

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER • 2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-0850

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: January 8, 2009
TO: Ann Cole, Commission Clerk - PSC, Office of Commission Clerk
FROM: Cindy B. Miller, Senior Attorney, Office of the General Counsel *CM*
RE: Letter to place in the docket - Docket No. 080503-EI

Please place this correspondence in the docket file.

CBM/wt

Attachment

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
00165 JAN-88
FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

Lois Graham

From: Robert Stonerock Jr [stonerockman@cfl.rr.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 07, 2009 11:23 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Argenziano; Office of Commissioner McMurrian; Office of Commissioner Skop;
Office of Commissioner Carter; Office Of Commissioner Edgar
Subject: This disturbs me greatly

January 7, 2009

This is a letter to the entire Public Service Commission of Florida:

Dear Chairman Carter, Commissioner Argenziano, Commissioner Edgar, Commissioner McMurrian, and Commissioner Skop,

I have been informed at this late hour that your staff has recommended that you change the designation "Renewable Energy Portfolio Standard" into "Clean Energy Portfolio Standard" so that nuclear energy and so-called "clean coal" can be included in the mix. I find this truly egregious.

First, just because nuclear and new coal technologies might cut greenhouse gas emissions does not make them clean in any other way, and saying that they are "clean", therefore, is as Orwellian as calling "red" green, and saying it so much that everyone starts to believe red is green. I would have expected such maneuvers 20 years ago when most were less enlightened and the science was in its infancy, but in 2009, such blindsiding is unacceptable.

Second, you seem to be more than willing to consider putting a 2% cap on electricity rate increases so as to stifle the effort to meet a 20% RPS, but then you do this right after approving Progress Energy's huge rate increase of 25% just to pay for one new nuclear facility. I regard this discrepancy as glaring and disingenuous.

Third, California certainly has the wisdom not to build more nuclear facilities or coal plants and to go with renewables along with energy efficiency and conservation techniques. California is larger than Florida and yet Florida seems continually to be trying to buck the trend and reinvent the energy "dark ages" all over again. Also, other states already have RPS's in place, and they have not seemed to have a problem doing so. Florida almost seems to exist in a vacuum from the energy standpoint. I feel that Florida's problem is that the two largest utilities do not care about the environment enough to be willing to do what it takes to be good stewards. They tend to get their way, also, and this must stop for the good of all of us---after all, you as well as I are going to have to live in the future environment that these companies either help or hurt, and you are the decision-makers that can cause help instead of hurt, if you only will. I insist that you protect us all by deciding against hurt and in favor of help.

Fourth, both coal and nuclear are sources of energy that add thermal gain to the earth in addition to that from the sun. Renewable energy is derived directly from the sun and thus does not add that extra heat. Why would you advocate adding extra heat to an already overheating planet? If you think the waste heat issue is negligible, please consider this again, because the heat is applied directly to the atmosphere and is not mitigated by other factors, and so the volume that has to absorb the heat (the atmosphere alone) is much less than previous models assumed. Besides, the way all the glaciers are melting, any amount of excess waste heat is harmful. When we look back on the way things went, would you like to be the group of Commissioners associated with the decision

1/8/2009

to enable the additional waste heat that aggravated glacier melting and caused maximal sea level rise? You probably will be, if you enable the coal and nuclear industries. Mainstream scientists are already warning about this particularly in the case of nuclear. They deliver so much waste heat that large increases in the number of nuclear plants could easily lead to cascading global climate change--just what we all are trying to avoid.

Finally, coal is one of the two filthiest fuels available, from its mining to its health effects. The PSC has never allowed its externalities to be factored into the price of electricity production from it. If the PSC had, the price of renewable energy might not have the (false) image of being "expensive" today. Nuclear is the other of the two filthiest fuels available, from its mining (using all that fossil fuel) to its security nightmares to its perpetual waste products that we still have not dealt with properly to its potential for deadly catastrophies no matter how safe you think you have made it. How could you consider enabling these two fuels to be used without even giving renewable energy half a chance?

I encourage you, as the group of bright, highly capable, well-meaning individuals that I know you are, to do the right thing for the greater good and opt to continue with a "renewable portfolio standard", reject changing it to an Orwellian "clean energy portfolio standard" against the obvious intent of the Legislature, and fully enable Florida to derive as much power as it can from renewable energy.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

Robert F. Stonerock, Jr.
1306 Woodland Street
Orlando, Florida 32806
407-898-8667