



WEEKLY UPDATE AUGUST 4 - 10, 2019



ALEX ALEXIEV

NOVEMBER 21, 1941 - JULY 28, 2019

ALEX WAS A FOUNDER OF COLAB OF SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY



California Bids Farewell to a Freedom Fighter

Scholar, writer, and geopolitical analyst Alex Alexiev dies at 77

BY LLOYD BILLINGSLEY

With nearly 40 million people in the Golden State, Californians may be unaware of heroic persons in their midst. Such a hero was Alex Alexiev, who lived in Templeton, San Luis Obispo County, from 1999-2014, and passed away on Sunday in his native Bulgaria at the age of 77.

“Alexiev was the son of Rayko Alexiev, a renowned Bulgarian writer and caricaturist, who was tortured and killed in 1944, following the communist takeover of Bulgaria,” notes [Josh Friedman of Cal Coast News](#). “Alex Alexiev escaped communist Bulgaria in the 1960s, resettling in California and embarking upon a long career as a geopolitical analyst, working for think tanks, as well as the United States Department of Defense.”

After undergraduate and graduate studies at UCLA, Alexiev worked for the Rand Corporation and other think tanks. As Friedman notes, Alexiev was part of “Team B,” commissioned by the CIA, which swayed U.S. policy “toward a more aggressive approach to countering the Soviet Union and with influencing the American weapons buildup that began under the Carter Administration and accelerated under the Reagan Administration.”

After the collapse of Communism, Alexiev became advisor to Philip Dimitrov, Bulgaria’s first post-communist leader, and directed the Bulgarian bureau of Radio Free Europe. Alexiev’s books include [Marxism and Resistance in the Third World: Cause and Effect](#), and he wrote countless newspaper articles including “Gorbachev Has Met His Match,” in [the Los Angeles Times](#).

Alexiev was also an expert in radical Islam, authoring articles such as [“Playing by Islamofascist Rules.”](#) In recent years, Alexiev became a regular contributor to the [American Thinker](#) and served as managing editor of [Bulgaria Analytica](#).

“He will be sorely missed by the team and by the readers,” the [website reads](#). “His insight and intellectual prowess were only matched by his devotion to help readers navigate through the risks and challenges of life.” Alex Alexiev leaves behind three children in California.

Lloyd Billingsley is the author of Sexual Terrorist, about the Golden State Killer, and A Shut and Open Case, about a California murder trial prolonged by Proposition 57 and recent legislation. Lloyd is a fellow with the Independent Institute and his work has appeared in the Daily Caller, City Journal, Orange County Register, Wall Street Journal and many other publications. Bill of Writes: Dispatches from the Political Correctness Battlefield is a collection of his journalism. This Article first appeared in the California Globe of July 29, 2019

See more on page 15

EARLY WARNING – SLO CITY TO DISINCENTIVIZE GAS FIRED HEATING & APPLIANCES ON TUESDAY, SEPT 3, 2019

On July 16, 2019 the City of Berkeley adopted regulations prohibiting the use of natural gas for heating, cooking, hot water and other uses in new construction low rise buildings. It is considering expanding the ban to all new buildings in the future. Many other cities, including Los Angeles and San Jose, are in the process of adopting anti-natural gas provisions.

The City of San Luis Obispo, as the wanna be Berkeley of the Central Coast, will consider revisions of its local building code at its City Council meeting on Tuesday, September 3, 2019. The revisions do not seem to be an outright ban, but instead a set of requirements which insent all electric installation for new construction as well as major renovations and expansions. Some of the initial questions that we have posed to the City include:

