

**From:** Stephanie Jensen <stephanipersonal@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <docket@energy.state.ca.us>  
**Date:** 8/4/2011 9:48 AM  
**Subject:** CA Sane Energy Planning (EE & renewable; NOT nuclear) Docket #11IEP1J

Per your email today, I am resending this with the docket # included-- Docket # 11IEP1J.

Kindly include it in the comments submitted by the August 2 deadline.

--- On Tue, 8/2/11, Stephanie Jensen <stephanipersonal@yahoo.com> wrote:

From: Stephanie Jensen <stephanipersonal@yahoo.com>  
Subject: CA Sane Energy Planning (EE & renewable; NOT nuclear)  
To: docket@energy.state.ca.us  
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2011, 2:33 PM

Honorable Commissioners:

Thank you for giving me and others the opportunity to address you regarding what I believe is the most important topic of our time, with something I feel I've waited most of my life to express to the right decision-makers at the propitious moment. The topic is safe and sane energy planning--for California, which often leads the world. The decision-makers are you; and the moment is now.

I have worked with both the Union of Concerned Scientists on energy and transportation matters, and at PG&E as a residential energy efficiency program manager. Through this experience, I've had the fortune and the burden of being exposed to scientists', engineers', economists', healthcare workers', and policy planners' best information about California's energy needs, infrastructure, and energy potential, as well as the costs--monetary, environmental, and health-- of all of the above. I'm aware of who pays and who will pay for any decision you make, and how we will pay.

By now you are certainly aware of the enormous monetary costs and many "hidden" ways we, the ratepayers and taxpayers subsidize nuclear energy. You are aware that nuclear is not carbon-free; and you are certainly aware that we have no disposal plan for the preposterously dangerous waste created in the production of this ironically/formerly considered "clean" (???!!) energy source, which is, in fact, the filthiest and most hazardous stuff on earth.

People like my former colleagues at the Union of Concerned Scientists have likely reported to you--with the restraint characteristic of the most perfectionist and conservative of scientists--some of the ongoing issues with leakage, overheating spent fuel pools, and multiple other safety incidents and other hazards--many of which the body of NRC/industry folks who are ostensibly charged with protecting the public and environmental safety never report, let alone properly address.

You now know how dismissive Edison and others have been of the hazards of multiple fault lines, tsunamis, terror incidents, and poor evacuation prospects (failing to include large faults in their reports and treating seismic hazards on par with "fog"). And, of course, you have read that in Japan today (one of the places people considered relatively sound in terms of nuclear facility management), radiation readings are exceeding 10 sieverts--an immediately lethal dose of radiation, and the maximum amount that can be measured.

Since the public interest scientists are few, and so very cautious in their documentation and in public declarations, you may not have heard detailed reports of all the breaches of safety occurring as I write, and again as you read this. But you know that no insurance company will cover

**DOCKET**

**11-IEP-1J**

DATE Aug 02 2011

RECD. Aug 02 2011

nuclear energy production, and that, therefore, we the ratepayers and taxpayers pay those exorbitant costs, and that the prospect of ever shipping the waste through major population centers or to a mountain in Nevada is grim.

Perhaps the (assured, given time) prospects of larger incidents at California's nuclear facilities is a risk you, as our policy leaders, wish to avert.

And perhaps you have knowledge of many of our alternatives.

However, having worked at the non-profit and investor-owned sources of information about even the common-sense alternatives, I realize you may not be getting all the information about the plethora of realistic, affordable, brilliant, and ready alternatives.

For example, since the investor-owned utilities, who are (oddly) given the reins of most state energy efficiency efforts, have no interest in UNselling energy (in fact, they see accomplishing much energy efficiency as contrary to their interest), you don't hear in their reports about the many untapped sources of energy savings. When I worked at PG&E and investigated the energy savings of installing residential solar hot water heaters, I was both encouraged by the enormous potential savings, and discouraged by PG&E Executives' \$20k annual bonuses for ensuring such solutions never saw the light of day (pun coincidental).

As we know, energy efficiency, properly implemented and utilized in California can save our need of building 2 power plants...or, perhaps could replace two existing decrepit and poorly managed and inherently dangerous and expensive nuclear ones. !!

Furthermore, there are multiple renewable energy solutions we have yet to apply. Within just 20 minutes of my home in southern California are some of the finest wind, geothermal, and solar resources in the world--most of which we have yet to tap.

It's sunny 363 days/year in the CA desert, and approximately the same in our neighboring Nevada desert. That we have not implemented more thin-film and other efficient, durable, cheap solar photovoltaics on every rooftop --whether through more residential loans through cities (a la Berkeley or Palm Desert) or through encouragement of Community Choice Energy or other plans that foster renewables is one bad reason you'd ever consider retaining dangerous nuclear facilities in our state.

As consumer advocate Ralph Nader has said, "We have so many more solutions than we use."

Since Californians are becoming aware of the potential (and likely) dangers of reliance upon nuclear energy, and since sane policymakers with sound objectives in Germany are doing the same thing you are doing--reassessing our energy planning, I urge you to do everything in your power (pun intended) to start today to create a nuclear-free California energy future.

On a very personal note: The people around me see me as a rational, clear-minded, pragmatic and highly functional neighbor. However, given the information to which I've been privvy, regarding ongoing toxic plumes, poorly contained gases, and radiation leaks and near catastrophes in California's current energy production, I live in a constant state of stress and a level of ongoing terror. Like a Viet Nam vet, I live in a constant state of stress about the facts to which I've been exposed and cannot forget. My stress is both daily and PRE-traumatic. I share this because, given Chernobyl and Fukushima, now many Californians now share stress over a certain level of imminent danger. However, they see our nuclear future as an awful inevitability.

Your demonstration of sanity and leadership in reconsidering California's energy future gives me reason

to hope that we can take this Armageddon in off the table. I urge you to continue on a sane course of true leadership for California (and, thereby, potentially for the world); Please begin applying our abundant, economy/jobs-stimulating, clean, renewable, and efficient energy alternatives for a safe, healthy, nuclear-free California NOW.

With utmost sincerity and appreciation, in advance, of your sane leadership,  
Stephanie  
Jensen