

## DOCKETED

<b>Docket Number:</b>	15-IEPR-12
<b>Project Title:</b>	Nuclear Power Plants
<b>TN #:</b>	204579
<b>Document Title:</b>	Dorah Shuey Comments: Comments on Nuclear Energy
<b>Description:</b>	N/A
<b>Filer:</b>	System
<b>Organization:</b>	Dorah Shuey
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Public
<b>Submission Date:</b>	5/11/2015 11:39:48 AM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	5/11/2015

*Comment Received From: Dorah Shuey*

*Submitted On: 5/11/2015*

*Docket Number: 15-IEPR-12*

## **Comments on**

Dear CEC Commissioners and Staff:

As a result of four years of research on Diablo Canyon and San Onofre nuclear power plants for California based environmental groups, I have concerns regarding nuclear energy.

Due to the multitude of comments that you will be receiving, I will keep mine brief.

### **SAFER, MORE EFFICIENT, MORE ECONOMIC ALTERNATIVES ARE AVAILABLE:**

Photovoltaic and wind energy technology are getting better and less expensive and new forms of harvesting sustainable energy sources, such as tidal power, that can be used in numerous parts of California are being developed.

More and more homes are producing their own electricity and feeding excess into the grid. Numerous companies are working to tie in small scale energy producers into the grid. An example is Advanced Microgrid Solutions, co-founded by former CEC chair, Jackalyn Pfaffenstiel. (I have no connection with AMS, nor with its officers or staff.)

### **NUCLEAR ENERGY IS NOT NEEDED:**

The small percentage of energy from Diablo Canyon is not needed. New technology is moving away from the baseline model. Nuclear energy is not an efficient source economically for the new "smart" grids that provide for efficiency in production and distribution.

When San Onofre was suddenly unexpectedly shut down due to a radioactive steam leak and then had to be permanently close at twenty years earlier than anticipated, there was a lot of scrambling to make up that production. However, despite dire predictions to the contrary, California's energy needs were met.

A planned closure of Diablo Canyon will cause no disruption to the grid and can be replaced easily with safer, more economical energy production.

:

### **SEISMIC HAZARDS POSED BY NUCLEAR ENERGY PRODUCTION ARE NOT WORTH THE RISK:**

There are well founded concerns about the ability of the San Onofre and Diablo Canyon nuclear facilities abilities to withstand seismic shocks, earth movement, tsunamis and other forces produced by the potential earthquakes. The NRC says that the buildings and systems are sound but, as recent news stories have shown, the NRC's oversight is compromised by the agency's closeness with the energy industry. Current legal precedent gives the NRC federal preemption powers, cutting state and local governments out of the decision making process as far as the safety of nuclear power plants is concerned.

Both San Onofre and Diablo Canyon are near well documented fault systems capable of producing large earthquakes and numerous high energy aftershocks. The USGS recently reported that the earthquake risk in California is almost double what had been previously thought.

A nuclear facility was planned for our area of the central California Coast. But fortunately, it was discovered in time that there is an active fault system here. The same fault zone (San Gregorio-Hosgri, now considered a major part of the San Andreas Fault system) also extends to the Diablo Canyon area, but that only became known after the plant was in operation and the NRC has agreed to let PG&E continue running Diablo Canyon, even as more and more faults have been discovered closer and closer to the plant.

### **NUCLEAR WASTE HAZARDS:**

Even though San Onofre, Rancho Seco, Humboldt Bay and smaller experimental nuclear power plants have been shut down, there is still highly radioactive waste ("greater than Class C" rating) on their sites. Obviously, Diablo

Canyon is still producing nuclear waste.

Even without an earthquake or seismic event, there is the danger of leakage into the ground, air and water from stored radioactive waste. Currently, there is no national nuclear waste repository and no plans for building one, due to the obvious political problems.

California can easily meet our energy needs without producing any more nuclear waste.

#### CONCLUSION:

When considering the viability of nuclear energy for our wonderful state, which has over ten percent (10%) of our nation's population and produces food crops for the whole nation, please consider the negative implications of continuing to endorse nuclear energy in California. Look at the new technologies for sustainable, green energy sources and continued efficiency in energy use and energy distribution.

California does have the legal ability to make decisions about nuclear energy based on economic considerations. Almost any type of cost-benefit analysis will show that nuclear energy comes at too high a price.

Sincerely,  
Dorah Rosen Shuey  
Davenport, CA