1. On new homes, multi-family structures, and commercial buildings, the new regulation does not seem to prohibit outright installation of gas services for heating, hot water, cooking, etc., but requires that sufficient electrical service capacity and structural features be installed to run the building as if they were to be all electric or will become all electric in the future. Is this the case?
2. The requirement pertains not only to new structures but also additions and renovations. What percentage over the size of the original structure triggers these provisions on renovation/expansion of existing structures?
3. Will all new construction and major renovations require installation of solar as a general requirement?
4. Is it public policy thought that by requiring builders or homeowners to expend the funds for the electrical version, they will be discouraged from installing natural gas or propane because of double the expense?
5. Has the City calculated the additional cost impacts of these regulations on:
 - a. A typical new 2700 sq. ft. single family home?
 - b. A typical 20-unit attached apartment house or condo?
 - c. A 1200 sq. ft. ADU?
 - d. Or some other equivalent examples?
6. There are some requirements on fenestration insulation. What do these mean and what do they cost?
7. Since the City appears to be requiring installation of all the front end features for total electric buildings, is it contemplating requiring conversion of existing structures to all electric at some future time, perhaps as a condition of clearing escrow at the point of sale? It would seem that this will be necessary to achieve major CO₂ reduction goals in a mature community which is largely built out, such as SLO City.
8. Is the overall public policy purpose designed to reduce the amount of metric tonnes of CO₂ generated over some accumulative time period? If so, what is the amount and the time period based on the City's various development estimates? A nice 20-year graph projection would be helpful here.

We will report back on these and other provisions as the meeting date approaches.

THIS WEEK

NO BOS MEETING

SLOCOG FINALIZES HOUSING NUMBERS

CAL PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION FORUMS

AUGUST 7&8 ON DIABLO CLOSURE

PUBLIC COMMENT INVITED – SEE DETAILS BELOW ON PAGE 7

LAST WEEK

NO BOS MEETING FOR NEXT 2 WEEKS

THE NEXT BOARD MEETING WILL BE ON AUGUST 13, 2019

SLO COLAB IN DEPTH

SEE PAGE 8

**THE OPPORTUNITY COST OF SHUTTING DOWN
DIABLO CANYON NUCLEAR POWER PLANT**

BY EDWARD RING

**POTENTIAL BREAK-UP OF PG&E LOOKING LESS
LIKELY**

BY CHRIS REED

GREEN NEW DEAL AND THE ‘WORLDS DUMBEST ENERGY POLICY’

BY ALEX ALEXIEV

THIS WEEK’S HIGHLIGHTS

No Board of Supervisors Meeting on Tuesday, August 6, 2019

The Board will meet next Tuesday, August 13, 2019.

San Luis Obispo County Council of Governments (SLOCOG) Meeting of Wednesday, August 7, 2019 (Scheduled)

Item D-13: 2019 Final Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). This is a status report on the State mandated plan which has been under preparation for the past year. The State published the draft plan on its website to receive any appeals. There were none. Accordingly, SLOCOG can now publish the plan prefatory to an October final adoption. It will then be submitted to the State Housing and Community Development Department (HCD) for review and probable approval. During 2020 the County and its 7 cities must update the Housing Elements of their General Plans.

2019 RHNA Plan Timeline

Fall 2018: Distribution Methodology developed. ✓
Dec. 2018: HCD finalizes allocation ✓
Dec. 2018: Board reviews distribution methodology ✓
Feb. 2019: Board adopted distribution methodology ✓
Jun. 2019: Board reviews draft RHNA Plan ✓
Aug. 2019: Issue Proposed Final Plan
Oct. 2019: Final 2019 RHNA Plan consider to adopt
Dec. 2020: Housing Element updates due

The table below depicts the number of housing units assigned in total, by jurisdiction, and by income level. It should be noted that the cities and the County are not required to see that all the units are actually constructed, but that their respective zoning ordinances would allow the permits to be issued.

The whole scheme is a somewhat hollow promise in that many homes and apartment houses must receive

a separate minor use permit or even a conditional use permit, even if they are proposed in a zone where they are expressly permitted on an existing lot. Of course some will have to go through the subdivision process prior to being able to apply for a permit. Once the actual costs of obtaining a permit are applied and the heavy fees for roads, schools, parks, housing-in-lieu taxes, and all the rest are imposed, many projects die.

The 2019 RHNA Plan, which covers the next 8 years, is detailed in the table below:

Regional Housing Need Allocation (2019)

Jurisdiction	Total Allocation	Very Low 24.60%	Low 15.50%	Moderate 18.00%	Above Moderate 41.90%
Arroyo Grande	692	170	107	124	291
Atascadero	843	207	131	151	354
Grover Beach	369	91	57	66	155
Morro Bay	391	97	60	70	164
Paso Robles	1,446	356	224	259	607
Pismo Beach	459	113	71	82	193
San Luis Obispo	3,354	825	520	603	1,406
Unincorporated	3,256	801	505	585	1,365
Regional Total	10,810	2,660	1,675	1,940	4,535

2019 RHNA: Jan. 1, 2019 - Dec. 31, 2028 (10 years)

Note: The table above includes minor percentage calculation adjustments that resulted in 1 unit increases or decreases to jurisdictions to accurately match income group totals as determined by HCD.

