
From: Mark Alexander [jiffg777@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2008 1:31 PM
To: Judy Harlow; bbrar@zeppelin-usa.com; worldwidedcap@hotmail.com; marnizollinger@cobcreations.com
Subject: RE: FPSC staff draft RPS rule
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

Judy,

My comment on the draft is that it is still wholly inadequate, unfair, and slanted in favor of the IOUs. Their aim is to avoid or pass on compliance to the consumer and give up monopoly power as their means of last resort.

The fossil fuel interests are not paying anything for the renewable energy delivered to the consumer, they pay for what they want. Unless the PSC makes the IOUs displace all of their electricity produced with any EPA emissions or carcinogens in favor of a priority system of lowest EPA emissions and carcinogens first..... in whatever volume or % is available in their service area without limits..... including whatever capacity is available then they ***shall*** wheel and deal to supplement that capacity into their service area on that priority basis and last but not least take the highest EPA emissions and carcinogenic supplies. Why should the IOUs at the behest of the PSC quantize the health risk in favor of the polluters with BACT compliance to be drawn out for as long as possible? If you answer no other question please admit to the public the "non-special interest" answer to that government obligation to consider the health and safety of the public **first and foremost**. Make the language of the bill prove that is the priority, be accountable.

When the public consumer is given a choice between buying from a clean generator that makes electricity without Dioxans and Furans their electricity needs must be, by law 100% "open access" for green energy with 0 carcinogens first to every public consumer in Florida. As a regular tourist don't we have a say in the matter? Who wouldn't rather buy green given the choice save and except the marketer of non-green electricity who has the PSC to protect their markets for them, which is the language of this bill at the current time. Show me any statistics that would suggest the public would prefer otherwise.

Your agency has the power to open the "public" utility transmission and distribution grids 100% to a green first priority by defining green as the lowest measurable EPA emissions of CO, CO₂, SO_x, NO_x and Dioxans and Furans as the #1 priority and everything else that is subject to semi-annual or quarterly air emissions testing or calibrated SCADA just like electronics RECs track compliance. Demand that the mindset of power from the "control minded" submit to the will of 'we the people'. That will be green first.

Finally the language of the bill should as a last resort allow the public utility and the IOUs to sell into the market the balance if any, of available carcinogen laced electricity based totally on the % of carcinogens associated with their power plants emissions profile as determined from SCADA measured stack gases. Priority language in that bill should read preference for lowest to highest first without exception and tied to a fair, non-discriminatory SCADA calibrated volumetric percentage that should be printed in the official public record.

That puts your bill up to the legal requirement of BACT. That mandate is all about the EPA telling the IOUs once you have a 0% carcinogen source such as wave, solar, wind, (nominal production) or ZESC (base load) generator plant up and running they already have set that priority. So have Florida admit that such no longer favors or rewards the IOU mindset of least possible compliance and protected markets that do not allow the consumer a choice. They ask for deregulation start with deregulating their control of distribution and marketing rights.

If your agency or department is asking that we draft the language of that bill we will do so and that language will seek compliance from every IOU ASAP, rather than placating their tactic to stall and render the least possible

compliance out to the farthest date they can get away with..... say the word we will deliver. The IOUs and the state of Florida needs to look at the NMTC and CREBs issues to promote renewable on a BTU for BTU basis with the tax credits government subsidies granted to the IOUs to clean up their emissions profile. What has all that corporate welfare done for the consumer's health risk to date, and what have they done of their own volition without government intervention like in this language of this bill? When does the PSC say dirty coal and the IOUs that operate them have to surrender their last vestiges of monopoly power because the consumer wants green first. The consumers get it,.... does the PSC and the IOUs!

mark alexander
832 289 5669

Subject: FPSC staff draft RPS rule
Date: Mon, 25 Aug 2008 11:36:05 -0400
From: JHarlow@PSC.STATE.FL.US
To: JHarlow@PSC.STATE.FL.US

Please see attached Word version of the Florida Public Service Commission staff's draft renewable portfolio rule. If you would like to make comments on the draft rule, we're requesting that you file comments by September 3, 2008. Please use type and strike format to make your proposed changes to the attached draft rule. Comments should be filed with the FPSC's Clerk's office in Docket No. 080503-EI.

Judy Harlow
(850)413-6842

Get thousands of games on your PC, your mobile phone, and the web with Windows®. [Game with Windows](#)