

**Solar Electric Should Stand On Its Own Without Incentives/Rebates? Old Falsehoods
Are Apparently Very Slow To Die
6-14-09**

Deborah,

Thank you for the recent email confirming that you will not be requesting additional funds for the solar electric rebate program in the near future.

Just this past week I was told by a third party that you think solar electric should be able to stand on its own without subsidies/incentives, and that solar electric is not economical. Did you make these statements? Do you believe that solar electric should be able to stand on its own, and that solar electric is not economical?

This contention that solar electric should be able to stand on its own I have heard before. Your predecessor, Simon Baker, was singing the same tune until I sent him the attached letter. On 9-13-07 I sent the same letter to both yourself and Steve Knopp. The first part of this letter addresses the differences in rebate amounts between CSU, Xcel and Back Hills Energy. The latter is outdated in that Xcel has reduced its rebate to \$3.50 per watt. The second part of the attached letter documents the fact that all of the conventional energy sources that solar electric must compete with have been heavily subsidized for probably fifty years or more. So I hope that your position is not that solar, a clean and renewable resource, should be able to stand on its own, since without incentives for solar electric the playing field between energy resources is skewed in favor of polluting non-renewable resources.

I am also attaching some information on the health effects of coal generated electricity, which CSU, including the CSU Board, almost never talks about. The information is from an email that I sent to several people on 6-7-09. The email was titled, Deaths and Injuries from Coal Electric Plants...Just one drop of mercury can contaminate a 25-acre lake to the point where fish are unsafe to eat. I think the latter is worth stating again: **Just one drop of mercury can contaminate a 25-acre lake to the point where fish are unsafe to eat.** And the new so called clean coal technology that CSU is funding does not reduce the mercury released by a coal plant. I wonder what the mercury level is in the local CSU owned reservoirs. Is anyone even looking at this? Of course the mercury levels closer to the plants are probably higher than at the reservoirs; and is anyone looking at these I wonder.

I think the Comments on Colorado Springs Utilities' (SU) 2008 EIRP Draft by CSU's Citizen's Advisory Group, and the CSU Technical Advisory Group (attached also), created a good start on addressing the economics of solar electric versus coal. Also, legislation having to do with placing a CO2 cap on coal plants has been moving through the U.S. House of Representatives; and the EPA may be drafting regulations that will be more restrictive having to do with coal fired electric plants. Both of these actions are likely to significantly increase the price of coal fired electricity in the future.

Last year CSU conducted a survey having to do with solar electric. The results of that survey have never been released. Please make the results of that study available to me, or explain why the public and I are not being allowed to see the results of that survey.

I would like to receive answers to my above questions, and a response to the attached information that I am providing you and others.

Thank you,

Lotus

Rocky Mountain Solar & Wind, Inc.

1075 Ford St., Unit 100
Colorado Springs, CO 80915
(719) 330-3699