



www.NoProp7.com

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

October 14, 2008

CONTACT:

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

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

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

***San Francisco Bay Guardian* calls Prop. 7 “confusing”**

***San Gabriel Valley News Group* says Prop. 7 “just the wrong way to go green.”**

### **Total NO on 7 Editorials: 32 and growing...**

**Sacramento** – Six more editorial boards have been added to the No on 7 column since late last week, bringing to 32 the total number of newspapers opposing the measure. The *San Francisco Bay Guardian* says Prop. 7 and the politics around it “smell worse than a coal-burning power plant.” The *Redding Record Searchlight* warns “Utility regulation is devilishly complex, and the results when we get it wrong can be disastrous” and the three papers in the *San Gabriel Valley Tribune News Group* say Prop. 7 is “just the wrong way to go green.”

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 Bay Guardian, 10/8/08, Proposition 7 Renewable-energy generation: NO***

- “We’re all for more renewable energy, but this measure and the politics around it smell worse than a coal-burning power plant.”
- “The measure is confusing.”
- “A number of solar and wind companies, which would presumably profit by its passing, are lined up against it...”
- “...other opponents include all the major green groups — Environmental Defense, the League of Conservation Voters, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Sierra Club, and the Union of Concerned Scientists — none of which were consulted before it was put on the ballot.”

#### ***Redding Record-Searchlight, 10/8/08, Prop. 7 wrongly rushes forward on green energy***

- “Proposition 7 would lock in place regulatory barriers that block the development of new power sources. It would put new burdens on the development of small wind and solar projects. It would unnecessarily raise rates. And it would remove the vestiges of local control...”
- “Utility regulation is devilishly complex, and the results when we get it wrong can be disastrous. Remember “deregulation” and the subsequent rolling blackouts?”

**San Gabriel Valley News Group, 10/12/08, "Vote 'no' on Prop. 7"**

Includes *Pasadena Star-News*, *San Gabriel Valley Tribune* and *Whittier Daily News*

- Prop. 7 is "just the wrong way to go green."
- "...when you see a proposition that claims to be green and is opposed by not only the Sierra Club and the League of Conservation Voters but by the Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Technologies, the Environmental Defense Fund, the Natural Resources Defense Council and the Union of Concerned Scientists, well, you can pretty much see that there's something horribly wrong with it."
- "We want to see green power and to see California leading the way to sustainability. But this measure is the wrong way to get there. Vote "no" on Proposition 7."

**Merced Sun Star, 10/14/08, "Our View: Propositions 7 and 10 won't clean up environment"**

- "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 Proposition 7..."

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. *Merced Sun Star* (10/14/08)
12. *Modesto Bee*
13. *Oakland Tribune* (10/7/08)
14. *Orange County Register* (9/30/08)
15. *Pasadena Star News* (10/12/2008)
16. *Redding Record-Searchlight* (10/8/08)
17. *Riverside Press Enterprise* (9/12/08)
18. *San Diego Union-Tribune* (9/12/2008)
19. *San Francisco Bay Guardian* (10/8/08)
20. *San Francisco Chronicle* (10/5/2008)
21. *San Gabriel Valley Tribune* (10/12/2008)
22. *San Jose Mercury News* (9/13/08)
23. *San Mateo County Times* (10/6/08)
24. *San Ramon Valley Times* (10/2/08)
25. *Santa Cruz Sentinel* (9/19/08)
26. *Santa Rosa Press Democrat* (9/25/08)
27. *Torrance Daily Breeze* (10/3/08)
28. *Tri-Valley Herald* (10/6/08)
29. *Valley Times* (10/2/08)
30. *Victorville Daily Press* (10/1/08)
31. *West County Times* (10/2/08)
32. *Whittier Daily News* (10/12/2008)

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

***San Gabriel Valley News Group, 10/12/08, "Vote 'no' on Prop. 7"***

Includes *Pasadena Star-News, San Gabriel Valley Tribune and Whittier Daily News*

PROPOSITION 7 on the Nov. 4 California ballot is this year's champion in the category of sounding great on paper but promising to be crazy-lousy in the execution.

The propaganda - er, advertising - can be hard to parse, as both sides on this renewable energy-based ballot question claim to be greener than thou.

Sometimes, when faced with such conflicts over what in fact is a complicated issue - Will clean-energy mandates help California's sustainability? - it's best to look down the list of groups that are supporting or opposing a ballot issue.

Few of us have the energy expertise to decide which side is right on such a massive engineering question. But all of us know and trust some organizations with expertise in their chosen areas.

So when you see a proposition that claims to be green and is opposed by not only the Sierra Club and the League of Conservation Voters but by the Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Technologies, the Environmental Defense Fund, the Natural Resources Defense Council and the Union of Concerned Scientists, well, you can pretty much see that there's something horribly wrong with it.

And there is. Just throwing up the out-of-the-blue date of 2025 as the year in which all California utility companies, public and private, must get half of their power from renewable resources doesn't really make such an ideal happen.

There's nothing wrong as such with setting tough goals. Sometimes it can kick-start something that had seemed impossible: a moon landing, famously. But California is not exactly in a financial position to start singing "Fly Me to the Moon" at this point. We've got lots of problems to solve, very much including sustainable energy production. But the experts are saying that quadrupling our current use of solar and wind and other ideal power sources within such a short time frame can't happen in a prudent economic fashion.