The State threatens to impose penalties on jurisdictions which do not adopt a housing element that comports with the RHNA.

When a local government fails to adopt an updated Housing Element by the deadline, or adopts an element that does not comply with the law, the city or county is regarded as noncompliant and is subject to penalties. If the General Plan or any element is not in compliance with the law, a petitioner can request a hearing or a trial. If a court finds that the General Plan or any of its mandatory elements do not substantially comply with the law then the court in its order of judgment may specify one or more actions such as to:

- Suspend authority of the entity to issue building permits or other related permits for residential housing;
- Suspend the authority of the entity to grant zoning changes, variances, or both.

Jurisdictions in SLO County have not encountered problems in the past with this requirement.

What is the Status of the Current (2014) RHNA Plan and the Respective Housing Elements? The table below depicts how the cities and County have performed as of 2018.

**California Department of Housing and Community Development –
Division of Housing Policy Development**

JURISDICTION	Very Low Income % Complete	Low Income % Complete	Moderate % Complete	Above Moderate % Complete	RHNA Total	Total Permit	Total RHNA Remain	Proration Factor
Arroyo Grande	0.0%	44.7%	0.0%	58.4%	242	76	166	100.0%
Atascadero	49.0%	41.9%	247.8%	148.8%	393	489	86	100.0%
Grover Beach	0.0%	34.6%	0.0%	152.2%	165	114	87	100.0%
Morro Bay	0.0%	0.0%	7.4%	58.5%	155	40	115	100.0%
Paso Robles	171.5%	114.3%	240.2%	91.3%	493	696	18	100.0%
Pismo Beach	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	395.3%	153	265	77	100.0%
San Luis Obispo	58.2%	17.3%	6.5%	169.2%	1,143	1,019	455	100.0%
County of San Luis Obispo	15.5%	42.2%	65.8%	278.3%	1,347	1,864	487	100.0%

Policy Conflict: The larger problem is that while the State is imposing these requirements on cities and counties to develop more housing, it is killing the effort with its failure to expand the State Water Project, repair and expand the state’s roads and highways, and invest in other infrastructure.

Similarly, its scheme of regulation, including requirements that new homes have solar panels, have expensive HVAC systems, and are energy neutral, severely constrain affordable housing development.

Worse yet, the California Environmental Quality Act provides a robust platform for anti-development, anti-housing, and general NIMBY groups to use the courts as weapons against housing.

The imposition of hard urban edges force higher densities, which require more sophisticated government services in the form of mass transit, parking garages, urban policing, and all the rest of the impedimenta which goes along with dense urban living as people are concentrated.

In summary, the State’s housing mandate is conflicted by its regulatory policies and its lack of capital investment.

California Public Utilities Commission Meeting of Wednesday, August 7 and Thursday, August 8, 2019 -- San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors Chamber

SAN FRANCISCO, June 24, 2019 - The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) will hold public forums for residents and organizations in and near San Luis Obispo to give their perspective and input to the CPUC about Pacific Gas and Electric Company’s (PG&E) requests related to its Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, as follows:

There is a choice of times and days for the forums per the table below:

Date and Time	Meeting Location
August 7, 2019 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 p.m.: Information Hearing • 6 p.m.: Public Forum 	County Government Center County Board of Supervisors Chamber 1055 Monterey St., San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
August 8, 2019 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 a.m.: Information Hearing • 11 a.m.: Public Forum 	County Government Center County Board of Supervisors Chamber 1055 Monterey St., San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

Application (A.) 18-07-013

On July 23, 2018, PG&E submitted an application to the CPUC requesting approval to establish the Diablo Canyon Decommissioning Planning Memorandum Account to track decommissioning planning costs. According to PG&E, it is necessary for them to track decommissioning planning costs separately because the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) regulations limit access to the nuclear decommissioning trusts for the costs of decommissioning planning. Under NRC regulations, PG&E may only access 3 percent of the minimum decommissioning funding amount established to retire Diablo

Canyon Units 1 and 2. PG&E states that it believes the decommissioning planning activities will exceed the allowed funding amount. The company is not seeking to recover costs in this application, but proposes to request cost recovery and ratemaking in the Nuclear Decommissioning Cost Triennial Proceeding A.18-12-008.

