

SALINA JOURNAL

Total costs should be compared

Gilbert Otter

May 9, 2016

It appears that the issue is the amount of money appropriated for research for the various sources of the production of energy. Would it be fair to ask that a comparison be made of the costs per kilowatt hour of wind energy versus fossil fuel and nuclear energy? All costs would have to come into play to determine the actual cost — research, construction, transmission, longevity of facilities, subsidies, etc.

There is no doubt that wind energy in Kansas has created jobs, investment and revenue for the state, but at what cost to consumers?

The Barack Obama administration's Clean Power Plan will do nothing to benefit our environment. According to the CATO Institute, the CPP will lower the global warming temperature by only .018 degrees Celsius over the next 85 years, or less than 0.02 of a degree Celsius by the year 2100.

The EPA's CPP will affect the poor more than the wealthy. According to a study by the National Black Chamber of Commerce, the CPP will increase Hispanic poverty by more than 26 percent and black poverty by more than 23 percent. It is estimated that by 2035 cumulative job losses for blacks will total about 7 million and for Hispanics about 12 million. This is because of the higher "green energy costs" that leave families with less to spend on housing, groceries and health care. According to *AmericasPower.org*, energy bills already consume an average one-fifth of low-income Americans' income. Lower-income families spend three times more proportionally on energy than households with higher income.

It would be beneficial to all Salina Journal readers if the editors would give a balanced report of issues, rather than the liberal biased views and agenda.