

## DOCKETED

<b>Docket Number:</b>	15-IEPR-01
<b>Project Title:</b>	General/Scope
<b>TN #:</b>	206448
<b>Document Title:</b>	Gene Nelson, Ph.D. Comments: DCPP Has an Excellent Safety Record
<b>Description:</b>	N/A
<b>Filer:</b>	System
<b>Organization:</b>	Gene Nelson, Ph.D.
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Public
<b>Submission Date:</b>	10/29/2015 12:26:05 PM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	10/29/2015

*Comment Received From: Gene Nelson, Ph.D.*

*Submitted On: 10/29/2015*

*Docket Number: 15-IEPR-01*

## **DCPP Has an Excellent Safety Record**

I request that the attached op-ed be considered by the California Energy Commission when they revise the draft 2015 IEPR. The draft fails to appropriately weight the economical and reliable operation of the Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP,) which typically generates about 18,000,000,000,000 Watt - hours (18 TWh) per year. DCPP is California's largest power generator by far. DCPP's capacity factor has exceeded 100% recently. DCPP is very important for grid stability, as illustrated by the grid stability problems caused when San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS) was prematurely shut down in January, 2012. As the El Nino bears down on California, with high temperatures exacerbated by global warming, it is also important to recall that DCPP does not have smoke stacks, as it generates its high-quality power without emitting a gram of Carbon Dioxide.

Please also note my comment to the excellent op-ed regarding how fossil fuel interests worked to shut down Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant in the early 1980s.

*Additional submitted attachment is included below.*



## Nuke power has enviable safety record

October 27, 2015 4:20 pm

[http://santamariatimes.com/news/opinion/editorial/commentary/nuke-power-has-enviable-safety-record/article\\_0f9f6cb6-ed2e-5522-9ae1-03ddc7579ef7.html](http://santamariatimes.com/news/opinion/editorial/commentary/nuke-power-has-enviable-safety-record/article_0f9f6cb6-ed2e-5522-9ae1-03ddc7579ef7.html)

[\(5\) Comments](#)

The recent Times editorial on the Diablo Canyon power plant was excellent. However, frequently mentioned were nuclear's "inherent risks."

A comparative study of human harm from energy in Forbes Magazine including the Chernobyl and Fukushima accidents, showed nuclear to be the safest source of power.

Actual inherent risk to crews of the nuclear submarines used by our Navy has been non-existent. For 60 years no radiation harm has occurred to any of the tens of thousands of sailors who live and work close to reactors.

The editorial cited "disastrous radioactive leakage" at Fukushima. No reactor was damaged by one of the largest quakes in recorded history, 9.0, showing reactor construction is a settled science. Vats with radioactive water pumped from reactors leaked into the sea. No human harm is expected, said the U.N.

The U.N. also found no one was killed in the accident itself, nor will the released radiation result in future illnesses.

About 1,600 residents died, but according to the *New York Times*, this was from elderly in hospitals being moved to facilities unable to care for them. Emotional shock added to fatalities.

The editorial listed reactor waste as an unsolved problem. No one has ever been harmed by waste at any American reactor site.

The editorial concludes, "The big, unsolved problem is ... nuclear waste?" Again, to properly access this problem, comparison is required with waste of the major competitor to nuclear, fossil fuel.

That waste containing deadly soot, smoke, ozone is not stored, but flung into the air we and our children breathe, causing widespread human death and injury, according to the Cancer Society, Lung Association, World Health Organization and others.

It seems illogical to label nuclear more dangerous when fossil fuel is the big killer. The fact is, continuing to use fossil fuels kills people, and installing nuclear can save those lives.

That is the kind of rational, factual comparison it is time to make.

The real question becomes, where is the scare factor coming from, since nuclear power has caused relatively tiny harm?

For one, as the editorial mentions, the atomic bomb. Reactors and atomic bombs are completely different devices with totally different technologies. The only thing they share is using heat from splitting atoms. An atomic explosion can't happen and has never happened in a reactor.

Still, nuclear protesters cause fear by endlessly inventing accident scenarios. Then they demand we and our children continue suffering actual, ongoing fossil fuel deaths and injuries to be safe from their imagined accidents.

Many of these protest groups get paid from utility ratepayer money for their protest time. The PUC funding is called the Intervenor program.

The Sierra Club constantly campaigns against nuclear power, but in 2012 Time Magazine showed them taking \$26 million from Chesapeake Energy. Could there be a connection between Sierra Club's widely publicized nuclear protests and this cash?

The Times editorial ends hopefully, saying some day we'll get power from solar, wind and tidal movements.

After 30 years of heavy subsidy, and much renewable hoopla, wind today provides only 4 percent of U.S. energy, and solar 0.4 percent.

In 2014, Google's Stanford-trained engineers Ross Koningstein and David Fork announced after seven years of research, that renewables are a false hope. Renewable energy technologies simply won't work, they said.

While nothing is 100-percent safe, a lot of evidence indicates existing and new nuclear technologies are the best, ready, reliable way to fight climate change.

You can help. Tell government representatives your opinion and demand they act to curb global warming. Other nations will follow because, for most, America is the leader.

William Gloege is a resident of Santa Maria.

Copyright 2015 Santa Maria Times. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed.

---

#### **GAN 10 29 15 Comment:**

To understand some of the motivations of antinuclear activists, it is important to read the following: Atomic Insights-Smoking Gun from Cold Case file. Oil Heat Institute of Long Island (OHILI) funds ad against LILCO's Shoreham #nuclear <http://bit.ly/4SzTtM>.

The New York Times noted on 11 October 1981

<http://www.nytimes.com/1981/10/11/nyregion/heating-oil-supply-and-prices-stable.html> that

"Lilco, which generates nearly 100 percent of its electricity by burning oil, says it expects the price of the oil it buys to increase, at least in pace with inflation. June Bruce, a spokesman for Lilco, **said the utility planned to replace 30 percent of the oil with nuclear power when its Shoreham nuclear facility went on line fully in 1983.**

She said that since electricity to heat homes would be produced primarily in the off-peak hours, most of the energy would be coming from the Shoreham plant."

(Lilco is the Long Island Lighting Company, Owner of Shoreham.) OHILI took these actions to protect its lucrative franchise.