

From: Moua, Louansee
To: DowntownWestD6
Subject: Fw: Google Study Session, 2021 Power Mix and Rates, and Climate Smart San Jose
Date: Monday, May 24, 2021 11:29:54 AM

From: Dave Boehm [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 10:55 PM
To: District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Re: Google Study Session, 2021 Power Mix and Rates, and Climate Smart San Jose

[External Email]

Dear Councilwoman Davis,

Thank you for providing this information. I appreciate knowing what San Jose is doing (or not doing) regarding “climate mitigation and adaptation strategies.” The financial burden on ratepayers is a serious issue that borders on misappropriation of funds due to its vague assumptions.

It is not the city’s job to accept responsibility for planet-wide concerns, nor to geo-engineer solutions, which is properly and exclusively the remit of the federal government. Cities may provide opinions regarding these issues to a higher authority, but it becomes a waste of time and resources when a city presumes to usurp federal authority — and it turns into an outrageous tax grab when “mitigation” of “climate changes” is presumed to be “scalable in neighborhoods throughout the city.” Such mumbo jumbo sounds like it was authored by witch doctors, not scientists.

Based on that city residents are to be taxed as if the proposed remedies will never be superseded by treaties negotiated by the the federal government. The same would apply to situations in which the federal government declines to enter into a treaty; in that case, city residents will be billed in lieu of a treaty, for putative remedies that cannot provide any meaningful, or even any measurable changes in the planet’s atmosphere.

In other words, it is proposed that city residents must bear the financial burden for a redundant effort that is properly the responsibility of the federal government, not mayors and city councils. Furthermore, these city proposals presume that all the pot holes have been filled, and that city residents are willing to pay the freight for something that will not make any measurable difference. Do either of those apply here?

These proposed expenditures presume that any rise in carbon dioxide is an evil that must be addressed at a local level, and the media has adopted the science-free belief that any rise in “greenhouse gases” (meaning primarily CO₂), is an *ipso facto* undesirable outcome.

But that anonymous belief has nothing to do with science, and it contradicts the OISM statement co-signed by tens of thousands of highly educated scientists who agree that CO₂ is harmless, and beneficial to the biosphere.

Science doesn’t take sides, and as usual this is all about more money for special interests — money to be extracted from city residents to ‘mitigate’ what has been proven to be a non-problem. If you recall, the issue that triggered the current concern over “climate change” was based on the failed predictions that man-made global warming would be caused by rising CO₂. But that prediction has been decisively falsified by the ultimate Authority; Planet Earth.

The anthropogenic global warming predictions were wrong — all of them. That falsifies the CO2=AGW hypothesis. Empirical evidence shows the predicted global warming never happened, despite a 45+% rise in CO2. Yet the city still proposes to tax residents as if those predictions were credible, and hand that money to... who, exactly?

That isn't made clear, but we can be certain that a special interest group will benefit at the expense of rate payers for this unscientific hocus-pocus.

Please demand verifiable measurements that clearly indicate the need for what are, in effect, higher taxes — and insist that skeptical scientific voices must be part of the debate before any decision is made to spend money on this issue. I am confident that if those things are required, the demand for these higher taxes will be silenced, because no credible measurements exist to justify the urgency underlying demands.

Thank you for taking the time to respond, and I am

Sincerely yours,

Dave Boehm
Retired Metrology*
Station Engineer
Lockheed Martin Corp.
Sunnyvale

*primarily developing and calibrating weather related instruments

On Nov 30, 2020, at 12:02 PM, Councilmember Dev Davis <district6@sanjoseca.gov> wrote:

On November 16, City Council held a Study Session on Google's Downtown West Project and the City's Diridon Station Area Plan to hear an update on the progress of three interrelated work efforts shaping the future development of the Diridon Station Area. Memo with many helpful links to additional documents and the full video can be found [here](#).

Watch my comments below.

2021 Power Mix and Rates

I continue to feel very strongly that San Jose Clean Energy (SJCE), as our ordinance states, should offer at least one option that is cheaper or at least equal to PG&E. In 2021, we will continue to meet that goal. However, it is becoming harder to do that because the Power

Charge Indifference Adjustment (PCIA) fee keeps increasing.

All SJCE customers pay the PCIA fee to cover above-market generation costs of investor-owned utilities (IOUs). SJCE customers are supposed to pay only for those above-market costs attributable to generation acquired prior to being enrolled in SJCE. However, PG&E's PCIA fee has risen over 600% between 2013 and 2020 and is expected to rise again in 2021. **At the base level, this fee essentially eliminates the consequences of competition for PG&E investors.**

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) oversees all utilities in California and has been approving PCIA fee increases every year. This is the CPUC protecting company shareholders at the expense of Community Choice Energy providers that are trying to bring greener and cheaper energy options to residents.

PLEASE NOTE: The PCIA fee you pay goes directly to PG&E. It is unrelated to the services that you receive from SJCE. This fee has doubled since we started SJCE in 2018. **Without this fee, our rates would be 38% lower than PG&E's rates in 2021.**

I implore you to write to the CPUC and the Governor, who appoints the members of the CPUC, to demand a stop these increases.

Contact **CPUC** [here](#).

Contact **Governor Newsom** [here](#).

Full presentation [here](#). More information [here](#). Watch my comments on this topic below.



Climate Smart San José Plan Semi-Annual Update

[Climate Smart San José](#), adopted by the City Council in 2018, lays out how we are doing our part to address climate change. It's a community-wide initiative to reduce air pollution, save water and improve quality of life. San Jose was recently ranked #1 in EV adoption and has the best infrastructure for EV charging in the United States.

Climate Smart San José is one of the first detailed city plans for reaching the targets of the international Paris Agreement. To get there, Climate Smart sets ambitious goals for energy, water, transportation and local jobs.

We recently received the annual report for Climate Smart. My colleagues and I asked for a Zero Emission neighborhood pilot (ZEN), focused on the nexus of climate and equity, where we can rapidly design and demonstrate whole-neighborhood climate mitigation and adaptation strategies that are scalable in neighborhoods throughout the city. This allows us to simultaneously work on our climate and equity goals.

Watch my comments below.



Office of Councilmember Davis | 408-535-4906 | district6@sanjoseca.gov | www.sjd6.org

City of San Jose
200 East Santa Clara St
San Jose, CA 95113

[Unsubscribe](#) stealey@pacbell.net

[Update Profile](#) | [About our service provider](#)

Sent by district6@sanjoseca.gov

powered by



Try email marketing for free today!

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.