Application (A.) 18-12-008

In this proceeding, PG&E submitted an application to the CPUC requesting cost recovery.

Application (A.) 18-12-008

In this proceeding, PG&E submitted an application to the CPUC requesting cost recovery and ratemaking to support the decommissioning activities for the Diablo Canyon and the Humboldt Bay power plants. According to PG&E, the requested revenue requirement to fund decommissioning planning over the next six years is necessary to avoid higher costs, such as taxes, to customers.

LAST WEEK'S HIGHLIGHTS

No Board of Supervisors Meeting on Tuesday, July 30, 2019

The Board will meet next on Tuesday, August 13, 2019.

COLAB IN DEPTH

IN FIGHTING THE TROUBLESOME, LOCAL DAY-TO-DAY ASSAULTS ON OUR FREEDOM AND PROPERTY, IT IS ALSO IMPORTANT TO KEEP IN MIND THE LARGER UNDERLYING IDEOLOGICAL, POLITICAL, AND ECONOMIC CAUSES AND FORCES

THE OPPORTUNITY COST OF SHUTTING DOWN DIABLO CANYON NUCLEAR POWER PLANT

BY EDWARD RING



For nearly 35 years, Diablo Canyon Power Plant has pumped just over 2.0 gigawatts of electricity onto California's power grid. Unlike hydroelectric power, which has good years and bad depending on rainfall, or solar and wind power which depends on sunshine and wind, Diablo Canyon's nuclear reactors generate this electricity 24 hours per day, 365 days a year.

But Diablo Canyon's days are numbered. In January 2018 California's Public Utility Commission voted to shut it down. Barring legislation to countermand this decision, by 2025 Diablo Canyon will cease operations, making California a nuclear free state. Is this a good idea?

Anti-nuclear environmental groups, [as reported](#) at the time in the **Los Angeles Times**, "hailed the decision, which was expected after 17 months of filings and debate, but also were concerned about what type of energy sources would be used to replace Diablo's electricity."

Good question. Especially since environmental groups are the groups one might expect to be most concerned about "greenhouse gas," and the only way wind and solar power can operate is by having natural gas power plants to spin into action every time the wind falters or the sun goes down.

The alternative to natural gas backup is to overbuild wind and solar farms and store the excess energy with batteries. An interesting comparison would be to see what battery storage capacity would be required to replace the power Diablo generates during off peak hours of 12 hours per day.

The following chart projects a \$12 billion price tag, based on a cost of \$500 million per gigawatt-hour of battery farm storage. This cost estimate relies on data from [several parallel projects](#) at the [2.0 gigawatt-hour](#) Moss Landing energy storage facility currently under development on the Central California coast.

While battery storage costs are declining rapidly, with some experts projecting prices at one-fifth current levels within 10-20 years, others are not so sanguine. And battery costs aren't the only consideration. Balance of plant costs – siting, distribution infrastructure – and California's obstructionist construction climate will also pile on costs.

How Many EVs Could Diablo Canyon Recharge Every Night?

If Diablo isn't shut down, of course, it isn't necessary to invest \$12 billion (or more) in battery storage to scoop up sun and wind dependent intermittent renewable energy and save it for nighttime charging. But either way, assuming California's policymakers achieve their goal of filling our roads with battery powered vehicles, how many miles could they travel based on tapping into 12 hours of Diablo Canyon's 2.0 gigawatt output?

As the next chart shows, the metric we're going to be getting used to when evaluating mileage efficiency from EVs is not "miles-per-gallon-equivalent," but the far more descriptive kilowatt-hours per 100 miles. And based on [US EPA data](#), most EVs on the road today require around 25 kilowatt-hours to travel 100 miles. That equates to 4 million miles per gigawatt-hour. Taking into account 12 hours of 2.0 gigawatt output from Diablo Canyon, that's enough to power a fleet of EVs driving 96 million miles per day. How does that compare to the total mileage driven each day by Californians?

According to US Federal Highway Administration data, the Californians log [per capita vehicle mileage](#) of 9,053 miles per year. That means California's nearly [40 million residents](#) are driving nearly one billion miles per day. Nonetheless, Diablo Canyon alone could power enough EVs to put quite a dent into that total. Nearly 10 percent of all driver mileage could be powered by EVs charged overnight by electricity produced by Diablo Canyon.

