

Schrepel, Eric

From: Jenkins, Kris
Sent: Friday, November 19, 2004 11:34 AM
To: Lapworth, Heather
Subject: FW: Comments: Draft 5th Northwest Power & Conservation Plan

-----Original Message-----

From: julianjane [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, November 19, 2004 11:18 AM
To: Jenkins, Kris
Subject: Comments: Draft 5th Northwest Power & Conservation Plan

2028 S. Adams
Spokane, WA 99203-1238
November 19, 2004

Mr. Mark Walker
Northwest Power and Conservation Council
851 W. 6th Ave.
Suite 1100
Portland, OR 97204

Re: Draft Fifth Northwest Electric Power and Conservation Plan

Dear Mr. Walker;

My comments amplify and extend the public testimony I gave at the Spokane meeting on November 17th which was conducted by Dr. Tom Karier with staff personnel.

Global Warming (GW), AKA Climate Change, is not only the most important current environmental issue extant but history will likely list it as the most significant issue in the world in 2004. GW directly or indirectly impacts not only the global natural environment but also all life, human and otherwise, on earth. My understanding of the issues below is based on my MSEE in Power Generation and Distribution; my employment of over two decades in the engineering application of infrared technology to missile guidance, hence some atmospheric involvement; and to my personal activities in GW including being an authorized speaker for the GreenHouse Network.

My internet search engine lists 623,969 sites for "Global Warming". I believe that it is not appropriate for me to offer information on GW as you all are sure to be conversant. (However, I can't resist including the following dated November 8, 2004: "With these facts before us, we need, more than ever before, a concerted and renewed international effort to combat the climate change problem," Klaus Toepfer, Executive Director of the UN Environment Programme <<http://www.unep.org/>>UNEP) said in a statement citing a newly released report by an international team of 300 scientists.)

The Governors of Washington, Oregon, and California are staking out new ground in their climate protection partnership. In a November 18, 2004 statement, they approved staff recommendations for immediate steps to reduce global warming pollution. They also charted

11/23/2004

a course to a more comprehensive climate policy for the region, including: adoption of stronger vehicle emission standards pioneered by California, state and regional goals and timelines for reducing global warming pollution, and a market-based system for reducing emissions from the power sector.

I offer brief comments as you can obtain GW information pertinent to your needs from the internet. Climatologists have published the prediction that the global surface mean temperature will CONTINUE to rise for 100 years after the atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases have stabilized. GW is exponentially getting worse with the current situation in the Arctic, Australia, and the European areas just north of the Mediterranean Sea arguably ready for doomsday posters.

A priority issue linked to GW is global oil depletion. I urge you to carefully read the material on <http://www.communitysolution.org> relative to the near-term depletion of global oil supplies. What is near-term? The above website says 2 to 6 years, other sources predict from 2005 to 2020. Even 20 years is too short a time for an orderly, reasonably trouble-free transition to a minimal fossil-fueled society. In 1956 a US geophysicist correctly predicted that US oil production would peak in the early 1970s. Dr. Kenneth Deffeyes, Professor Emeritus at Princeton University, using an analytical approach patterned after the one used in the 1956 prediction, published a book in 2001 that predicted world oil production would peak during this decade, then fall and never rise again.

My perception from reading your Draft 5th Power Plan is that the predicted near-term global oil depletion did not significantly impact your plan. I have, therefore, included below some information on global oil depletion from the scientific, business, and popular journalism communities. It is highly significant that the US, with about 4.5% of the global population, generates about 25% of global greenhouse gases!

-The *First U. S. Conference on "Peak Oil" and Community Solutions* was held in Ohio from November 12-14, 2004 by The Community Solutions, www.communitysolution.org. The over 200 attendees included representatives from England (President of the Association for the Study of Peak Oil) and Iran (Director of Strategic Planning, Iranian National Oil Company). A few quotes from presenters: "We have only a dwindling amount of time to build lifeboats-that is, the needed alternative infrastructure. It has been clear for at least 30 years what characteristics this should have-organic, small-scale, local, convivial, cooperative, slower paced, human-oriented rather than machine-oriented, agrarian, diverse, democratic, culturally rich, and ecologically sustainable. We have known for a long time that the status quo-a society that is machine-oriented, competitive, inequitable, fast-paced, globalized, monocultural, corporate-dominated-is deadening to the human spirit and ecologically unsustainable." "The world is producing 82 million barrels of oil a day, globally. I think that's all we'll ever have....The world is fundamentally changing as far as energy is concerned." "We now find one barrel (of oil) for every four we consume. The general situation seems so obvious." "I expect oil to reach \$182 per barrel within the decade."

-From a recent Barron's, the influential US financial weekly, a measure of the concern about the "entirely different" and "unprecedented" energy crisis which "should have a severe impact, be global in scope, and be difficult to solve". Maxwell, dubbed by the magazine as the "dean of energy analysts", subscribes to the Hubbert's Curve theory of depleting oil resources.

-CNN Money reported on peak oil in an article titled, "Oil: Is the End at Hand? A once-fringe group saying we'll run out of oil is gaining attention, even within the oil industry." The article says, "The end of cheap oil may mean more than just higher gas prices for Americans. It may mean the end of the oil age as we know it."

-The June 2004 National Geographic has an article titled The End of Cheap Oil. The text starts with: "It's inevitable."

<http://magma.nationalgeographic.com/ngm/0406/feature5/index.html#top>

-The construction of more wind energy capability is three years (2016-2013) behind that of a coal generating plant. The rationale, to me, was not obvious. My understanding is that the Stateline wind installation was on-line within 9 months of the first shovel into the ground. Is there a problem with the on-line reliability of wind at over 95%? Dr. Karier was familiar with the increased reliability of wind generation when wind installations in separated geographical locations would feed into the same power grid.

-The hindrances to wind energy development are the need for transmission lines to elevations where the wind is best, the minimization of regulations, and complications in connecting to the power grid. IF the Council wants to encourage wind development, the above hindrances should be worked on, now.

-The questions asked of the public include: (1) are the costs of wind generation development reasonable? The implication is that the technologies as demonstrated by production primarily in Europe but also at, e.g., Stateline, are not ready for production but are still in development! Was this question about "development of wind" formulated in 2004, --or, perhaps in 1990? (2) Is climate change treated appropriately? I have discussed this above. Overall, the apparent anti-wind bias in the 5th Power Plan Draft has, indeed, caused me to have some paranoia. I do hope that the Council's Final Power Plan is objective and fair.

-As I understand them, the statements about utilities are positive, i. e., they want new technologies, are willing to take some risks, are constrained by transmission line availability, and are willing to fund the development of new energy generating facilities. If so, the Council should only set necessary rules and let competition drive the system.

-My bottom line is that the Council should work with, not direct, the utilities in developing an integrated, effective power system. In this case, the utilities would plan the type and timing of new generating facilities with the Council supporting them by working to remove hindrances such as those enumerated above. Significantly, the Council has the responsibility to provide guidance as to the projected impacts of GW as far in the future as the nominal life of the facilities funded by the utilities.

-Finally, why plan for a coal-generating plant at all? Its not needed if: (1) you provide a level playing field for wind, and (2) if GW is a problem. If your position is that GW is not a problem, PLEASE contact me and I will put you in contact with recognized experts such as Dr. Philip Mote, U of W.

Sincerely,

Julian Powers
509-838-5803