

**DOCKETED**

<b>Docket Number:</b>	18-IEPR-01
<b>Project Title:</b>	2018 Integrated Energy Policy Report Update
<b>TN #:</b>	227158
<b>Document Title:</b>	James E. Hopf Comments Reverse Decision to Close Diablo Canyon
<b>Description:</b>	N/A
<b>Filer:</b>	System
<b>Organization:</b>	James E. Hopf
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Public
<b>Submission Date:</b>	2/22/2019 6:06:33 PM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	2/25/2019

*Comment Received From: James E. Hopf*  
*Submitted On: 2/22/2019*  
*Docket Number: 18-IEPR-01*

## **Reverse Decision to Close Diablo Canyon**

The fraction of California in-state power generation from fossil fuels has not decreased much over the last decade or two, since the state is largely using all the new solar and wind generation (constructed at great cost) to replace also-non-emitting nuclear as opposed to using it to replace fossil generation. After San Onofre closed, it was replaced mainly by gas generation, and power sector fossil fuel use and CO2 emissions actually went UP. It took the state many years (of renewables construction) just to get back to where it was before San Onofre closed with respect to the fraction of non-emitting power, and state power-sector CO2 emissions. If Diablo Canyon also closes, these trends (of little power-sector emissions reduction) will continue.

These are not the actions of a state that is genuinely concerned about global warming. It should be obvious that new renewable generation should be used to replace fossil fuels, not non-emitting nuclear. Even if the the goal of "replacing all of Diablo's output" with solar and wind were achieved, it would still amount to an indefensible decision to use renewables to replace nuclear instead of fossil generation.

Keeping Diablo open would result in greater emissions reductions at lower cost. It is also the case that, if elimination of power-sector CO2 emissions is the ultimate goal, a combination of nuclear and renewables will have a lower overall cost than an all-renewable grid, as it would involve much less large-scale electricity storage.

It is not too late to reverse this regrettable and indefensible decision. Diablo needs to be given an exemption to the Once-Through Cooling rule, or be allowed to engage in offsetting activities. Any impacts of Diablo on the local coastal area ecosystem are much smaller than the environmental impacts (air pollution and global warming) of the gas generation that would effectively replace it. One also has to wonder whether the bird and bat kills from solar and wind (as well as other wilderness and habitat impacts) by themselves would exceed any impacts from Diablo's cooling system. There is also no justification for treating renewables and nuclear differently under CA's energy mandate policies.

If PG&E is unwilling to keep running the plant, they need to sell it to someone who will. Shouldn't the closure of such a large non-polluting energy generator require some kind of environmental impact analysis? Why hasn't such an analysis been performed? Given that the overall net environmental impacts of Diablo's close are obviously highly negative, couldn't the EIA be used as a reason to disallow the plant's closure?