

Jericho Moulder

From: Thomas Schmiderer
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 6:48 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Fwd: Request that Oceanside take a position on the Golden Pacific Powerlink

Thomas Schmiderer, MMC, MPA
Assistant City Clerk
(760) 435-3004
(760) 576-8860 – Cell
TSchmiderer@oceansideca.org

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Maxim Maximov <pastormaxim@gmail.com>
Date: August 17, 2026 at 5:32:52 PM PDT
To: City Council <Council@oceansideca.org>
Subject: Request that Oceanside take a position on the Golden Pacific Powerlink

EXTERNAL MESSAGE: Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.
When in doubt, please contact CustomerCare@oceansideca.org

August 17, 2026

Mayor and Members of the City Council,

I am a resident at 1317 Panorama Ridge Rd. **I am asking the Council to agendize the Golden Pacific Powerlink and to adopt a resolution taking a position on it, and to file the City's comments with SDG&E and the CPUC as a public agency.**

Why this concerns Oceanside specifically. SDG&E proposes roughly 145 miles of new 500 kV transmission from the Imperial Valley through Anza-Borrego Desert State Park, **at a cost CAISO places near \$2.3 billion.** Whatever route is finally chosen, **Oceanside ratepayers help pay for it**, and we pay twice: once for construction, and then every year in authorized return on the asset, currently set at 9.93 percent. **A \$2.3 billion asset produces roughly \$114 million a year in guaranteed return, collected from customers, for decades.**

Other cities are not waiting. Temecula has the project on its Council agenda at every meeting with updates from the City Manager, and residents there have organized. The San Diego County Board of Supervisors heard a presentation on August 18. **Oceanside has taken no position, and comment periods do not stay open indefinitely.** SDG&E intends to file its formal application with the CPUC this year, and once filed there is only a 30-day window to protest.

There is a local alternative worth the City's advocacy. Oceanside and Vista already showed that a piece of this system can be changed by local decision when both cities joined Clean Energy Alliance in April 2024. The same logic applies here. **SDG&E has about 350,000 residential solar customers. The budget of this one line, spent instead as a 30 percent incentive for home solar and storage, would reach roughly 750,000 households,** with homeowners paying the other 70 percent from private capital that never enters the rate base. Distributed storage also keeps homes powered during public safety shutoffs, which is a direct municipal interest here every fire season.

What I speak from. I have 37 panels and about 40 kWh of storage. Last year I exported 7,125 surplus kilowatt-hours. SDG&E paid me \$427, about six cents per kWh, and resold that power on my own street at rates reaching about 46 cents. **I am not permitted to sell a single kilowatt-hour to the neighbor sixty feet away.** Meanwhile Oceanside residents are reporting monthly bills of \$600 and more.

Specifically, I ask the Council to:

- 1. Agendize the Golden Pacific Powerlink** for discussion at an upcoming meeting, with a staff report on ratepayer and route impacts to Oceanside.
- 2. Adopt a resolution** requesting that the CPUC require full and equal study of distributed storage and non-wires alternatives, including reconductoring of existing corridors, before any certificate is granted.
- 3. File the City's comments** with the SDG&E project team and the CPUC, and **direct staff to monitor the CPCN filing** so Oceanside does not miss the 30-day protest window.
- 4. Support state legislation**, including AB 1813, that would allow transferable energy credits and neighbor-to-neighbor sale of surplus generation, and would let residents of this city reduce their own bills without a new transmission corridor.

I am glad to provide my data and calculations to staff, and to speak during public comment.

Respectfully,

Maxim Maximov
1317 Panorama Ridge Rd, Oceanside, CA 92056
PastorMaxim@gmail.com · (760) 933-0000

maxim|maximov

cell +1(253)846 2171
work +1(760)933 0000
PastorMaxim@gmail.com

Jericho Moulder

From: Rachel Esquibel <raesparr@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 11:30 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Comment for meeting Wednesday, 8/19

EXTERNAL MESSAGE: Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding. When in doubt, please contact CustomerCare@oceansideca.org

Dear Oceanside City Council,

I'm writing to share my opposition to the City of Oceanside's use of Flock cameras and ALPRs, and to urge the Council to remove these surveillance systems from our community.

I would much rather see taxpayer dollars invested in true public safety and community resources—including third spaces, mental health resources, youth programs, and other investments that actually strengthen our community—than in technology that tracks the movements of ordinary residents.

I also have serious concerns about privacy. I do not believe that simply driving down a public street should mean having my movements recorded, catalogued, and potentially accessible to law enforcement without a warrant. Living in a community should not mean accepting constant surveillance as the price of public safety.

There are also important concerns about the disproportionate surveillance of people of color. A technology that can track where people travel throughout our city has the potential to amplify existing racial disparities in policing rather than make our community safer.

Public safety and privacy should not be treated as competing values. Oceanside can invest in approaches that keep people safe without creating a permanent record of where residents go.

I urge the City Council to reconsider the use of Flock and ALPR technology and to remove ALPR surveillance from our community. Please prioritize investments that build trust, strengthen neighborhoods, and address the root causes of crime rather than expanding mass surveillance!!

Rachel