To make the opportunity cost of shutting down Diablo Canyon even more stark, one might ask what the cost would be to use solar panels and batteries to replace Diablo Canyon's off-peak nocturnal output? The next chart shows those estimates, based on a rock bottom price of \$1.00 per watt of solar panels. That is a best-case number pretty much forever, since land acquisition, engineering, labor, racking, connectors, utility interties, distribution infrastructure – along with the price of the actual panels – make this a mature industry.

As an aside, the less said about wind power, the better. Wind power is an abomination, slaughtering [birds](#), [bats](#), and [insects](#) at a rate which would destroy the planet in a few years if it were ever developed to any meaningful scale, not to mention the visual blight, the hideous quantities of materials, or the [physical and psychological illness](#) the inescapable low frequency thrum triggers in humans and animals.

As shown above, it would cost about \$18 **billion** to develop renewable assets using solar and battery technology to replace the overnight EV recharging capacity of Diablo Canyon. If California's vehicles were electrified, this capacity is sufficient to power 10 percent of California's automobile mileage. And this is exactly **half** the story – Diablo Canyon operates 24 hours per day, not just at night to charge EV batteries.

It is interesting – or depressing, depending on one's ability to confront these scandalous miscarriages of policy with equanimity – to wonder why environmentalists, who think we have barely a decade to "decarbonize" before the planet is lost, are so intent on shutting down Diablo Canyon.

The only sane way to sell renewable energy is to make it cheaper than fossil fuel and nuclear power. But the flawed policies and phony accounting that are used to present renewables as competitive need to be replaced by honest analysis.

It should be obvious that if renewable energy was truly less expensive, every nation in the world would be turning to renewables instead of building, as fast as they possibly can more coal, natural gas, and nuclear power plants.

The single most significant variable affecting the economic viability of intermittent renewable energy is storage costs. Maybe batteries will eventually come down in price to, say \$50 per kilowatt-hour, i.e., \$50 million per gigawatt-hour. And if and when that happens, maybe it will make economic sense to convert to 100 percent renewables. And maybe then, instead of having to sow fear and panic in the media, and weaponize brainwashed elementary school children for photo ops with politicians pushing “green” energy, states and nations will adopt renewables because they really are the cheaper alternative.

If we are entering the electric age, where not only lights, PCs, refrigerators and air conditioners use electricity, but also space heaters, water heaters, cooktops, and vehicles – not to mention cyber currency – then we’re going to need **more** electricity at a time when “renewables” aren’t ready for prime time. And if the urgent imperative to rush into this decarbonized electric age is to supposedly save the planet, why are we shutting down Diablo Canyon?

In the meantime, Diablo Canyon is a sunk cost. Ratepayers long ago covered the construction bill for Diablo Canyon. But these reactors, instead of continuing to generate 2.0 gigawatts of clean, carbon free electricity for decades to come, are going to be shut down and subject to expensive decommissioning costs. Those who sincerely believe in the need to decarbonize energy need to join with those who support economically sound energy policies, to demand Diablo Canyon stay open.

This article originally appeared in the California Globe on July 30, 2019.

Check out the video on the role of nuclear power in a national energy strategy

https://youtu.be/8_FSGErzVSs

POTENTIAL BREAK-UP OF PG&E LOOKING LESS LIKELY BY CHRIS REED

Eight months after the head of the California Public Utilities Commission suggested it was time for a radical shake-up of Pacific Gas & Electric, the state’s largest power utility appears to be at much less risk of a hostile takeover or being broken up into smaller utilities.

While Gov. Gavin Newsom has been sharply critical of PG&E for years for fires and disasters blamed on its lax practices, the former San Francisco mayor has offered no encouragement to London Breed, the city’s current mayor, who is interested in taking over some PG&E assets and using them in a municipal power utility.

The bill passed by the state Legislature this month at Newsom’s behest to create a \$21 billion account jointly funded by utilities and ratepayers to help deal with the high cost of wildfires included provisions that gave the CPUC more power to control the fate of PG&E assets. It also specified that any new owner

of a utility cannot reduce the number of employees for three years, which analysts saw as an attempt to discourage a takeover.

