

# LETTERS

## Conrath, Schare build trust between residents, district

To the Editor:

In the past I've been quick to be critical of the board and superintendent when they've chosen to spend poorly and not make good decisions with taxpayer money (the delayed merger of Liberty and Sutter elementaries is but one example).

I would, however, like to commend the leadership of Superintendent Melissa Conrath, as she's proven to be more than capable in leading this district and maintaining our high standards. She is an outside-the-box thinker who is not afraid to make the right decision for both the kids and long term health of our school district.

In addition, Marc Schare has been a tremendous asset to the board. He has brought an unmatched fiscal oversight, and the ability to hold accountable those who would choose to spend our tax dollars frivolously. Marc is indeed one member of this board we should all desire to keep in place in order to maintain the oversight needed for proper fiscal accountability. Together these two are helping lead the way toward building community trust, as they partner with us to educate our children to the highest standards.

Jose Cannon

## Solar study still a good idea

To the Editor:

Ted Thompson's letter regarding the economics surrounding photovoltaic (solar) electricity production for schools offers a perfect example of why I have been proposing that a specific study be made of the matter, ("Solar energy not a cost-saving option for schools," Sept. 12). That is all that I have been suggesting.

The Solar Advisory Model (SAM) gave me essentially the same results as reported by Thompson. However, the model refers to commercial buildings that presumably would operate at full (seasonal) load for approximately 220 days a year or, in the case of stores, 365 days a year. Because that is not the way schools buildings are operated, the model used without considering those differences can be said to compare apples to oranges.

This difference in building usage can be expected to affect the pay-back economics, because the amount of power used by

a school building might well be different from that used in a commercial building of equal size. On the other hand, because many school buildings are idle during the period of maximal sunlight, the amount of power returned to the grid (for payment to schools) may be different from the amount returned by a commercial building.

Each uilding will be different. For that reason I suggested a building- by- building study to see if, when, and where the economics might be favorable. My suggestion for a study was made in view of what, at that time, was the impending deregulation of electricity rates. Gov.Ted Stricklands energy plan puts that deregulation into question. It is another factor that would need to be factored into any study. Resistance to study and jumping to conclusions without specifically investigating the pertinent factors is to subscribe to a "one size fits all" formula that may work well for socks but, in the case of energy, could easily result in missed opportunities.

Abramo Ottolenghi