

**DOCKETED**

<b>Docket Number:</b>	21-ESR-01
<b>Project Title:</b>	Energy System Reliability
<b>TN #:</b>	245430
<b>Document Title:</b>	Theresa m Ryan Comments - Opposition to re commissioning Diablo
<b>Description:</b>	N/A
<b>Filer:</b>	System
<b>Organization:</b>	Theresa m Ryan
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Public
<b>Submission Date:</b>	8/18/2022 5:24:57 PM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	8/18/2022

*Comment Received From: Theresa m Ryan  
Submitted On: 8/18/2022  
Docket Number: 21-ESR-01*

## **Opposition to re commissioning Diablo**

Re commissioning Diablo is not how I want my tax dollars spent. There are a number of ways opening up Diablo could all go south. Most of them mentioned here. My children and grandchildren live in the East Bay. So just on a personal note do I want them in the path of a nuclear meltdown if wildfire, earthquake, extreme heat or other environmental disaster occur? On a state perspective I want my tax dollars going towards renewable energy not a dinosaur like nuclear power. It is not sustainable. What lobbyist or other dark money source has gotten your ear to do this?

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.