

DOCKET

09-IEP-1E

DATE _____

RECD. SEP 03 2009

Docket Office; MS-4 Re: Docket No: #09-IEP-1E
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, California

To: California Energy Commission and Staff:
From: CREED, Coalition for Responsible and Ethical Environmental Decisions
Re: Comments ,Responses, and Requests on Cost Drivers of California Energy Technologies

Overview of CREED's research of energy cost driver related findings

CREED commends the California Energy Commission staff for several years of expansion in the assessment of California energy resources. Four years ago, seeking cost statistics, we were told by staff that the print charts issued to us were composed of the cost figures that the utility company provided. Now, the staff preliminary reports cover a spectrum of current cost estimates and future trends.

We say "thank you," and we ask for MORE...and we are encouraged by your welcoming requests for our participation.CREED's

As we requested in our Web-Ex plea in your August 25 workshop on cost on comparative costs of central station electricity generation, we hope that you will focus on ACTUA:LS, available through the experience record of most of the energy utilities, recorded in government agency license safety stage proceedings, rate increase processes, and various utility company applications for permits.

CREED supports life sustainability programs and goals for the benefit of possible future generations. We advocate for acceleration of transition to clean, safe, abundant free-fueled renewables, globally. Some of our CREED organization liaisons have worked through their organizations for more than 30 years to promote the State of California 1976 Law prohibiting new nuclear energy generation in California until or unless safe permanent disposal of the lethal nuclear wastes is achieved. What costs do you attribute to nuclear industry inability to contain radio nuclide wastes, inability to produce an impermeable containment material?

What costs do you assess to the controversial "allowables" of radionuclide emissions to our air, our ocean, and to our work-force at San Onofre? What cost to the potential of future nuclear reactors to leak tritium Into beach sites as, at San Onofre, causing the removal of 50 truckloads of contaminated beach sand to repository in Richland, Oregon, ...and no known method of cleaning it from our sandstone bluffs?

The legislative mandate under which your research is done, specifies "health and safety," but the nuclear utilities and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission will tell you that you cannot. The nuclear industry took the State of California all the way to the Supreme Court, and the Court ruled for California. The foundation of the contended law was California's finding that the people of California could not afford permanent lethal nuclear wastes. So, cost is the unmitigable...the "significant negative impact" of CEQA and NEPA, that we who live in the evacuation radius, and we who live in the uninsurable southern California high hazard of San Onofre, depend on you to estimate a cost for purpose of comparison with the safe, clean free fueled renewables.

If a cost can be determined for dealing with the GreenHouseGases, it can be determined for dealing with the damages and potential ravages of the uncontrollable, permeating, poisons of radionuclides.

The costs are in the financial records of Edison, in the authorized rate increase of March, 2009. Legal costs, retirements of workers "sent home sick," "settlements" to families who have lost their wage-earner to death by causes related to radiation exposure. We have several names that could be researched. The retirement records can be deciphered. And what if the settlements and retirements are assumed to be not related to readiation exposure? Those costs must surely be legitimate record to compare with the 30 plus life records of no retirement costs of renewables distributive!

The courts have awarded the injury and death neighbors of Simi Valley Department of Energy Reactor partial meltdown scores of millions of dollars in damages.

The ball is in your court. This is part I.....more to come.

Respectfully submitted,
Lyn Harris Hicks, Advocate Coalition for Responsible and Ethical Environmental Decisions