

Energy - Docket Optical System

From: Bruce Campbell [madroneweb@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2013 9:42 PM
To: Energy - Docket Optical System
Cc: Korosec, Suzanne@Energy
Subject: Docket # 13-IEP-1A -- Draft 2013 IEPR Scoping Order

Categories: Ready to Docket

California Energy Commission

DOCKETED
13-IEP-1A

TN # 69257

JAN 24 2013

January 23, 2013

Bruce Campbell
3520 Overland Ave. # A 149
Los Angeles, CA 90034

California Energy Commission
Dockets Office, MS-4
Re: Docket No. 13-IEP-1A
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512

Dear Lead Commissioner McAllister and to whom it may concern:

Thanks for this opportunity to comment on the Draft 2013 IEPR Scoping Order.

Besides the preliminary scope mentioned in your report, I would advise several other avenues of inquiry regarding California energy and reliability issues.

One issue involves the latest petrochemical craze which is "hydrofracking." The very term "hydro" in there means water, and it takes a lot of energy in many cases to move large volumes of water. Since apparently more water is used in "hydrofracking" than in more traditional natural gas extraction, I call upon this study to evaluate the amount of energy and water used in a variety of oil and gas extraction techniques -- thus, of course, partially evaluating how much energy and water (and how much energy to move water) is expended in producing the gas from shale and other formations.

While the IEPR preliminary scope does address the increasing natural disasters and extremes which are associated with climate change, it should also consider that increasing volumes of water in the ocean puts more weight and pressure on faults beneath the ocean.

One thing not evaluated that I see in the scope, is seismic setting of energy facilities. One should carefully evaluate from the Palos Verdes Fault and Newport-Inglewood Fault through the Hosgri - San Simeon - San Gregorio Fault, and the San Andreas Fault itself what a moderately large to large earthquake would do to various energy-related facilities in California.

Along with this investigative theme, assess what a range of accidents at various energy-related facilities (which could be triggered by an earthquake or other types of accidents) would have on the public health and safety of Californians. (Please consider the impact of property values, food supply, and future generations in your assessment of the range of damage which could occur at energy facilities due to earthquakes centered in California or within 15 miles of the California coast.)

In your price assessment, please carefully evaluate not only sweetheart rate deals between investor-owned utilities and the PUC for operating large nuclear reactors, but also specifically evaluate the impact on ratepayers from possibly paying for long delays and severe reliability problems with the steam generator situation at San Onofre Units # 2 and # 3.

Certainly the San Onofre steam generator and worst "safety culture" situation cries for an assessment of the likely future reliability of Unit # 2 -- if it is ever started again at 70% or full power, etc. And if you examine how various energy sources are linked to carbon emissions, please recall that nuclear power has the highest carbon footprint of any non-fossil fuel energy source. (For instance, it takes two coal facilities to power a uranium enrichment facility in Tennessee -- for one carbon-spewing example.)

And lastly, when evaluating impact on the state economy, please look at things such as the job creation potential of decentralized solar energy installations on business, residential, and school rooftops. Conservation to save energy (as well as conservation of water which is also related to reducing energy use) must be integral to the assessment as well.

Thank you very much for considering this advice for additional evaluations in your finalized scoping order to guide the info-gathering for the report.

Sincerely yours,

Bruce Campbell