Mayors blast part of wildfire legislation

Breed, San Jose Mayor Sam Liccardo, and Oakland Mayor Libby Schaaf sharply criticized these provisions in a letter to Newsom and legislative leaders. They “set a dangerous precedent by limiting local government autonomy over its own employee relationships,” the mayors wrote.

Newsom also effectively sided with PG&E in opposing the attempt by utility bondholders to force the utility to change its present plan to emerge from the Chapter 11 bankruptcy it filed for in January because of \$30 billion in expected claims over wildfires blamed on the utility’s equipment. PG&E wants to use a portion of its earnings and cost savings to issue tax-exempt bonds to pay for wildfire costs. Bondholders back a complex alternative plan that would sharply reduce the equity of shareholders.

PG&E, which has 16 million customers, must finalize and file its reorganization plan with federal bankruptcy court by Sept. 29. To qualify for assistance from the \$21 billion state wildfire relief fund, it must be out of bankruptcy by June 30, 2020.

Meanwhile, the CPUC president who blasted PG&E in December is likely in his final weeks on the job. Michael Picker announced in May that he would retire this summer but would stay on until Newsom chose his replacement.

Picker has long faced criticism for the perception that the utilities commission was too protective of the state’s three giant investor-owned utilities – PG&E, Southern California Edison and San Diego Gas & Electric. New scandal was last straw for CPUC chief

But a turning point came in December when the CPUC staff presented evidence that PG&E knowingly followed unsafe practices in maintaining and inspecting natural gas lines for five years after a natural gas explosion killed eight people in San Bruno in 2010.

“This process will be like repairing a jetliner while it’s in flight,” he said. “The keystone question is would, compared to PG&E and PG&E Corp. as presently constituted, any of the proposals provide Northern Californians with safer natural gas and electric service at just and reasonable rates.”

Picker subsequently said the CPUC and state leaders should consider a state takeover or having the utility broken up into smaller components.

The new scandal and Picker’s remarks helped drop PG&E’s stock price from over \$23 a share in mid-December to under \$7 a month later. The share price had rebounded to \$18.70 as of the close of the market on Friday, reflecting analysts’ confidence that PG&E will survive Chapter 11.

Chris Reed is a regular contributor to Cal Watchdog. Reed is an editorial writer for U-T San Diego. Before joining the U-T in July 2005, he was the opinion-page columns editor and wrote the featured weekly Unspin column for The Orange County Register. Reed was on the national board of the Association of Opinion Page Editors from 2003-2005. From 2000 to 2005, Reed made more than 100 appearances as a featured news analyst on Los Angeles-area National Public Radio affiliate KPCC-FM. From 1990 to 1998, Reed was an editor, metro columnist and film critic at the

Inland Valley Daily Bulletin in Ontario. Reed has a political science degree from the University of Hawaii (Hilo campus), where he edited the student newspaper, the Vulcan News, his senior year. He is on Twitter: @chrisreed99. This article first appeared in Cal WatchDog of July 29, 2019

WE WILL MISS ALEX'S PRECISE AND INFORMED COMMENTARY

GREEN NEW DEAL AND THE 'WORLD'S DUMBEST ENERGY POLICY'

BY ALEX ALEXIEV

The democrats' latest promise to fuel America's economy from "100% percent clean, renewable, zero-emission" sources and do so within a decade, while eliminating "systemic injustice," sounds very much like the perennial Soviet promises that communism was just around the corner. And the communist tenor of these promises is unmistakable. For apart from ridding the world of CO2 emissions, the Green New Deal's promoters also promise national i.e. government, health care, government job guarantees, upgrading all buildings in the country to green standards and high-speed trains to replace air travel. The only doubts these wild-eyed socialists seem to have is that they are "[not sure that we'll be able to fully get rid of farting cows and airplanes that fast,](#)" as their, in the meantime deleted, FAQ said.



These borderline lunatic ravings could simply be dismissed for what they are, except that there are at least two reasons to take them seriously. First, virtually all the announced democratic candidates running for president in 2020 have already endorsed them. Secondly, some of it has already been tried in an advanced Western economy and the results are here for everyone to see. It is these results that prompted the [editorial board of the Wall Street Journal](#) recently to declare Germany's energy policy under Chancellor Angela Merkel "the worlds dumbest."

