

Anticipated CC
Date: 5-10-22

From: Kevin Dawson <kevindaw@aol.com>

Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 6:20 PM

To: Hemenway, Steve <SHemenway@riversideca.gov>; Perry, Jim <JPerry@riversideca.gov>; Plascencia, Gaby <GPlascencia@riversideca.gov>; Cervantes, Clarissa <CCervantes@riversideca.gov>; Fierro, Ronaldo <RFierro@riversideca.gov>; Edwards, Erin <EEwards@riversideca.gov>; Conder, Chuck <CConder@riversideca.gov>; Zelinka, Al <azelinka@riversideca.gov>; 2Mayor <2MAYOR@riversideca.gov>

Cc: ddowney@scng.com; Mark Acosta <macosta@scng.com>

Subject: [External] ELECTREK: Tesla Megapack project with 730 MWh of capacity is now up and running on PG&E's network

CAUTION: This email is originated from OUTSIDE of City of Riverside and was not sent by any City Officials or City Staff. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the email and know that the content is safe. If you suspect this is a phishing or malicious email, please contact the helpdesk.

Dear Council,

The latest article on the Moss Landing battery storage facility. They've just turned on the latest batch of batteries, bring the total capacity to 730 MWh and are on track to 1.1 GWh. This project was conceived, planned, approved by CPUC, and built, in stages, over just 4 years. RTRP has been in works for 19 years. In the latest EIR project alternatives study, SCE dismissed battery storage out of hand because the 489 MWh amount of storage they said they need exceed the total amount installed national wide. (They used outdated data from 2016) Just four years now after that report, Moss Landing alone is running a system vastly exceeding SCE's stated need for Riverside.

The cost of batteries has plummeted and the capability has climbed. Any reports or studies over three years old are outdated. Alternative battery designs are just on the cusp of coming to market, which will be more environmentally viable and further reduce price, freeing up the higher density to weight lithium batteries to be used exclusively for EVs.

As I've said before, the \$600m RTRP will not generate or store 1 watt of energy. It will not protect Riverside from rolling blackouts caused by problems elsewhere on the grid.

If we want resiliency, we should apply and lobby the CPUC to fund battery storage instead of transmission lines. We should restructure city finances to do away with the electrical GFT, so The city's need for GFT revenue doesn't get in the way of promoting roof to solar. We need people and businesses to invest and install roof top solar. We are already limited by how many hours we can run our gas powered peaker plants. We are already having maintenance challenges in finding spare parts for those plants. Every watt generated by roof top solar and stored in batteries, is instantaneous power we don't have to generate by burning gas. It's win, win, win, all around.

The latest reports on climate change show we need to get off gas by 2030. That's only 7 years away!

Replacing RTRP with batteries doesn't have to be purchased all at once. As with Moss Landing, we can buy in phases to take advantage of continuous price drops and technical improvements. We have over 95 warehouses with over 1 m square foot. With the current 20% efficiency, solar provides 20 watts/ sq. ft., so each warehouse could generate 20

MWh. So, with just those 95 structures we could get 200 MWh, and without using up existing undeveloped open space.

We should explore floating solar on Lake Matthew, which would reduce water loss due to evaporation and have an added benefit of cooling the solar panels, maximizing their efficiency and lengthening their life expectancy.

If we are the city of innovation, then we need to think more broadly and creatively when faced with the existential threat of climate change and the estimated time line within which we need to adopt change.

If the CPUC gave us \$600m, is RTRP the project we should spend it on? I say the evidence is a resounding NO.

We need to put a hold on RTRP, and conduct a thoughtful re evaluation.

I can think of two properties next to RPU transformer farms, that are so contaminated they should never be used for human activity, which would be perfect for battery storage.

We need to change our thinking, and quickly.

I'm disappointed in UCR. Their Long Range Development Plan shows they will not address the state required Green House Gas requirements. They just say they will buy carbon credits and use biogas (pixie dust). As a premier research and education center, I expect them to set the example of practicing what they teach, and they are falling short. Or maybe it's an example of the magnitude of the problems global warming is presenting. Regardless, business as usual is not an option.

Respectfully,
Kevin Dawson

Tesla Megapack project with 730 MWh of capacity is now up and running on PG&E's network

PG&E announced that they have turned on their giant Tesla Megapack project with 730 MWh of capacity, and the electric grid company expects that it will "enhance the overall reliability of California's ever-changing energy supply."

