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We need flexible demand response & storage, not expensive Diablo Canyon

A whole lot of work went into the decision to shut down Diablo Canyon: deep cost-benefit analysis and detailed planning. Let’s stick with that, and with a fast path to clean, reliable energy.

Baseload power creates a mismatch for cheaper, cleaner wind and solar energy, and a more difficult-to-manage system. Big chunks of inflexible power do not address peak usage problems, which are better addressed by responsive storage and shifting demand.

Nuclear is a brittle source of power, especially in hot weather, and losing big chunks of inflexible power is a disaster. Far from stabilizing the grid, Diablo Canyon reduces the power available during peak times because system operators need to reserve power sources in case the facility has to shut down. It will cost taxpayers and ratepayers BILLIONS to keep Diablo Canyon online. This money is far better spent on 21st century technologies.