dangerous”***

### **Total NO on 7 Editorials: 10 and growing...**

**Sacramento** – The *Bakersfield Californian*, *Victorville Daily Press*, and the *Orange County Register* recently joined a growing list of editorial boards urging a NO vote on Prop. 7 this November. The *Daily Press* and *Register* warn that Prop. 7 is an “onerous scheme,” while the *Bakersfield Californian* says that the initiative “could spike energy costs.” Selected quotes as well as the full editorials appear below.

Prop. 7 supporters claim the measure will increase renewable energy in California. Opponents of Prop. 7, who strongly support increasing alternative energy production in California, believe the initiative is so flawed it will result in less, not more, renewable power. Economists and consumer advocates warn the initiative will significantly increase electric bills. Prop. 7 is opposed by virtually every renewable power provider and environmental organization along with business, consumer, taxpayer, labor, senior, local government groups and more than 200 other groups.

Below are select quotes from each editorial:

#### ***Bakersfield Californian, 10/2/08, “No on Proposition 7”***

- “Seldom have we seen a ballot measure unite so many often-warring interests utility companies, environmental groups, government energy regulators, alternative energy producers and both political parties.”
- Prop. 7 “could spike energy costs”
- “flawed and complicated scheme”

#### ***Orange County Register, 9/30/08, “California Prop. 7 Editorial: A energy-fraud twofer”***

- Prop. 7 is “economically dangerous...”
- “A highly unlikely coalition of 160 groups oppose it”
- “...its rigid, top-down mandates would drive smaller-scale, renewable energy providers out of the market...”
- “Prop. 7 is an example of a ham-handed, onerous scheme...”

#### ***Victorville Daily Press, 10/1/08, “Energy Fraud”***

- “Prop. 7 is an... onerous scheme”

- “The independent state Legislative Analyst concluded, ‘Higher electricity rates are more likely in the short term,’ and ‘the same cost factors ... might also lead to higher long-run electricity rates.’ So much for reducing energy costs.”
- “...many environmental groups oppose Prop. 7 because its rigid, top-down mandates would drive smaller-scale, renewable energy providers out of the market

Full editorials below.

### **List of No on 7 Editorials so far**

- 1) Bakersfield Californian (10/2/08)
- 2) Victorville Daily Press (10/1/08)
- 3) Orange County Register (9/30/08)
- 4) Santa Rosa Press Democrat (9/25/08)
- 5) Los Angeles Times (9/19/08)
- 6) Santa Cruz Sentinel (9/19/08)
- 7) San Jose Mercury News (9/13/08)
- 8) San Diego Union-Tribune (9/12/2008)
- 9) Riverside Press Enterprise (9/12/08)
- 10) Imperial Valley Press (7/10/08)

Go to [www.noprop7.com](http://www.noprop7.com) for more information.

### ***Bakersfield Californian, October 2, 2008***

<http://www.bakersfield.com/opinion/editorials/story/568396.html>

#### **No on Proposition 7**

Editorial

Seldom have we seen a ballot measure unite so many often-warring interests utility companies, environmental groups, government energy regulators, alternative energy producers and both political parties.

The problem: Proposition 7 has united these groups in opposition.

Prop. 7 is so poorly written and the potential consequences so dire that groups that would normally support an alternative energy initiative are screaming: NO!

California voters should join this chorus of concern on Nov. 4. Vote NO on Prop. 7.

The initiative's goals are admirable: reduce California's dependence on fossil fuel and reduce global warming.

But the brainchild of Arizona billionaires John and Peter Sterling, the founders of the University of Phoenix, went off track at the start. They failed to adequately consult with groups long involved in California's development of alternative energy. Instead they created a nightmare of consequences that could spike energy costs and set back the movement.

The initiative requires California utilities to obtain 50 percent of their energy from alternative sources solar, wind, biomass, etc. by 2025. California already is on track to increase these supplies. But 50 percent by 2025 is doubtful.

The initiative seems to exclude systems that generate less than 30 megawatts from the state's renewable-power goal. Tough break for rooftop systems and smaller plants.

The initiative allows alternative producers to charge over 10 percent more than the going rate for their energy and locks utilities into 20-year contracts.

Enacting this flawed and complicated scheme through the initiative process requires a difficult two-thirds vote of the Legislature or voter approval to correct problems.

The out-of-state billionaires who concocted this scheme should have kept the \$7.5 million they already have spent on the campaign in their pockets.

