

July 14, 2016

RECEIVED  
STATE OF COLORADO  
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMM.  
2016 JUL 21 AM 8:21

Joshua B. Epel, Chairman  
Colorado Public Utilities Commission  
1550 Broadway #250  
Denver, CO 80202

Subject: "Xcel in a Rush on Rush Creek"  
Incl: Copy of: "Steal the Wind Reap the Whirlwind"

Dear Mr. Epel:

I am writing in reference to the June 16<sup>th</sup> article in the Denver Post titled "Xcel in a Rush on Rush Creek".

I want to point out before addressing my opposition to the Rush Creek Wind Farm that I do believe CO2 emissions are a factor that can cause warming of the earth. The current level of CO2 in the atmosphere is about 398 ppm and new emissions are certainly a problem that needs to be addressed. I do not, however, believe that the massive investments being made in renewable energy will do anything substantial to eliminate this pollution and warming problem. There are other approaches that are much more dependable, less costly, and will achieve desired results much more rapidly.

We must recognize that there is not a "shortage" of power in this country or Europe or in any "developed" countries. In China and India new coal powered plants are being built more rapidly than Wind Farms. So basically, these two renewables are being built, not to provide added power capacity, but solely to reduce the threats of Global Warming and Climate Change by reducing CO2 emissions. Trillions of dollars will be spent on "renewable" energy while maybe a few hundred million or a few billion will be spent on research to develop new, far cleaner, forms of energy or vastly improving the current fossil fuel technology. Or replacing the most egregious coal plants with much cleaner natural gas plants.

Before addressing the \$443 million "savings" that Xcel suggests it would be able to pass on to its customers, I would like to briefly describe Germany's **Energiewende**, or "energy transformation" program.

**Energiewende** is a 16 year-old effort that has already had devastating consequences on Germany's energy sector and has had very little effect on reducing CO2 emissions. In fact, since 2009, the average annual CO2 emissions in Germany have actually increased. This is what I refer to as "**socio-enviro-emotionalism**" run amok. Germany has shut down 8 of its 17 "clean", zero carbon nuclear power plants. Germany has shut down most of its NEW natural gas plants. It has built several NEW "lignite" coal plants (A 1600 MW coal plant opened November 20, 2015) to help maintain "stability" of its Grid. Germany must build more than 4,000 miles of new and extended Transmission Lines to access the wind farms, the longest being from the North Sea to the south of Germany. Much of the latter will be very expensive



"underground" cable to avoid the wrath of the citizenry. The European Grid is suffering from the variability of wind and solar and the shutdowns of reliable power plants.

Germany's politicians, socioenviroemotionalists, and the wind industry exalt on the few days when the turbines provide 90% of Germany's electrical power, but the Grid Operators and the Grid itself shudders under the strain of fluctuating power, both within and adjacent to Germany. Germany still gets 44% of its power from coal, 11% from gas, and 10% from nuclear. It will shut down its remaining "zero carbon emission" nuclear plants by 2022.

Germany's taxpayers and power consumers are paying the cost of subsidies and high utility rates, the costliest in Europe.

All of the European Union, particularly the western European countries (the UK, Ireland, Sweden, Denmark, Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, France, Portugal, Spain, Italy Greece, and *GERMANY*) is a vast forest of wind turbines.

Germany has spent hundreds of billions of Euros on *Energiewende* and the ultimate cost is expected to exceed one trillion Euros. Germany is one of the leaders in Nuclear Fusion research but is spending a pittance on this effort by comparison. The Nuclear Fusion "stellarator" experiment in Germany and the "tokamak" experiment have cost a little more than \$1 billion combined.

### **Back to Xcel's "savings".**

I am somewhat confused about the pronounced savings being \$125 million or \$443 million but I presume the \$125 million is the 2016 federal tax subsidy that Xcel would get if it began work this year and \$443 million is the cumulative credits (*savings*) if the project is completed by October 31, 2018.

Let's be clear, the \$443 million dollars that would be paid to Xcel by the federal government is borrowed or printed money. The national debt is \$19.5 trillion and the annual deficit is, conservatively, \$500 to \$600 billion so every penny of subsidy paid by the federal government for anything is borrowed or printed money. The same can be said for most subsidies paid by many states. Colorado pays \$6,500 to wealthy Coloradoans to buy Tesla cars, on top of the federal subsidy of \$7,000. (My niece being one of them). Sensible?

The only rational way Xcel's customers could *save* \$443 million is for the \$1 billion Rush Creek Wind Farm not to be built at all. In fact, there is absolutely no justification for this Wind Farm. Constructing 90 miles of transmission lines to 200-300 more wind turbines is lunacy! There are thousands of miles of new transmission already built and being built to wind farms across this country.

Companies (including Xcel), environmentalists (socioenviroemotionalists), and politicians always like to talk about *the jobs being created*. Jobs should be a by-product of building or creating something that is *right*. After graduating from West Point Lieutenant Dwight D. Eisenhower, in 1919, participated in an Army experiment/exercise. This was having an army convoy travel from the east coast to the west coast. Eisenhower came away from that trip realizing that the country needed a completely new highway system if it was ever to be able to defend itself in wartime. When he became President 30 plus years later, he initiated the construction of the Interstate Highway System. He **did not** do this to *create jobs*, but many jobs were the by-product of this visionary effort.



