

**Docket Optical System - Fwd: AB 1632 report**

**From:** Barbara Byron  
**To:** Docket Optical System  
**Date:** 11/24/2008 10:19 AM  
**Subject:** Fwd: AB 1632 report  
**CC:** Bob Aldrich; Donna Parrow

**08-IEP-1F****DOCKET****07-AB-1632**

DATE NOV 24 2008

RECD. NOV 24 2008

Dockets,

Please docket the following letter from Mr. Brandt. Thank you.

Barbara

&gt;&gt;&gt; &lt;f.brandt@att.net&gt; 11/23/2008 3:47 PM &gt;&gt;&gt;

Dear MS Byron,

I have just read your report on AB 1632 to the energy commission. I wonder if you read my letter below prior to presenting that report?

Can you explain to me why it is necessary to agonize over more ways that large nuclear plants can have unplanned shutdowns when your consultant plainly states that the CA grid can withstand such an unplanned shutdown?

You recommend that more studies be made. The public taxpayers have to pay for these studies and I don't see where the taxpayer gets any benefit from added studies of an event which does not harm the grid.. I believe the CEC is reinforcing my contention that the real purpose of AB 1662 was to add more fuel to the drive to shut down SONGS and Diablo Canyon. As I state in my letter this is not a wise position for the CEC. to promote.

There is no way that the attempt to reduce GHG significantly can be accomplished without additional nuclear power plants How can we get the CEC to accept that fact and to tell it to the legislature and governor in no uncertain terms ?

I would appreciate your reasoned response to this query. Thank you.

Sincerely,  
 Frank Brandt  
 San Jose, CA

California Energy Commission:

In the Matter of:

Preparation of the AB 1632 Nuclear Power Plant Assessment Report,  
 2008 Integrated Energy Policy Report Update, and the 2009 Integrated Energy Policy  
 Report

Docket No. 07-AB-1632

Docket No. 08-IEP-1F

SUBJECT: AB 1632 Assessment

The intent of part 8 of AB1632 was to have the CEC prepare a report to support the thesis of the legislature that large nuclear plants are subject to unplanned shutdowns that will have a catastrophic effect on the state's electric grid. Ostensibly this report was to justify the preparation of a state mandate that the two operating nuclear reactor plants in the state be shutdown permanently and also to add a another layer to the roadblocks that the state has erected against nuclear plants.

The draft version of the report does not support the AB1632 thesis. It is crucial that the CEC, despite its own anti nuclear bias, explicitly explains this fact to the legislature with an easily obtained and easily understood

document. The legislature depends on the CEC for sound advice and this will be a great service to them and other interested parties. I suggest that the best way for the CEC to accomplish this is to say it in the cover letter that is sent with the report and also to say it in a revision of the report's abstract.

As I read it this is what the report says and is what should be reported to the legislature.

1. SONGS and Diablo Canyon plants are the same as any power plant, be it fossil, solar, nuclear or whatever energy source is used, are subject to unplanned shutdowns
2. An simultaneous unplanned shutdown of both of the subject plants can be tolerated by the state power grids . No catastrophic damage to the state's electric grid will occur.
3. Since they are low cost sources of clean energy long term shutdowns will have an adverse effect on rates and the environment.
- 4 The state should be cautious about opposing the re-licensing of these plants since failure to re-license them will lead to rate increases and more greenhouse gas production.

The basic problem with this report is that it is too long to be useful to either a legislative committee or an individual legislator. A legislator needs advice on what to do when the next legislative action on nuclear power is introduced I doubt that many legislators have the time or inclination to digest the main body of the document. If they look to the EXECUTIVE SUMMARY, it is also too long and difficult to decipher . If they look to the current abstract they will see that it has no useful information . The solution is to rewrite the abstract to tell what the report says.

Emphasizing what the report really states will not be appreciated by anti nuclear people but they have to face the facts. The report buries the facts with really unnecessary research on possible causes for unplanned shutdown and also mostly anti nuclear arguments that try reduce the impact of the facts. Why does it take 20 pages of the summary to say the obvious fact that nuclear power plants are subject to unplanned shutdowns but doesn't say these plants are more vulnerable than any other type. Only one page is used to say that the state grid can tolerate a large scale unplanned shutdown of the 2 nuclear plants which renders moot any worry about an unplanned shutdown. All the research on possible causes is a waste of time, effort and taxpayer money. One can interject here that the proposed alternates to nuclear such as solar plants in addition to being subject to unplanned shutdowns when a cloud intervenes are shutdown every day when the sun sets. Wind plants are also subject to daily unplanned shutdowns when the wind stops.

If the CEC could only convince itself and the legislature that as soon as reliability enters the energy policy debate it becomes obvious that large scale nuclear plants which can produce clean, low cost reliable 24/7 electric power cannot be replaced by clean but unreliable solar and wind plants. One can only wish that the revelation will come soon.

Frank Brandt, a private citizen  
San Jose, CA