



FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

October 3, 2008

CONTACT:

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

In Case You Missed It...

Seven More Newspapers Oppose Prop. 7

Long Beach Press-Telegram calls Prop 7 “a costly energy scheme.”

CC Times says “For the sake of the environment, voters should reject Prop. 7”

Total NO on 7 Editorials: 17 and growing...

Sacramento –The *Contra Costa Times* and its four sister papers along with the *Long Beach Press-Telegram* and *Torrance Daily Breeze* are the most recent newspapers to urge readers to vote NO on Prop. 7 this November. The *Press-Telegram* warns voters that the “*measure is confusing and destructive,*” while the *Times* gives proponents of Prop. 7 “...*a failing grade for their execution.*”

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:

Contra Costa Times, 10/2/08, “Vote no on Prop. 7”

- “For the sake of the environment, voters should reject Prop. 7.”
- “In an industry that is developing so quickly, it's foolish to lock in bad rules and make it nearly impossible to change them.”

Long Beach Press-Telegram, 10/3/08, “Prop. 7: A costly energy scheme”

- “State needs renewable power, but this measure is confusing and destructive”.
- “...the more we learn about this measure, the less we like it.”
- “The solar energy market in California... is dominated by small providers of solar power who could be put out of business if Proposition 7 passes.”
- “Proposition 7 would lead to energy market manipulations like California endured at the beginning of the decade”
- “Voters should also consider the groups opposing Proposition 7. They include the California League of Conservation Voters, Environmental Defense Fund, Natural Resources Defense Council and the Union of Concerned Scientists - all of which are on the front lines in the fight against global warming.”

Full editorials below.

List of No on 7 Editorials so far

- 1) Long Beach Press-Telegram (10/3/08)
- 2) Torrance Daily Breeze (10/3/08)
- 3) Contra Costa Times (10/2/08)
- 4) San Ramon Valley Times (10/2/08)
- 5) Valley Times (10/2/08)
- 6) East County Times (10/2/08)
- 7) West County Times (10/2/08)
- 8) Bakersfield Californian (10/2/08)
- 9) Victorville Daily Press (10/1/08)
- 10) Orange County Register (9/30/08)
- 11) Santa Rosa Press Democrat (9/25/08)
- 12) Los Angeles Times (9/19/08)
- 13) Santa Cruz Sentinel (9/19/08)
- 14) San Jose Mercury News (9/13/08)
- 15) San Diego Union-Tribune (9/12/208)
- 16) Riverside Press Enterprise (9/12/08)
- 17) Imperial Valley Press (7/10/08)

Go to www.noprop7.com for more information.

Contra Costa Times, October 2, 2008

http://www.contracostatimes.com/opinion/ci_10619704

Vote no on Prop. 7

Editorial

THE BACKERS OF Proposition 7 get top marks for their good intention to increase the amount of renewable energy generated in California — and a failing grade for their execution.

The measure, funded by Phoenix billionaire Peter Sperling, would require government-owned utilities to generate 20 percent of their electricity from wind and solar energy sources by 2010, a standard currently applicable to private providers. It would also raise requirements for all utilities to 40 percent by 2020 and 50 percent by 2025.

In this era of global warming and soaring energy prices, the goal is laudable but unrealistic. Moreover, the details are so poorly thought out that utility companies, solar panel manufacturers and environmentalists are united in their opposition.

It's not often that the state Democratic Party bonds with the state GOP, or that Pacific Gas and Electric agrees with the Natural Resources Defense Council and the California League of Conservation Voters. But, in this case, they all concur: The state is off to a good start in its fledgling efforts for renewable energy. The last thing we need is to rewrite rules that seem to be working.

But that's what Prop. 7 would do. For starters, the measure would shift authority for permitting of renewable energy power plants from local governments to the California Energy Commission. This would be extremely disruptive to applications already in the pipeline.

The measure would also give authority to the Energy Commission for approval of constructing new transmission lines — authority currently held by the state Public Utilities Commission.

However, as the state's independent Legislative Analyst's Office points out, "it is unclear ... whether the measure has removed PUC's authority in giving it to the Energy Commission." In other words, rather than substituting, this could add a new layer of bureaucracy.

To meet the renewable energy goals, utilities would only be able to count power generated by plants larger than 30 megawatts. That's the equivalent of roughly 15,000 typical solar rooftop systems or about 30 large wind turbines. This minimum-size requirement is anathema to the renewable energy movement, which has built up using small generators. Currently, nearly 60 percent of renewable energy contracts in California are with small providers who would not meet the threshold.

To make matters worse, the measure could be amended only by a two-thirds vote of the Legislature and approval of the governor. In an industry that is developing so quickly, it's foolish to lock in bad rules and make it nearly impossible to change them. For the sake of the environment, voters should reject Prop. 7.

Long Beach Press-Telegram, October 3, 2008

http://www.presstelegram.com/search/ci_10622693?ADID=Search-www.presstelegram.com-www.presstelegram.com

Prop. 7: A costly energy scheme

State needs renewable power, but this measure is confusing and destructive.

Editorial

On its face, Proposition 7 looks like an environmentally beneficial proposal aimed at increasing California utilities' use of renewable energy to 40 percent by 2020 and by 50 percent by 2025. But the more we learn about this measure, the less we like it. For one thing, the campaign for it is being funded largely by an Arizona billionaire, John Sperling, and his son Peter, who seem to be enamored with the idea of large desert solar generators.

The solar energy market in California, however, is dominated by small providers of solar power who could be put out of business if Proposition 7 passes. That's because the measure defines renewable energy as what's produced from stations generating 30 megawatts or more. That seems to exclude most of the state's smaller solar power providers, whose industry association opposes Proposition 7. The future of solar energy generation looks highly decentralized, while this initiative seems to push for large solar projects that transmit energy to distant population centers.

Voters should also consider the groups opposing Proposition 7. They include the California League of Conservation Voters, Environmental Defense Fund, Natural Resources Defense Council and the Union of Concerned Scientists - all of which are on the front lines in the fight against global warming. Opponents see this as a fatally flawed plan that will disrupt more thoughtful efforts to develop renewable energy.

We're also disturbed that Proposition 7 transfers local government oversight of renewable energy plants to the California Energy Commission.

Then there's the state legislative analyst's prediction that the measure would likely result in higher electricity rates for California consumers - at least in the short term. What happens in the long term is impossible to determine. Proposition 7 does contain language limiting electricity rate increases to 3 percent, but the measure lacks a provision to enforce that limit.

The measure does put pressure on government-owned utilities, which historically have been slow to shift to renewables, to increase their dependence on green power. But even those utilities have become more responsible in recent years by increasing their delivery of renewable electricity at a faster rate than investor-owned utilities.

Opponents also fear that Proposition 7 would lead to energy market manipulations like California endured at the beginning of the decade.

The opponents include business groups, organized labor, the two major political parties in California and taxpayer watchdogs. South Bay voters should join this growing list of opponents by voting "No" on Proposition 7 on Election Day.