

July 2, 2013

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

VIA EMAIL

Re: Written Follow-up to June 19, 2013 Workshop on Nuclear Power Plant Issues

Dear Ms. Walter:

Thank you again for the opportunity to participate as a panelist at the Energy Commission's June 19, 2013 workshop on nuclear power plant issues affecting California's electricity supply.

As I mentioned in my presentation, I am attaching for your Docket No.13-IEP-1J a considerably expanded version which was submitted on June 28, 2013 as testimony by the Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility ("A4NR") in PG&E's General Rate Case proceeding at the Public Utilities Commission (CPUC docket A.12-11-009).

In light of this material, A4NR strongly contests the accuracy of PG&E's May 19, 2013 answer (docketed in 13-IEP-1J as TN 70883) to the Energy Commission's 2013 Integrated Energy Policy Report ("IEPR") Nuclear Data Request:

It is not possible to reliably predict whether the site-specific seismic hazard and ground shaking levels from which to assess the DCCP critical structures, systems, and components will increase or decrease at this stage of the seismic hazard update. This will be known in March 2015.¹

As previously documented by the NRC Senior Resident Inspector at Diablo Canyon, PG&E has known since 2010 that ground motions attributable to the Shoreline Fault (and possibly the Los Osos Fault and the San Luis Bay Fault) are significantly in excess of the Double Design Earthquake ("DDE") specified in the plant's license as the Safe Shutdown Earthquake ("SSE"). While PG&E has deflected enforcement of this SSE license requirement until after completion of the 10 CFR 50.54(f) review process in March 2015,

¹ TN 70883, p. 3.

the NRC bluntly forecasts:

*The NRC recognizes that using the DDE as the basis of comparison will most likely result in the Shoreline fault and the Hosgri earthquake being reported as having greater ground motion than the SSE.*¹

The disruptive prospect of significant seismic retrofit requirements, or premature plant retirement, in the wake of the March 2015 evaluation deserves careful scrutiny by California's energy agencies. More immediately, questions of whether the NRC's multi-year forbearance in enforcement of the DDE requirements constitutes a "de facto license amendment" cannot be avoided, in light of the recent regulatory demise of SONGS on these very grounds.

This matter deserves prominent attention in the Energy Commission's 2013 IEPR process.

Sincerely,

/s/ John L. Geesman

¹ October 12, 2012 letter to PG&E signed by Joseph M. Sebrosky, Senior Project Manager for Plant Licensing Branch IV, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. This letter is accessible on the NRC's website (<http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>) as ADAMS Accession No. ML120730106.