California is interested in electricity that is ALWAYS ON.  Not intermittent.  It is no wonder that the State of California is interested in selling Nevada WIND energy.  Please...give me a break.  As a Nevada ratepayer and taxpayer, why on earth would I be interested in purchasing "renewable energy" from CA, that is only available when demand is low?  Why would I want to run my A/C less, when it is so much hotter, than later, when the sun goes down?

<http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2012/08/13/wind-and-solar-have-little-value-when-trying-to-keep-the-lights-on-the-example-of-california-and-its-current-flexalert/>

<http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/ir_25.htm#.UIdfno5waQI>

excerpt below:

Despite numerous violations, the Obama administration—like the Bush administration before it—has unofficially exempted the wind industry from prosecution under the Eagle Protection and Migratory Bird Treaty Acts. If Congress extends the PTC, federal taxpayers will, in effect, be subsidizing the killing of federally protected birds.

<http://cnsnews.com/news/article/9-billion-stimulus-solar-wind-projects-made-910-final-jobs-98-million-job>

<http://science.house.gov/sites/republicans.science.house.gov/files/documents/hearings/HHRG-112-SY21-WState-LLinowes-20120419.pdf>

exerpt below:

Wind power cannot replace the need for many 'capacity resources,' which are generators and dispatchable load that are available to be used when needed to meet peak load. If wind has some capacity value for reliability planning purposes, that should be viewed as a bonus, but not a necessity.

DOE is well aware of the fact that wind energy is an unpredictable, variable resource that cannot be relied on to deliver electricity when needed. Claims by industry proponents that installed wind today powers, on average, over 12 million American homes misrepresents wind energy's purpose and limited contribution to our energy portfolio. For the authors of the report, satisfying the 20% wind energy goal is entirely independent of our need for reliable power plants

<http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2012/10/08/more-wind-on-extending-the-ptc/>

excerpt below:

**Conclusion**

Generally speaking, tinkering with the tax code to give advantages to certain sectors—such as wind energy—can’t increase employment on net, but can only rearrange it. Clearly, destroying jobs in non-wind sectors in order to create them in wind, doesn’t boost tax receipts to various level of government. In a normal economy, the tax expenditure of the PTC is a net loss to the government.

Even in the midst of a recession, where one could argue that properly designed tax cuts might spur a faster recovery, the wind PTC is hardly suited for the task. There would be much more job-creation bang for the tax-expenditure buck by implementing a broad-based reduction in marginal rates, rather than targeting a specific sector with generous advantages.

I sincerely hope that all of the members of the NEITF will read these articles, as I have.  There is no business case, the Emperor has no clothes.
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