Local publicly owned utilities - along with some of the state's shareholder-owned giants - already have green goals established for the future. Pasadena Water & Power, for instance, the largest municipal utility in our area, has set a 10 percent renewable energy target for 2010. That's progress, even if it's slow and incremental. The city wants to be 20 percent green by 2017. But under Proposition 7, it would have to be 40 percent renewable by 2020. The relatively small utility's managers say that would mean a rate increase for residents and businesses of at least 35 percent. That's just the wrong way to go green.

The right way is to understand that the transition to solar, for instance, is still being led by small businesses and homeowners installing solar panels on rooftops and selling energy back to the utility. And small commercial providers, which for some odd reason are completely left out of the equation Proposition 7's authors drafted - in other words, their work doesn't count toward the 50 percent goal - right now have 60 percent of the renewable energy contracts in California. The little guys are leading the way, so why leave them out?

We want to see green power and to see California leading the way to sustainability. But this measure is the wrong way to get there. Vote "no" on Proposition 7 on Nov. 4.

***Redding Record-Searchlight, 10/8/08, "Prop. 7 wrongly rushes forward on green energy***

***Our view: Even environmentalists say the initiative is badly flawed.***

California easily leads the nation's race to our clean-power future. By law, utilities must draw 20 percent of their watts from renewable sources by 2010. And if you think the state will pause to recharge its batteries when it achieves that mark, we've got a cold-fusion reactor to sell you.

Proposition 7 would push the state further, requiring 40 percent renewable power by 2020 and half by 2025. A good idea? Maybe, but even environmental groups that avidly support green energy oppose the measure, calling it badly flawed.

Proposition 7 would lock in place regulatory barriers that block the development of new power sources. It would put new burdens on the development of small wind and solar projects. It would unnecessarily

raise rates. And it would remove the vestiges of local control enjoyed by public power companies such as Redding Electric Utility.

Don't believe us? Listen to the environmentalists themselves. The Sierra Club, the Environmental Defense Fund, the Natural Resources Defense Council and the Union of Concerned Scientists - among many other advocates of cutting fossil fuels' use - say Proposition 7 is a dud. So does most of the renewable-power industry. So do the big utilities. So do the state Republican and Democratic parties. So do the California Taxpayers' Association and the California Consumer Federation. Notice a trend? Utility regulation is devilishly complex, and the results when we get it wrong can be disastrous.

Remember "deregulation" and the subsequent rolling blackouts?

And while the Legislature is bound to foul things up now and again, at least it can fix its mistakes relatively simply. Repairing the errors in Proposition 7 would require a new initiative or a two-thirds supermajority of lawmakers.

It will be no surprise to see the Legislature push for renewable standards every bit as aggressive as Proposition 7's, but we're happy to wait and see the job done right. Proposition 7 needlessly short-circuits the legislative process and deserves an emphatic "No" vote.

### ***San Francisco Bay Guardian, 10/8/08, "Proposition 7 Renewable-energy generation NO"***

We're all for more renewable energy, but this measure and the politics around it smell worse than a coal-burning power plant.

Proposition 7 would require all investor-owned and municipal utilities to procure 50 percent clean energy by 2025. It would allow fast-tracked permitting for the new power plants and suggests they be placed in "solar and clean energy zones" in the desert while still meeting environmental reviews and protections. There's a hazy provision that the solar industry groups argue would discredit any power sources under 30 megawatts from counting toward renewable portfolio standards (RPS), which the Yes on Prop. 7 people refute.

The measure is confusing. The California Energy Commission and the California Public Utilities Commission would play somewhat unclear roles in the state's energy future.

Overall, the CEC would site power plants and the CPUC would set rates. Penalties levied to utilities that don't meet the new RPS would be controlled by the CEC and used to build transmission lines connecting the desert-sourced solar power with cities.

The coalition supporting Prop. 7 is an interesting mix of retired public officials, including former San Francisco supervisor Jim Gonzalez, former state senator John Burton, former mayor Art Agnos, and utility expert S. David Freeman. Interestingly, Gonzalez was a staunch ally of Pacific Gas and Electric Co. when he was a local politician, and Burton has done legal work for PG&E. The bankroll for the campaign comes from Arizona billionaire Peter Sperling, son of medical marijuana proponent John Sperling.

A number of solar and wind companies, which would presumably profit by its passing, are lined up against it, but the No on 7 money comes entirely from PG&E, SoCal Edison, and Sempra, which have dumped \$28 million into the campaign. That, of course, makes us nervous.

But other opponents include all the major green groups — Environmental Defense, the League of Conservation Voters, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Sierra Club, and the Union of Concerned Scientists — none of which were consulted before it was put on the ballot.

We're obviously uncomfortable coming down on the side of PG&E, but renewable energy is a major policy issue, and this measure was written with little input from the experts in the field. Gonzalez told us it's mostly aimed at pushing giant solar arrays in the desert; that's fine, but we're also interested in small local projects that might be more efficient and environmentally sound.

Vote no.

### ***Merced Sun Star, 10/14/08, "Our View: Propositions 7 and 10 won't clean up environment"***

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. 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 and Electric Co. to get a portion of their power from renewable resources. Proposition 7 would extend the requirement to public utilities such as the Merced Irrigation District. That's unfair.

Why? Because the utility already generates a significant portion of its electricity through the most nonpolluting means possible -- hydroelectricity. But it gets 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.