



FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

October 20, 2008

CONTACT:

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

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

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

***La Opinion*** says there are “serious uncertainties” about Prop. 7

***Los Angeles Daily News*** says Prop. 7 “won’t get us there”

### **Total NO on 7 Editorials: 38 and growing...**

**Sacramento** – Five more editorial boards have urged their readers to reject Prop. 7 on the November ballot, bringing the total number of newspapers opposing the measure to 38. *La Opinion* says the “doubts caused by the drafting of this initiative are sufficient to warrant its rejection,” and the *Daily News* says Prop. 7 “won’t get us there.” The other papers to come out against Prop. 7 are: *Malibu Times*, *San Diego City Beat*, and the *Bay Area Reporter*.

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 nearly 400 other groups.

Below are select quotes from *La Opinion* and the *Daily News* editorial as well as the complete editorials:

#### ***La Opinion*, 10/18/08, “Two measures to reject”**

- “While the idea is interesting, there are some serious uncertainties, such as an unspecified percentage increase in the cost of electricity to consumers. It may also be detrimental to the development of small wind and solar energy companies. The doubts caused by the drafting of this initiative are sufficient to warrant its rejection.”

#### ***Los Angeles Daily News*, 10/16/08, “Props. 7 and 10 aren't good green initiatives”**

- “The worst thing about Proposition 7 is that one must be an energy wonk - or at least briefed by one - to fully understand its implications. The measure's backers hope the feel-good sound of the initiative will hook voters who aren't experts enough to recognize its flaws.”
- “It's in the best interests of every one in California to have cleaner energy. But this proposition won't get us there.”

Full editorials below.

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

##### 1. *Alameda Times-Star* (10/6/08)

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

2. *Bakersfield Californian* (10/2/08)
3. *Bay Area Reporter* (10/14/08)
4. *Contra Costa Times* (10/2/08)
5. *East County Times* (10/2/08)
6. *Fremont Argus* (10/6/08)
7. *Fresno Bee* (10/7/08)
8. *Hayward Daily Review* (10/6/08)
9. *Imperial Valley Press* (7/10/08)
10. *La Opinion* (10/18/08)
11. *Long Beach Press-Telegram* (10/3/08)
12. *Los Angeles Daily News* (10/16/08)
13. *Los Angeles Times* (9/19/08)
14. *Malibu Times* (10/15/08)
15. *Merced Sun Star* (10/14/08)
16. *Modesto Bee* (10/6/08)
17. *Oakland Tribune* (10/7/08)
18. *Orange County Register* (9/30/08)
19. *Pasadena Star News* (10/12/2008)
20. *Redding Record-Searchlight* (10/8/08)
21. *Riverside Press Enterprise* (9/12/08)
22. *Sacramento Bee*, (10/9/08)
23. *San Diego City Beat* (10/17/08)
24. *San Diego Union-Tribune* (9/12/2008)
25. *San Francisco Bay Guardian* (10/8/08)
26. *San Francisco Chronicle* (10/5/2008)
27. *San Gabriel Valley Tribune* (10/12/2008)
28. *San Jose Mercury News* (9/13/08)
29. *San Mateo County Times* (10/6/08)
30. *San Ramon Valley Times* (10/2/08)
31. *Santa Cruz Sentinel* (9/19/08)
32. *Santa Rosa Press Democrat* (9/25/08)
33. *Torrance Daily Breeze* (10/3/08)
34. *Tri-Valley Herald* (10/6/08)
35. *Valley Times* (10/2/08)
36. *Victorville Daily Press* (10/1/08)
37. *West County Times* (10/2/08)
38. *Whittier Daily News* (10/12/2008)

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

### ***La Opinion*, 10/18/08, "Two measures to reject"**

California voters have two renewable energy measures on the ballot, an important issue for the state's future. But these initiatives are problematic enough to warrant rejection. Vote no on Propositions 7 and 10.

Proposition 7 is a bold proposal to accelerate the use of clean energy by requiring power companies to generate 20% of their energy from renewable sources. While the idea is interesting, there are some serious uncertainties, such as an unspecified percentage increase in the cost of electricity to consumers. It may also be detrimental to the development of small wind and solar energy companies. The doubts caused by the drafting of this initiative are sufficient to warrant its rejection.

Proposition 10 also has a number of very serious problems. The measure authorizes the issuance of \$5 billion in state bonds, of which \$2.9 billion would be used as rebates to encourage consumer purchases

of clean alternative fuel vehicles. The rest is earmarked for solar energy and education and training projects.

The measure is being pushed by oil and gas industry millionaire T. Boone Pickens, who is its primary benefactor. This deal by Pickens requires California to assume \$10 billion in debt to be repaid over 30 years for a natural gas system of dubious advisability.

In short, the problem with Proposition 7 is so serious that it has galvanized opposition across ideological and economic lines, while Proposition 10 is more a personal windfall for its sponsor than a benefit for Californians.

