



FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

October 7, 2008

CONTACT:

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

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

### ***Nine More Newspapers Oppose Prop. 7***

***San Francisco Chronicle* says Prop. 7 “runs a good cause off the cliff.”**

***Fresno Bee* calls Prop. 7 “disingenuous.”**

### **Total NO on 7 Editorials: 26 and growing...**

**Sacramento** –The *San Francisco Chronicle*, *Modesto* and *Fresno Bees*, the *Oakland Tribune* and its five sister ANG papers came out against Prop. 7 in recent days. The *Chronicle* says, “...this measure runs a good cause off the cliff” and wonders, “Since when did the California ballot get to be a playground for rich dilettantes trying out pet causes?” The *Modesto Bee* and *Fresno Bee* both call Prop. 7 “disingenuous”.

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 as well as the complete editorials:

#### ***San Francisco Chronicle*, 10/5/08, Vote no on Proposition 7**

- “...this measure runs a good cause off the cliff.”
- “A strange-bedfellows alliance of power companies, environmental groups, labor and business organizations are opposing it. The supporters, along with the big-spending Sperling clan, are only a handful of players.”
- “Since when did the California ballot get to be a playground for rich dilettantes trying out pet causes?”

#### ***Fresno Bee*, 10/7/08, “Vote no on Props. 7 and 10. The fine print makes both measures disingenuous”**

- “The fine print makes (Prop. 7) disingenuous.”
- “...poorly conceived or even disingenuous proposals should not be written into state law. That's the case with Propositions 7...”
- “Under the proposition, utilities would get credit only for green power generated at plants producing 30 megawatts or more. That would mean any help given to homeowners to install solar panels wouldn't count for green credit.”

**Oakland Tribune, Editorial, October 6, 2008 “Vote no on Prop. 7”**

This editorial also ran in the *Contra Costa Times*, *Fremont Argus*, *Tri-Valley Herald*, *San Mateo County Times*, *Hayward Daily Review*, *Alameda Times-Star*, *San Ramon Valley Times*, *Valley Times*, *East County Times* and *West County Times*.

- “...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.”

**Modesto Bee, 10/6/08, Let's go green, but Props. 7 and 10 won't get us there**

- “Let's go green, but Prop 7 won't get us there.”
- “...sometimes, good intentions can do more harm than good. That's the case with Propositions 7...”
- “Why would such a diverse group put aside their huge differences to gang up on a proposition that purports to help clean up bad air and reduce global warming? Because it is more likely to have the opposite effect.”

Full editorials below.

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

1. *Alameda Times-Star* (10/6/08)
2. *Bakersfield Californian* (10/2/08)
3. *Contra Costa Times* (10/2/08)
4. *East County Times* (10/2/08)
5. *Fremont Argus* (10/6/08)
6. *Fresno Bee*, (10/7/08)
7. *Hayward Daily Review* (10/6/08)
8. *Imperial Valley Press* (7/10/08)
9. *Long Beach Press-Telegram* (10/3/08)
10. *Los Angeles Times* (9/19/08)
11. *Modesto Bee*
12. *Oakland Tribune* (10/7/08)
13. *Orange County Register* (9/30/08)
14. *Riverside Press Enterprise* (9/12/08)
15. *San Diego Union-Tribune* (9/12/2008)
16. *San Francisco Chronicle* (10/5/2008)
17. *San Jose Mercury News* (9/13/08)
18. *San Mateo County Times* (10/6/08)
19. *San Ramon Valley Times* (10/2/08)
20. *Santa Cruz Sentinel* (9/19/08)
21. *Santa Rosa Press Democrat* (9/25/08)
22. *Torrance Daily Breeze* (10/3/08)
23. *Tri-Valley Herald* (10/6/08)
24. *Valley Times* (10/2/08)
25. *Victorville Daily Press* (10/1/08)
26. *West County Times* (10/2/08)

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

**San Francisco Chronicle, October 5, 2008**

<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2008/10/04/ED7D137S5T.DTL>

### **Vote no on Proposition 7**

It's hard not to like the outlines of Proposition 7, a ballot measure that would push California to shift sharply from fossil fuels to renewable energy. The timing - with \$4 gas, a move to offshore drilling, and a lopsided dependence on foreign oil - couldn't be better in a state shaping a clean-and-green future. But this measure runs a good cause off the cliff. It forces the state to change energy habits on an unrealistic timetable, draws up complex rules at the ballot box instead of through the legislative process, and ignores a chance to work with the state's wide circle of environmentalists and power companies.

The measure is the do-good brainchild of a billionaire family that founded the for-profit University of Phoenix. John Sperling and his son Peter have a background in liberal and environmental causes and are major backers of Prop. 7. To their credit, they don't stand to advantage themselves as Texas oilman T. Boone Pickens does with the deeply flawed Proposition 10, which taps state bond money to help his natural gas company fuel cars.

But good intentions take Prop. 7 only so far. It sets a goal to produce half of the state's electricity needs by 2025. Right now, California is at the 11 percent level with a pledge to raise this to 20 percent by 2010. Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger wants to boost this number to 33 percent by 2020 as part of a multisided effort to rein in greenhouse gas emissions.

These existing targets put the state in the forefront of the country and world in switching to clean energy. By comparison, Prop. 7 is late to the party. California is already leading the way and pushing producers, small and large, to change the way electricity is produced.