### ***Orange County Register, September 30, 2008***

Paid for by Californians Against Another Costly Energy Scheme - No on 7,  
major funding from PG&E Corporation and Southern California Edison Company,  
a coalition of environmentalists, renewable energy companies, taxpayers, and labor  
Phone 866-811-9255 Fax 866-811-9258 [www.NoProp7.com](http://www.NoProp7.com)

<http://www.ocregister.com/articles/prop-energy-market-2173960-government-electricity>

## **California Prop. 7 Editorial: A energy-fraud twofer measure dictates more renewable energy use** Editorial

Proposition 7's arrogance should offend every Californian. Its two alleged benefits are that it will "reduce the rising costs of energy" and "limit the dangers of global warming."

First, the more-obvious canard: Even if you buy the theory that man-made greenhouse gas emissions create higher global temperatures, which we don't, the certainty of growing reliance on fossil fuels by developing nations alone would far outweigh whatever relatively meager emission reductions California might accomplish through Prop. 7.

The other preposterous claim that Prop. 7 will "reduce the rising costs of energy," is, at best, wishful thinking. The independent state Legislative Analyst concluded, "Higher electricity rates are more likely in the short term," and "the same cost factors ... might also lead to higher long-run electricity rates." So much for reducing energy costs.

The Legislative Analyst also states that the proposition's imposed government manipulation of electricity prices, artificial price caps and efforts to determine electricity's "market price" will have unknown effects. We shudder at the thought of government determining market prices. Recall President Nixon's wage and price controls of the early 1970s.

What Prop. 7 would accomplish is a new requirement that utilities must generate half their electrical output from renewable energy sources by 2025. The state already requires nongovernment-run utilities to provide 20 percent of their power from renewable sources by that date.

Prop. 7 would force the conversion from affordable and proven coal, oil and nuclear power to alternative sources such as solar and wind. If solar and wind are so economical, affordable and reasonable, why haven't utilities already converted?

The Draconian proposals and over-the-top claims of Prop. 7 have achieved one, heretofore implausible outcome. A highly unlikely coalition of 160 groups oppose it, including the Democratic and Republican parties, unions and the Chamber of Commerce, the California Taxpayers Association, California League of Conservation Voters and many other environmental groups.

Interestingly, many environmental groups oppose Prop. 7 because its rigid, top-down mandates would drive smaller-scale, renewable energy providers out of the market; others object to the arbitrary cap on pricing.

These are the inherent flaws of government dictating prices and products, which are matters best determined by the free, unregulated market through voluntary exchanges that benefit all participants. Prop. 7 is an example of a ham-handed, onerous scheme for government to pick economic winners and losers based on preconceived notions and arbitrary preferences of a handful of cloistered, self-styled experts. That's more than offensive. It's economically dangerous and freedom-denying.

**Victorville Daily Press, October 1, 2008**

[http://www.vvdailypress.com/opinion/energy\\_8782\\_article.html/prop\\_market.html](http://www.vvdailypress.com/opinion/energy_8782_article.html/prop_market.html)

### **Energy fraud**

Editorial

Proposition 7's arrogance should offend every Californian. Its two alleged benefits are that it will "reduce the rising costs of energy" and "limit the dangers of global warming."

First, the more-obvious canard: Even if you buy the theory that man-made greenhouse gas emissions create higher global temperatures, which we don't, the certainty of growing reliance on fossil fuels by developing nations alone would far outweigh whatever relatively meager emission reductions California might accomplish through Prop. 7.

The other preposterous claim that Prop. 7 will "reduce the rising costs of energy," is, at best, wishful thinking. The independent state Legislative Analyst concluded, "Higher electricity rates are more likely in the short term," and "the same cost factors ... might also lead to higher long-run electricity rates." So much for reducing energy costs.

The Legislative Analyst also states that the proposition's imposed government manipulation of electricity prices, artificial price caps and efforts to determine electricity's "market price" will have unknown effects. We shudder at the thought of government determining market prices. Recall President Nixon's wage and price controls of the early 1970s.

What Prop. 7 would accomplish is a new requirement that utilities must generate half their electrical output from renewable energy sources by 2025. The state already requires nongovernment-run utilities to provide 20 percent of their power from renewable sources by that date.

Prop. 7 would force the conversion from affordable and proven coal, oil and nuclear power to alternative sources such as solar and wind. If solar and wind are so economical, affordable and reasonable, why haven't utilities already converted?

Interestingly, many environmental groups oppose Prop. 7 because its rigid, top-down mandates would drive smaller-scale, renewable energy providers out of the market; others object to the arbitrary cap on pricing.

These are the inherent flaws of government dictating prices and products, which are matters best determined by the free, unregulated market through voluntary exchanges that benefit all participants. Prop. 7 is an example of a ham-handed, onerous scheme for government to pick economic winners and losers based on preconceived notions and arbitrary preferences of a handful of cloistered, self-styled experts. That's more than offensive. It's economically dangerous and freedom-denying.