

| <b>DOCKETED</b>         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| <b>Docket Number:</b>   | 21-ESR-01                                    |
| <b>Project Title:</b>   | Energy System Reliability                    |
| <b>TN #:</b>            | 244586                                       |
| <b>Document Title:</b>  | Audrey Ichinose Comments - NoExtDiabloCanyon |
| <b>Description:</b>     | N/A  |
| <b>Filer:</b>           | System                                       |
| <b>Organization:</b>    | Audrey Ichinose                              |
| <b>Submitter Role:</b>  | Public                                       |
| <b>Submission Date:</b> | 8/12/2022 8:00:07 AM                         |
| <b>Docketed Date:</b>   | 8/12/2022                                    |

*Comment Received From: Audrey Ichinose  
Submitted On: 8/12/2022  
Docket Number: 21-ESR-01*

**NoExtDiabloCanyon**

*Additional submitted attachment is included below.*

To: California Energy Commission (CEC)  
Office of Governor Gavin Newsom  
California Independent System Operator (ISO)

From: Audrey Ichinose  
Berkeley resident and Member, East Bay Clean Power Alliance (EBCPA) and  
California Alliance for Community Energy (CACE)

RE: Extending Life of Diablo Canyon Nuclear Facility

There are three compelling reasons to **reject** any operational extension of the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Generating Facility beyond 2025, as agreed to in 2016 and codified by the CA Legislature in 2018.

- As short-term mitigation against current inflationary pressures, extending the life of Diablo Canyon is **materially different** from other proposed measures to ease energy markets. It is the only measure that brings with it the inherent risk of nuclear accident. The CA legislature wisely, if reluctantly, decided to close the facility, at least setting a time limit to our exposure to the enormous health risks and incalculable costs in case of accident in our earthquake-prone state. We are not out of the woods yet, but it would be tempting fate to increase our exposure any longer than necessary.
- As a nation, we have yet to solve the problem of safe, long-term storage of spent fuel. The nuclear waste from the first atomic bombs, for example, is still being stored in temporary facilities in Washington State. It's also unconscionable, given the mind-boggling time scale of uranium half-lives, that we leave this nuclear "fallout" for countless future generations to deal with.
- Finally, trying to lower energy prices cannot justify the scourge that abandoned uranium mines and milling operations continue to visit on rural populations. Well over fifty dangerous abandoned mines dot the Navajo reservation alone. And non-indigenous populations are suffering as well. Take a look at what is happening in New Mexico currently as Homestake, owner of one of the largest defunct mines now under Canadian ownership, has decided after decades of foot-dragging that the best way to clean up the contaminated ground water and other ills is to buy out the residents, bulldoze the community and move on, leaving US taxpayers to clean up the mess and foot the bill.  
([https://www.latimes.com/environment/story/2022-08-08/new-mexico-uranium-homestake-pollution?utm\\_id=63829&sfmc\\_id=4339162](https://www.latimes.com/environment/story/2022-08-08/new-mexico-uranium-homestake-pollution?utm_id=63829&sfmc_id=4339162))

Until we adequately address all of the problems associated with nuclear generation, it would be foolhardy to prolong the operating life of Diablo Canyon. In fact, we should really be looking for a way to shut down its operation before 2025.

Thank you for holding this workshop.