

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	15-IEPR-12
Project Title:	Nuclear Power Plants
TN #:	206719
Document Title:	Eloise Srednicki Comments: Happy to see reduction in nuclear power usage on electric bill's Power Content Label
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Eloise Srednicki
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	11/20/2015 3:09:44 PM
Docketed Date:	11/20/2015

Comment Received From: Eloise Srednicki

Submitted On: 11/20/2015

Docket Number: 15-IEPR-12

Happy to see reduction in nuclear power usage on electric bill's Power Content Label

Dear Public Advisors to the Energy Commission,

As a member of the public who has a concern regarding safety of nuclear power plants and their waste, I was glad to see that the Power Content Label, on SCE's electric bill, showed a decrease of nuclear power usage from 2013 to 2014. Living in California, there are several serious concerns about the presence of nuclear power plants. San Onofre has thankfully quit operating, but we still have Diablo. And we still have both sites and their waste to contend with.

General negatives of nuclear power, from my perspective:

- 1) In the history of energy production, the implementation of nuclear power plants was premature when technology had not found a means to neutralize the radioactive waste--until then, nuclear power is absolutely not a "clean energy"
- 2) no community wants to house the waste, since it cannot be made harmless, and securing it completely is not guaranteed
- 3) no community wants to see this waste transported through their area
- 4) transport of the radioactive waste via ocean barges is unwise

Negatives of nuclear power specific to California, from my perspective:

- 5) building of plants in California is unwise, because it is earthquake country
- 6) discovery of more faults under Diablo, post the approval process
- 7) coastal location of plants, risking long-term ocean and coastal contamination
- 8) California should be an example of environmental heedfulness

Comments regarding my personal experience in California:

Here in Santa Barbara in 2002, there was an outcry regarding possible transport of Diablo nuclear waste through the Santa Barbara Channel on barge, and this concern continues. Any transport of the spent fuel had been criticized, especially in light of the 9/11 terrorist attacks the year before, with concerns that all transported radioactive waste was a moving "dirty bomb" (by barge, truck, or rail). Let's not forget that nuclear plants may indeed also be targets. And with the Paris attacks, this concern is at the forefront again.

Regarding the concerns voiced in 2002 about barge transport of radioactive waste, at that time I had written a letter to the editor in a local paper lamenting that all the hard work citizens go through each day to care for their children, to show up on time to work day after day--all of that would be eclipsed by a nuclear spill accident in the ocean waters of the Channel, impacting health, ocean waters, and property values. And I'm sorry to say that accidents do happen in the Channel. In 1969, the Santa Barbara area had an oil spill from a rig blowout that greatly impacted the Channel, coast, wildlife, and peaceful enjoyment of the citizens here, taking a long time to recover from. In 1987 a freighter sank due to a collision, with 23,000 tons of copper, iron, and sulfur and 386,000 gallons of bunker fuel, according to the Los Angeles Times. These two accidents of hazardous fuel/chemicals just 18 years apart emphasize that the risk of exposing the Channel ocean water to radioactive waste is too great, especially because the repercussions may be felt for a lifetime and beyond.

Solutions? Quit making more radioactive waste, for one thing. We have too much already. In light of the nature of radioactive waste, coal is much "cleaner" than nuclear--coal just pollutes in real time, among those currently living. Nuclear waste and storage becomes a problem that spans not only our current generation, but future ones as

well. That is a "dirty" trick to play on our grandchildren.

I am pleased that Southern California Edison is weaning off the nuclear power, while also weaning off coal, according to the Power Content Label. However, on that same Label, I am interested in knowing what the 40% "Unspecified sources of power" category covers, since that jumped up from just 12% in 2013. Has SCE really been weaning off non-renewables, or did they just re-categorize them into the "Unspecified" category?

Thank you for listening.

Eloise Srednicki