Read in Electrek: <https://apple.news/Adg84XwyHT5643X02NIYH-Q>

Shared from [Apple News](#)

Sent from my iPad

cc Mayor
City Council
City Manager
City Attorney
ACMs
PU General Manager

From: Sharon Mateja <rrr.lasierra@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, April 28, 2022 12:33:20 PM

To: Plascencia, Gaby <GPlascencia@riversideca.gov>

Cc: 'Sharon Mateja' <rrr.lasierra@gmail.com>; 'Sharon Mateja' <smateja@earthlink.net>; 'Chair NBT' <chairnbt@gmail.com>; 'Aurora Chavez' <achavez5068@aol.com>; 'Tom Donahue' <tjdonahue53@att.net>; 'Barbara Croonquist' <bcroonquist@sbcglobal.net>; 'Christine Duran' <dco7355@gmail.com>; 'Diana Ruiz' <jediruiz@aol.com>; 'Don Morris' <drdmorris@earthlink.net>; 'Jane Block' <jblock29@charter.net>; 'Kevin Dawson' <kevindaw@aol.com>; 'Gurumantra Khalsa' <gkhalsa@nutritionnews.com>; 'Michele Wise (Simpson)' <edstvimi@hotmail.com>; 'Sean Mill' <smill@wfgtitleco.com>; 'Susan Fahrney' <sfahrney9@gmail.com>; Peter Wohlgemuth <pjdnw@yahoo.com>; 'April Glatzel' <aprilglatzel@gmail.com>; regaffairs@aol.com <regaffairs@aol.com>; 'Donna Stephenson' <dsteph2107@aol.com>; CityClerkMbx <City_Clerk@riversideca.gov>; delanolaw319@gmail.com <delanolaw319@gmail.com>; 'Tinka Friend' <tinkafriend@sbcglobal.net>; 'Janice Bielman' <jebielman@aol.com>; epolcene@gmail.com <epolcene@gmail.com>; johnsoneservices@aol.com <johnsoneservices@aol.com>; devopitz@sbcglobal.net <devopitz@sbcglobal.net>; serah888@gmail.com <serah888@gmail.com>; 'Duffy Atkinson' <datkinson1@att.net>; ericenciso@att.net <ericenciso@att.net>; JeffKraus951@yahoo.com <JeffKraus951@yahoo.com>; emailme@jennifergamble.com <emailme@jennifergamble.com>; dgazzolo@aol.com <dgazzolo@aol.com>; eighty8anna@aol.com <eighty8anna@aol.com>; dchuxley@yahoo.com <dchuxley@yahoo.com>; Media-monrowmabon <monrowmabon@yahoo.com>; 'Linda Baker' <mamabaker51@gmail.com>; 'Chair NBT' <chairnbt@gmail.com>

Subject: [External] RTRP

CAUTION: This email is originated from OUTSIDE of City of Riverside and was not sent by any City Officials or City Staff. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the email and know that the content is safe. If you suspect this is a phishing or malicious email, please contact the helpdesk.

Hi Gabby,

Thank you for attending the NBT meeting Sunday April 24, 2022; as you know, the majority of wards are represented by this group of community leaders.

I hope that your takeaway message from the group regarding the RTRP, is that it is time to not throw good money towards a poorly designed project. Many in our group have done extensive research on this project, along with other council persons, and recognize it is time to pause this project as written and look into current technology and plan for a better Riverside and a better project.

As written, this is an antiquated project developed about 18 years ago with old technology. I recently read in the newspaper that SCE is planning 10,000 miles of undergrounding for transmission lines as it is recognized this is the superior way to place transmission lines. If Riverside puts "its money where its mouth is", our money will be used to develop an updated plan for the transmission lines and live up to its slogan of "The City of Arts and Innovations"...this project does not fit the slogan. We are known as the "Emerald City", (according to Ron Loveridge)...this IS NOT A GREEN project, it is the opposite; it will destroy the open space and Wildlife Preserve in Ward 7. On the City website, Hidden Valley was described as the "gem of the city"; are you willing to destroy our "gem"?

This project is coming back to the city council, my hope is that you support the residents of Riverside in asking for a pause of the current project and the development of a project that fulfills our energy needs, protects residents and protects our open space. We are asking that you support the request of Councilman Steven Hemenway when he asks for your vote in pausing this project.

Respectfully,

Dr. Sharon B Mateja

cc Mayor
City Council
City Manager
City Attorney
ACMs
PU General Manager