

Docket Optical System - Comment for docket No. 11-IEP-1J

From: Patti Davis <valhala@cox.net>
To: <docket@energy.state.ca.us>
Date: 7/28/2011 3:24 PM
Subject: Comment for docket No. 11-IEP-1J

Dear Commissioners,

I appreciate that you are taking a closer look at the Nuclear Power Plants on our coasts.

They need to be shut down NOW!

All the Hazardous Waste needs to be taken away from our shores and our towns.

It must be permanently and safely stored away from populous areas, seismic zones, tsunami zones, and the bad intent of suicide terrorists.

Although I want see further studies on the safety of these plants, I feel it is a terrible mistake to allow them to operate during this "fact finding" period. A disaster could strike at any time during this period and then it would not matter what any study found. Needless to say, all of the money that would go into those studies could be put to better use by ramping up renewable energy for the state, now.

| | |
|------------------|--------------------|
| DOCKET | |
| 11-IEP-1J | |
| DATE | <u>JUL 28 2011</u> |
| RECD. | <u>JUL 28 2011</u> |

I live in San Clemente and I will tell you these facts:

We have 7.4 million people within 50 miles of SONGS.

There is no way out in case of an emergency!

The streets & highways could never get everyone out in time.

Even if La Pata is completed, you could not get everyone out in time.

If an accident strikes during a school day, the school busses we have on hand could not hold enough children to transport them to safety. They would have to make many round trips. Do the drivers really want to drive back into a hazard zone? Who gets to ride in the first busses? Who will be asked to stay behind and wait.

And where is safety for the CUSD kids?
 The Santa Anna Fair Grounds?

That is within the 50 mile evacuation zone that the US Government recommended for the the US citizens in Japan. Still not safe.

Our state could never bear the cost of a disaster from either of our Nuclear Plants.

I checked with my insurance agent,
I cannot obtain insurance at any price for myself, my family, my car, or my home from a Nuclear Accident.

We can recover from Earthquakes, Floods, Wildfires and Tsunamis because we can get insurance for those disasters but...

We could never recover from a Nuclear Disaster.

Thank You

Patti Davis
23 Chapital
San Clemente CA 92672

PS

I want to include the comments from the Alliance For Nuclear Responsibility as I strongly support their efforts:

As concerned California ratepayers and residents, and in consideration of the many issues raised by our state's reliance on nuclear power in a post-Fukushima world, the following recommendations posed by the Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility should be adopted in the 2011 IEPR proceeding:

- 1) The CEC should recommend that SCE and PG&E undertake immediate studies to determine how they would replace 4400 MW of baseload generation in the short and long term should their nuclear plants be rendered unusable by a seismic event or other natural disaster as well a potential shutdown due to acts of malice or terror should the "unthinkable" become a reality on the our side of the Pacific Rim.
- 2) The CEC should recommend that the U.S. Department of Energy's Blue Ribbon Commission come to California to explain why our state should risk another 20 years of radioactive waste production on seismically active coastal zones. As the NRC has promulgated a waste confidence ruling increasing the allowable on-site storage of waste for as long as 60 and possibly 100 years after shutdown, questions of responsibility for overseeing the waste and ongoing storage costs need to be evaluated. There is no assurance that fiscal burdens would not leave the state responsible for this unfunded federal mandate.
- 3) The CEC should recommend that the federal government review liability limits under Price-Anderson (\$12.6 billion) in light of damage estimates that exceed \$100 billion in Japan. As a state, how would California residents, property owners and businesses be "made whole again" after a nuclear accident in light of the gap between coverage and damages?
- 4) The CEC should recommend that the 1967 Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) issued for Diablo Canyon be reviewed and updated in light of new evidence on population, seismic vulnerabilities, absence of a permanent offsite solution to safe storage of highly radioactive waste.
- 5) The CEC should recommend an updating and analysis of the costs associated with increasing the emergency planning and evacuation zones from 20 to 50 miles and beyond in the wake of the NRC's own recommendation that residents voluntarily evacuate a similar sized area around Fukushima.