Prop. 7 digs its hole deeper. It reassigns bureaucratic duties to approving new power lines (needed to wheel in juice from huge solar farms in the Southern California desert) and contains contentious language that could leave out small power producers from being counted toward the 50 percent clean-energy goal. Another weak point: There would be a 3 percent cap on renewable energy increases, but no such limit on fossil-fuel boosts. Why leave this loophole for big energy suppliers to exploit?

These small-type disputes could well be Example A in a textbook study on why the ballot box, not the deliberations of a legislative panel or rule-making commission, is the wrong way to forge significant public policy. Prop. 7 backers argue that big power companies shut off any move toward forcing higher renewable goals.

But that's plainly not the case as California moves in myriad ways toward cleaner tailpipe emissions, solar panel subsidies and energy-efficient land use. It's fashionable and easy to blame state lawmakers for all that ails California, but on global warming the statehouse and governor have worked together on a complicated and crucial issue.

There's also a been-there, done-that quality to the debate over Prop. 7. In 2000 and 2001, the state went through months of power shortages, brought on partly by an energy deregulation plan. Now, here we are again with a huge makeover that claims to supply lots of answers to complex issues in a huge state. Voters should think twice about embracing an energy cure-all that commits the state to a lofty goal.

If the arguments over energy policy aren't convincing, consider the political lineup on Prop. 7. A strange-bedfellows alliance of power companies, environmental groups, labor and business organizations are opposing it. The supporters, along with the big-spending Sperling clan, are only a handful of players.

This measure has arrived on the ballot without the broad consultation, input and tinkering that makes for good public policy. Since when did the California ballot get to be a playground for rich dilettantes trying out pet causes?

The challenge of switching California to renewable electricity supplies needs continued work. But a one-shot ballot measure will only make this task worse. Vote no on Prop. 7.

**Fresno Bee, October 7, 2008**

<http://www.fresnobee.com/opinion/story/918205.html>

### **Vote no on Props. 7 and 10**

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

## **The fine print makes both measures disingenuous**

We're all for saving the environment and developing cleaner energy. But poorly conceived or even disingenuous proposals should not be written into state law. That's the case with Propositions 7 and 10 -- both billed as pathways to a cleaner environment and less polluted future. Voters should reject both.

### **Proposition 7**

Environmentalists, industrialists, municipal and private utilities, labor unions and scientists all have linked arms to oppose this plan. Why would such a diverse group put aside their huge differences to gang up on a proposition that purports to help clean up bad air and reduce global warming? Because it is more likely to have the opposite effect.

The heart of Proposition 7 requires all electricity providers to get 50% of their power from renewable sources by 2025.

State law requires investor-owned utilities such as Pacific Gas & Electric to get a portion of their power from renewable resources. Proposition 7 would extend the requirement to smaller public utilities. In many cases, that's unfair, because most already generate a significant portion of their electricity through the most nonpolluting means possible -- hydroelectricity. But they would get no "green credit" for that power. Nor would they get any green credit for investing in additional hydro power.

It gets worse. Under the proposition, utilities would get credit only for green power generated at plants producing 30 megawatts or more. That would mean any help given to homeowners to install solar panels wouldn't count for green credit. If it doesn't count, what incentive does any utility -- private or public -- have for helping to solarize homes or for creating biomass generation on farms?

This proposition has a host of similar problems. Worse yet, if passed, it would take a two-thirds vote to fix them.

### **Oakland Tribune, Editorial, October 6, 2008 "Vote no on Prop. 7"**

This editorial also ran in the *Contra Costa Times*, *Fremont Argus*, *Tri-Valley Herald*, *San Mateo County Times*, *Hayward Daily Review*, *Alameda Times-Star*, *San Ramon Valley Times*, *Valley Times*, *East County Times* and *West County Times*.

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.

**Modesto Bee, October 6, 2008**

<http://www.modbee.com/opinion/story/453379.html>

**Let's go green, but Props. 7 and 10 won't get us there**

Good intentions are never enough to fix a problem. But sometimes, good intentions can do more harm than good. That's the case with Propositions 7 and 10 -- both billed as pathways to a cleaner environment and less polluted future.

We're all for saving the environment and developing cleaner energy. But poorly conceived or even disingenuous proposals should not be written into state law. Voters should reject Propositions 7 and 10.

**Proposition 7**

Environmentalists, industrialists, municipal and private utilities, labor unions and scientists all have linked arms to oppose this plan. Why would such a diverse group put aside their huge differences to gang up on a proposition that purports to help clean up bad air and reduce global warming? Because it is more likely to have the opposite effect.

The heart of Proposition 7 requires all electricity providers to get 50 percent of their power from renewable sources by 2025.

State law requires investor- owned utilities such as Pacific Gas & Electric to get a portion of their power from renewable resources. Proposition 7 would extend the requirement to public utilities such as the Turlock and Modesto irrigation districts. That's unfair.

Why? Because both utilities already generate a significant portion of their electricity through the most nonpolluting means possible -- hydroelectricity. But they get no "green credit" for that power. Nor would they get any green credit for investing in additional hydro power.

It gets worse. Under the proposition, utilities would get credit only for green power generated at plants producing 30 megawatts or more. That would mean any help given to homeowners to install solar panels wouldn't count for green credit. If it doesn't count, what incentive does any utility -- private or public -- have for helping to solarize homes or for creating biomass generation on farms?

This proposition has a host of similar problems. Worse yet, if passed, it would take a two-thirds vote to fix them.