Despite the dismal outcome of these policies, because of the leftist stranglehold over of the media in Europe and here, most Americans are not aware of the pending green disaster. Indeed, we have been told that we should emulate them and at least some states, such as California, seem to be embarked on exactly the same road to disaster. Thus, it is worth recapitulating what actually happened in Germany.

It all started in 1980 with the founding of the German green party, which fervently believed that man was not the solution but the real cause of nature's problems, as detailed in a proto-Nazi screed called "Man and Nature" of 1911 by the German greens patron saint [Ludwig Klage](#). The opportunity to act on their beliefs came in the late 1990s when the Greens joined as a coalition partner the government of left-wing social-democrat Gerhard Schroeder. Schroeder later on distinguished himself as a paid lackey of Vladimir Putin immediately upon leaving the chancellorship.

In the event, under Green tutelage, the German government passed in April 2000 the first renewable energy law (EEG) and feed-in tariff mandating radical subsidies and preferential treatment for

renewable energy to be financed by the electricity user. This was the first act of a fundamental energy transition (Energiewende) that promised to dramatically lower greenhouse gas emissions and increase renewable energy to 80% of the total by 2050. The Energiewende was universally greeted at the time by left wingers worldwide as green paradise about to be reclaimed.

Then in 2011, in the aftermath of the Fukushima disaster, the German government decided to close all of its nuclear power plants on the asinine assumption that a similar 9 by Richter earthquake and a 48 foot tsunami could happen in Germany.

Predictably, it didn't work out that way as could be easily predicted because renewable energy is intermittent i.e. unreliable, and there are as yet no economically feasible storage solutions. Nor is increasing the capacity of renewable energy a solution. When the sun doesn't shine and the wind doesn't blow, whether you have a renewable capacity of 10 GigaWatt/hours or a 1000 makes no difference at all. Your production is zero regardless. In January 2019, with German announced renewable capacity of **40% of needed power, the production was 15.34%.**

The only thing that has gone up inexorably and dramatically is the cost of electricity paid by the ratepayer and those industries that are not subject to subsidies yet (those that use more than 1 GigaWatt/hour and spend more than 16% of income on electricity). With a renewable surcharge of 6.4 euro cents per kilowatt, the Germans now pay the highest electricity rates of 33 cents per kilowatt in Europe. This despite the huge sum of euro 550 billion of rate and tax payer money spent to date subsidizing wind and solar. To add insult to injury, CO2 emissions in Germany have not gone down since 2009.

And it is going to get worse. According to the consumer advocacy NAEB, German electricity prices are projected to reach **40 cents per kilowatt**, by 2020, which will make them four times those in the US and two times those of France. And there is more. By 2023, 14,000 Megawatts of installed wind turbine capacity would have to be terminated since it is not economically feasible without the subsidy, which runs out after 20 years.

Germany, the much touted world champion of renewable energy, is clearly headed for disaster. How German industry could remain competitive, to say nothing of its people's standard of living, under those conditions is an open question.

Alex Alexiev Tuesday April 16th, 2019 The article first published in instituteeforenergyresearch.org on 12/14/2018.

ANNOUNCEMENTS





GEOPOLITICAL ANALYST ALEX ALEXIEV, FORMER SLO COUNTY RESIDENT, DIES AT 77

BY JOSH FRIEDMAN

Alex Alexiev, an accomplished geopolitical analyst who lived and worked in numerous locations around the world, including San Luis Obispo County, where he raised a family and resided for 15 years, died early Sunday morning in his native Bulgaria at 77.

Alexiev was the son of Rayko Alexiev, a renowned Bulgarian writer and caricaturist, who was tortured and killed in 1944, following the communist takeover of Bulgaria. Alex Alexiev escaped communist Bulgaria in the 1960s, resettling in California and embarking upon a long career as a geopolitical analyst, working for think tanks, as well as the United States Department of Defense.



“Alex was a beacon of reason and wisdom earned over a long life that he shared with his followers and readers, friends and even opponents,” said Ilian Vassilev, the former Bulgarian ambassador to Russia and current managing editor of the publication *Bulgaria Analytica*, a role he had shared with Alexiev. “He rarely spoke in public on anything else but topics which he had mastered — radical Islam and Kremlinology. He was listened to in many places world over. This came at a cost; his openness earned him entry bans to a number of countries.”