### ***La Opinion, 10/18/08, "Dos medidas para rechazar"***

Los votantes de California tienen ante sí dos medidas sobre energía renovable. Estas iniciativas tienen suficientes problemas como para ser rechazadas. ¡Diga NO a las proposiciones 7 y 10.

La Proposición 7 es una audaz propuesta para acelerar el uso de energía limpia obligando a las compañías a generar el 20% de su energía mediante fuentes renovables. Si bien la idea es interesante no hay falta de seria incertidumbre, como un aumento en el costo de la electricidad al consumidor en un porcentaje no especificado. También puede dañar el desarrollo de las pequeñas empresas de energía eólica y solar. Las dudas que deja la iniciativa basta para rechazarla.

Por otra parte, los problemas de la Proposición 10 son varios y muy serios. La medida autoriza la emisión de bonos estatales por valor de \$5,000 millones, de los cuales \$2,900 millones serían usados como reembolso para alentar la compra de vehículos con combustible alternativo limpio por parte del consumidor. El resto está destinado para energía solar y otros proyectos.

La medida está impulsada por el millonario de la industria del petróleo y gas, T. Boone Pickens, quien es el principal benefactor de la misma. Este negocio de Pickens obliga a California a asumir una deuda de \$10,000 millones, a pagar en 30 años por un sistema de gas natural de dudosa conveniencia.

En resumen, la dificultad con la Proposición 7 es tan seria que galvaniza una oposición que rompe barreras ideológicas y económicas, mientras que la Proposición 10 es más un beneficio personal para su autor que para los californianos.

### ***Los Angeles Daily News, 10/16/08, "Props. 7 and 10 aren't good green initiatives"***

TWO measures on the Nov. 4 California ballot - Propositions 7 and 10 - purport to push California in a green direction. But both are financed by wealthy men with an agenda, and neither makes the best environmental sense for California. We urge voters to reject both.

The worst thing about Proposition 7 is that one must be an energy wonk - or at least briefed by one - to fully understand its implications. The measure's backers hope the feel-good sound of the initiative will hook voters who aren't experts enough to recognize its flaws.

On its face, Proposition 7 appears to be a straightforward push for California's utilities to generate 20 percent of their own power from renewable sources, such as solar or wind, by 2010, and 50 percent by 2025.

Sounds like something the environmentalists might celebrate, right?

Actually, no. Along with the state's big utilities - Edison and Pacific Gas & Electric - the Sierra Club, the League of Conservation Voters, the Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Technologies, the Environmental Defense Fund, the Natural Resources Defense Council and the Union of Concerned Scientists strongly oppose this measure. They say it will actually harm green efforts already under way by the state's utilities.

It's got nonpartisan opposition as well; Both the Democratic and Republican parties are against the measure. Who likes this bill? The father-and-son Arizona billionaires who are backing it.

Local publicly owned utilities already have green goals established, and they are working. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power already has a 20 percent renewable energy target for 2010. It's in the best interests of every one in California to have cleaner energy. But this proposition won't get us there.

(Omitted section about Prop. 10)

Say no to both these billionaire-backed propositions.

***San Diego City Beat*, 10/17/08, “Our Endorsements: Prop. 7”**

If you have enough money, you can get pretty much anything on a ballot. That’s part of the reason why you should vote no on measures over which you’re in doubt. Prop. 7, an effort to move California faster toward renewable energy, while appearing to be well-meaning, is awfully confusing.

It was placed on the ballot by a wealthy father and son from Arizona, and it’s opposed by pretty much everyone, including the most reputable environmental organizations. As Natural Resources Defense Council spokesperson Craig Noble writes in a blog post, “Proposition 7 was put together by people who don’t know what they’re doing; they don’t understand California’s clean energy policies, laws and markets.”

Many flaws in Prop. 7 have been discovered. One is that it appears to provide a disincentive for energy utilities to lease space on corporate rooftops for the purpose of generating solar power and selling it on the open market, which, apparently, has started to occur, and that’s a good thing.

We’re not experts on energy. That’s why we pay attention to people who are not only experts, but experts who are also passionate advocates for renewable energy. And they say to vote no on Prop. 7.

***Malibu Times*, 10/15/08, “The Malibu Times Endorsements. Proposition 7, Renewable energy: Recommend a No vote”**

This one is a bit of puzzlement. This proposition sets targets for renewable energy goals, which would appear to be environmentally friendly. Yet, all the main-line environmental organizations, including National Resources Defense Council, California League of Conservation Voters, Union of Concerned Scientists and many others, are against it. I have to assume there is something in the small print they’re all afraid of, so I would have to go along with their collective judgment and say vote no.

***Bay Area Reporter*, 10/14/08, “Prop 7: Renewable Energy Generation: NO”**

This deeply flawed measure was put on the ballot by an out-of-state billionaire with no energy expertise.