We do not need the Rush Creek Wind Farm. Building it cannot be justified by having the federal government borrow or print \$443 million dollars! This must be paid back by U.S. taxpayers, including those here in Colorado. Furthermore, it will not remove one gram of CO<sub>2</sub> from the atmosphere. In fact, the 300,000 plus wind turbines on the entire planet today will not *remove one gram* of CO<sub>2</sub> from the atmosphere. Atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> takes thousands of year to dissipate.

There are three main approaches to renewable energy: Ethanol, Wind Power, and Solar Power.

Ethanol (corn ethanol), with a law passed in 2007, must provide 32 billion gallons annually by 2022. This program is a monumental economic and environmental disaster (see my book).

Three hundred thousand wind turbines, with thousands of miles of transmission lines, provide a very low single-digit percentage of the world's (unreliable) power. How many millions of turbines and hundreds of thousands of miles of transmission lines would be required to provide a meaningful amount of the world's power? What about the slaughter of millions of birds, bats, eagles, raptors, bees, butterflies (Monarchs), etc.?

Solar Power? Drive around Denver, and envision putting roof-top solar on every house. Drive around Minneapolis-St. Paul in late January and envision every roof having solar. Solar Gardens are not the answer either!

Consider the fact that there are only 2,300 coal-powered plants on the entire planet today (around 6,000 individual power units). Hillary Clinton, if elected, wants to put 400,000,000 solar panels on houses during her first term and wants to have "every home in America running on "renewable energy" within ten years after taking office. I believe it is safe to say that 2,000 of those coal plants would still be operating at the end of that ten year period. Possibly more at the rate China and India are building them. Also consider the fact that almost every home in the northern half of the U.S. is heated by natural gas.

Next consider the fact that by comparison to the trillions of dollars that are/will be spent on the three renewable energy initiatives, we are spending "pennies" on Carbon Capture technologies, Carbon Removal technologies, Carbon Storage, new, cleaner forms of Nuclear Fission, development of Nuclear Fusion, Fuel Cell technologies, and other forms of energy that could lead us through the 21<sup>st</sup> Century and beyond. **Carbon Removal** is the only way that CO<sub>2</sub> *already* in the atmosphere can be reduced.

I wonder if it makes more sense to replace the most egregious of the 2,300 coal plants with natural gas plants and change our focus on forward thinking technologies rather than on Corn, Pinwheels, and Glass Panels.

I'm a simple Layman, 82 years old. I have a Bachelor's Degree in Geology but I spent my entire career in computer software, beginning in 1959. Wind and Solar have their uses in certain areas but they are not solutions for the mass power required for the people and industries on this great planet.

**Wind Power** and **Solar Power** are what I refer to as "Passive" Power. We cannot control where and when the sun shines or where and when the wind will blow. In fact, Climate Change itself may determine changes to these very basic earthly forces. World commerce, industry, and humankind require "Active" Power, power we control every minute of every hour of every day.

In conclusion, do not approve the building of the \$1 billion Rush Creek Wind Farm. There are no "savings" for Xcel's Colorado customers. All federal subsidies are borrowed or printed money that must be paid back by our children and grandchildren and great grandchildren, etc. including those in Colorado.

Thirty years from now the Wind and Solar initiatives will be looked back upon as obsolete, fantasy actions driven by socioenviroemotionalists, politicians hoping for reelection, and greedy corporations.

Think about it!

Sincerely,

Duane J. Hyland

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Duane J. Hyland".

Author: *Steal the Wind Reap the Whirlwind*

djhhy33@yahoo.com



John Cooke  
State Senator

State Capitol  
200 E. Colfax Avenue  
Denver, Colorado 80203  
john.cooke.senate@state.co.us



**SENATE  
STATE OF COLORADO  
DENVER**

**COMMITTEES**

Member of:

Agriculture, Natural Resources,  
and Energy  
Judiciary  
Transportation

July 15, 2016

Chairman Joshua Epel  
Commissioner Frances Kincilja  
Commissioner Glenn Vaad  
Colorado Public Utilities Commission  
1560 Broadway #250  
Denver, CO 80202

2016 JUL 21 AM 8:22  
OFFICE OF COLORADO  
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Dear Chairman Epel, Commissioner Kincilja, and Commissioner Vaad,

After reviewing the filings of public comments on 16A-0117E regarding Xcel Energy's plan for the Rush Creek Wind Farm, and after seeing the public application, I wish to have my name removed as a supporter of the project. Learning more about the project I am now adamantly opposed to the Rush Creek Wind Farm. Xcel has requested an expedited approval process that does not give ratepayers and other interested parties an opportunity to complete a thorough economic analysis.

I believe that this process has become a coronation, of sorts, and has become too rushed to make a proper decision on the proceeding. The Rush Creek Wind Farm is a massively complex \$1.1 billion project that spans multiple jurisdictions and will impact some 1.4 million Colorado ratepayers and every U.S. taxpayer. It's a wonder how you could possibly reduce the approval process to a few months to gather all the facts and necessary analysis and still believe that the right decision has been made.

Coloradans have already seen their electricity rates increase dramatically in the last decade. What will this do to their future rates? It seems the easy thing to do is jump on the Rush Creek bandwagon, but I would like to see you take a more deliberate approach to your decision.

We all want what is best for Coloradans, which is why I cannot support a project that leaves key questions regarding economic impact completely unanswered. Furthermore, I certainly don't support the project under Xcel's requested timeline, and I hope you do not either.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John B. Cooke".

John Cooke  
State Senator - District 13