Upon immigrating to the United States, Alexiev completed both his undergraduate and graduate studies at UCLA. Alexiev went on to work for the Santa Monica-based Rand Corporation and various Washington, D.C. think tanks, in addition to The Pentagon.

In the 1970s, Alexiev served as one of the experts who contributed to Team B, a competitive analysis exercise commissioned by the CIA, then led by eventual President George H.W. Bush. Team B is credited with swaying U.S. foreign policy toward a more aggressive approach to countering the Soviet

Union and with influencing the American weapons buildup that began under the Carter Administration and accelerated under the Reagan Administration.

Alexiev authored or co-authored at least a dozen books, including works such as *Inside the Soviet Army in Afghanistan* and *Marxism and Resistance in the Third World: Cause and Effect*.

In 1991, Alexiev returned to Bulgaria and became the advisor to the country's post-communist prime minister, Philip Dimitrov. Also around the time of the collapse of communism, he directed the Bulgarian bureau of Radio Free Europe.

From 1999 to 2014, Alexiev lived in Templeton, where he helped raise a family. He spent much of the current decade bouncing back and forth between the United States and Bulgaria.

In 2011, Alexiev founded the Sofia, Bulgaria-based Center for Balkan and Black Sea Studies, a non-governmental organization for which he served as chairman. In recent years, Alexiev was also a regular contributor to the publication *American Thinker*, as well as *Bulgaria Analytica*, for which he served as managing editor.

Alexiev additionally penned multiple opinion pieces for *CalCoastNews*.

Two of Alexiev's children currently live in SLO County, while another lives in Los Angeles. Alexiev's son, Eric Alexiev, recently followed in his father's footsteps, moving from SLO County to Bulgaria.

"It's hard to imagine looking up to somebody as much as I do my father," Eric Alexiev said.

A funeral is scheduled for Friday in Sofia, Bulgaria.

Josh Freedman is a reporter for CalCoastNews. The article was first published on July 27, 2019.



**SUPPORT COLAB!
PLEASE COMPLETE THE
MEMBERSHIP/DONATION FORM
ON THE LAST PAGE BELOW**



MIKE BROWN ADVOCATES BEFORE THE BOS



VICTOR DAVIS HANSON ADDRESSES A COLAB FORUM



DAN WALTERS EXPLAINS SACTO MACHINATIONS AT A COLAB FORUM

See the presentation at the link: <https://youtu.be/eEdP4cvf-zA>



AUTHOR & NATIONALLY SYNDICATED COMMENTATOR BEN SHAPIRO APPEARED AT A COLAB ANNUAL DINNER



NATIONAL RADIO AND TV COMMENTATOR HIGH HEWITT AT COLAB DINNER

Coalition of Labor, Agriculture and Business
San Luis Obispo County
"Your Property - Your Taxes - Our Future"
PO Box 13601 - San Luis Obispo, CA 93406 / Phone: 805.548-0340
Email: colabslo@gmail.com / Website: colabslo.org

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

MEMBERSHIP OPTIONS:

General Member: \$100 - \$249 \$ _____ Voting Member: \$250 - \$5,000 \$ _____

Sustaining Member: \$5,000 + \$ _____

(Sustaining Membership includes a table of 10 at the Annual Fundraiser Dinner)

General members will receive all COLAB updates and newsletters. Voting privileges are limited to Voting Members and Sustainable Members with one vote per membership.

MEMBER INFORMATION:

Name: _____

Company: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Phone: _____ Fax: _____ Email: _____

How Did You Hear About COLAB?

Radio Internet Public Hearing Friend

COLAB Member(s) / Sponsor(s): _____

NON MEMBER DONATION/CONTRIBUTION OPTION:

For those who choose not to join as a member but would like to support COLAB via a contribution/donation.
I would like to contribute \$ _____ to COLAB and my check or credit card information is enclosed/provided.

Donations/Contributions do not require membership though it is encouraged in order to provide updates and information.
Memberships and donation will be kept confidential if that is your preference.
Confidential Donation/Contribution/Membership

PAYMENT METHOD:

Check Visa MasterCard Discover Amex NOT accepted.

Cardholder Name: _____ Signature: _____

Card Number: _____ Exp Date: ___/___ Billing Zip Code: _____ CVV: _____

TODAY'S DATE: _____

(Revised 2/2017)