

Judith E Jones  
713 Calle Contenta  
San Clemente, CA

August 2, 2011

California Energy Commission  
Docket Office, MS-4  
Re: Docket No. 11-IEP-1J  
1516 Ninth Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

# DOCKET

11-IEP-1J

DATE Aug 02 2011

RECD. Aug 02 2011

## **RE: California Nuclear Power Plant Issues**

### **Comments on Committee Workshop on California Nuclear Power Plant Issues**

Commissioners:

Thank you Chairman Weisenmiller, members of the committee and staff for a well organized and supportive workshop as well as this opportunity to express my concerns.

I'm Judy Jones from San Clemente, CA, within the evacuation zone of SONGS; a resident of San Clemente for 15 years and of California for 25 years. So, my perspective is that of a citizen with a real stake in the future, and especially the safety of SONGS!

It was especially memorable to me last Tuesday, July 26<sup>th</sup> to hear that the seismic data for our region of California has not been as thoroughly collected and analyzed as for Diablo Canyon area. And, also disappointing to learn that there are no USGS near term plans to change that.

I appreciated the Commissioner who commented on her trip from San Diego last week as she passed SONG on I-5, which is basically our one and only major evacuation route, and especially in San Clemente and down to Oceanside with little option to turn off onto an alternate route.

As an active citizen in my community I have attended NRC hearing for about three years. I did run for State Assembly in my district, and was committed to knowing the issues of my district. Primarily, I've been active in environmental groups since I moved to California and especially in San Clemente --Sierra Club, San Clemente Green, San Clemente Watershed Task Force, and Surfrider. I've also been a member of the League of Women Voters (LWV) for more than 30 years and did appreciate their pleas to the NRC for transparency and for openness about the true, complete cost of nuclear energy.

When I moved to San Clemente, I thought I was moving into a quiet little beach town, experiencing some typical California development growth. Little did I know it's a hotbed of political activists in many areas! So, I know individuals with a variety of concerns about SONGS: Some with an emphasis on replacement with renewables; others want to shut down SONGS now; there are those concerned with the employees at SONGS, our neighbors; others who find SCE is a good community partner and contributor to our local events; some have been contacted by whistleblowers about SONGS safety issues, since they have leadership in the worst operational records based on NRC reporting; and there's the LWV as noted above.

So, we don't all agree in San Clemente, but based on recent discussion at our City County. I would say we do agree on the positions below. And our City Council with a unanimous vote to do so, has expressed these concerns in letters to our US leaders:

- We want our city and our families to be safe.
- We want our leaders to act on their concerns for our health and safety, including evacuation.
- We are concerned with the spent fuel rods staying on our coastline within 2 ½ miles of an earthquake fault line.
- We are concerned with the limited evacuation routes, and inadequate access roads for the public evacuation as well as for backup routes to provide emergency services to SONGS.

My recommendations to this committee are:

- Relicensing must require seismic review.
- Liability should be updated.
- Backup power planning needs major improvements.

**Relicensing MUST require new seismic studies**, and environmental review of storing permanently at SONGS the spent fuel rods. In fact, relicensing should require anything that would be required of a NEW facility. SONGS is an aging facility and given that it was never intended to last 40 years, analysis and costs to upgrade should be addressed. You don't have a 40-year old refrigerator in your home; you definitely don't have a 40-year old dial-up internet connection (as I read in the NRC Lessons Learned document, many US nuclear facilities do); and, when you renew your DMV license, you don't take a test on what the law was when you got your first driver's license (in my case more than 40 year ago). So, why would we trust our safety and energy source to something 40 years old and not updated to all current standards?

**Public and/or rate payer costs that could exceed \$100 billion need to become utility company costs in their calculations of the economics of nuclear power plants**, providing affordable energy.

Note: San Clemente home prices are even higher than San Luis Obispo, with a median price in homes sold in this month exceeding \$700,000 (average value of home in the \$600,000's), and San Clemente's population has almost tripled since SONGS was built.

My career in computer management/software development has used my math degree and my MBA to identify technology solutions, to compare alternatives and look at approaches that eliminate needless costs. It just seems obvious when looking at alternatives for energy sources, that there's several costs that don't need to be covered for renewable sources—including the liability, but also the emergency planning, and an extensive NRC organization, which frequently has included extra staff to monitor our poorly performing SONGS facility, changing management twice in the past three years.

**There are two major aspects to lack of energy backup**, First, backup supplies of energy to keep cooling the spent fuel rods to prevent meltdown and second, backup supplies to replace the lack of energy generated by a damaged nuclear plant.

Because of our lack of adequate evacuation routes near SONGS – we basically have I-5 and that's it—we also have limited access to supplies to keep backup battery-driven or other generators running. This even includes access to neighboring firefighting equipment and other assistance that may be required.

Second, the energy to replace power that is provided by SONGS should be addressed. If the problem is the grid – we know we need a smart grid anyhow, so why aren't we building it?

Somehow both of these energy issues seem to be missing in the emergency planning, which overall is another expense that should be considered when evaluation/comparing the cost of nuclear power—especially now that the NRC recommended a 50-mile evacuation zone in Japan, which is a major cost increase, too. FEMA and the NRC haven't even figured out how to really get their message to everyone in the 10 or 20-mile current zone – that's a major PR dilemma and the cost to fix that is also uncertain.

Please do consider that SONGS is an aging reactor, near a fault line, in a community that has grown in population and economic significance since SONGS was built with no significant increase in evacuation routes and backup options.

As a footnote, I'd like to express my appreciation of some brief mentions by the committee of your exciting renewables efforts. My priority is to invest in renewable energy solutions for our future sustainability! I personally do support solutions than emphasize RENEWABLE energy. Instead of repairing aging reactors in California, we would be better off to spend our R&D money to make wind and solar more cost effective and sustainable. After all, I do have solar panels on my roof, and with my roots are in WI, some cousins there have changed their operations from dairy farms to wind farms.

I urge this commission in the state of California with its great technology leadership to forge ahead with SOLUTIONS that will lead the nation in energy solutions that are affordable and sustainable!

Thank you again for this opportunity.

Sincerely,



Handwritten signature of Judith E. Jones in black ink.

Judith E Jones