

1736 Tierra Nueva La.
Oceano, 93445 CA
US
coolkit66@yahoo.com

2005/05/03

Andrew Barnsdale, CPUC
c/o Aspen Environmental Group
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 935
San Francisco, CA 94104

Comments regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report, Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant Steam Generator Replacement Project

Application No. A.04-01-009 SCH No. 2004101001

Dear Mr. Barnsdale:

I am writing in support of the comments submitted by the San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace (MFP) and its joint parties. Specifically, I emphasize the following:

1. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) “necessarily involves some degree of forecasting,” and that “an agency must use its best efforts to find out and disclose all that it reasonably can.” Furthermore, the agency cannot reach a determination of “too speculative for evaluation” without conducting a “thorough investigation.” (CEQA Guideline 15144)

The Draft EIR is deficient because it dismisses the likelihood that Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) will extend its operating license. It considers this issue “speculative” (D.1-2) and thus does not include accumulated environmental impacts that will likely occur in the years beyond 2025. This is a fatal flaw of the Draft EIR, for it provides a deceptive and incomplete picture of the probable environmental impacts.

The Draft EIR acknowledges that the Steam Generator Replacement Project (Project) may provide an “incentive” for PG&E to seek a license renewal. (D.1-2). In its scoping comments, PG&E agreed that the Project “could provide an incentive for extending the operable life of the nuclear facility beyond its current license.” (p.9) The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has already granted PG&E authorization to build a facility to store enough high level radioactive waste on site to allow operation through an extended licensing period. Despite these “clues,” the Draft EIR denies an obvious outcome of the Project and thus fails to comply with CEQA, for it does not provide an analysis of its conclusion that a license renewal is “speculative.”

The Draft EIR should consider the scenario of a license renewal and add its significant environmental effects – additional years of accumulated high level radioactive waste, marine degradation, seismic risk, terrorist threat, and the effects of prolonged operation on public safety and the environment.

2. CEQA requires the CPUC to consider the information in the EIR prior to reaching any decisions on the Project. According to a Supreme Court decision, “A fundamental purpose of an EIR is to provide decision makers with information they can use in deciding whether to approve a proposed project, not to inform them of the environmental effects of projects that they have already approved.” (Laurel Heights Improvement Assn v. Regents

of University of California, 47 Cal.3d 376, 394 (1988)) The CPUC, however, has already issued an Interim Decision – and did so before the Draft EIR had even been issued. I support the MFP finding that this defies CEQA law and undermines public confidence in the CPUC process.

3. The Draft EIR consideration of alternatives is impermissibly narrow and superficial. Considering environmentally superior alternatives is at the heart of CEQA, and this Draft EIR pays mere lip service to options available to the CPUC.

The State's energy policy requires that utilities consider a wide range of options for meeting future energy needs. The CPUC judge in the long-term resource planning case (A.04-04-003) specifically ordered PG&E to consider a future without Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant (DCNPP); it was to analyze realistic options for meeting its customers' electricity needs should DCNPP cease to operate by 2014. PG&E has not taken this order seriously, and the Draft EIR does not even mention that this long-term planning process is underway despite the fact that MFP et al's comments on the CPUC's EIR Notice of Preparation contained extensive information about this case and its relevance to the DCNPP Steam Generator Replacement Project.

The failure to compare the environmental impacts of alternatives to DCNPP's operation beyond 2014 is a glaring deficiency of the Draft EIR. The report is legally inadequate because it does not comply with CEQA's requirement to provide a detailed analysis of possible alternatives.

4. I support the Draft EIR mitigation to incorporate new earthquake data developed since publication of PG&E's Long Term Seismic Program (PG&E, 1988). This proposed update is to be used to review the seismic characteristics of the storage facility for the original steam generators. I propose that this seismic update be utilized to review the structural design of the entire Diablo Canyon facility.

In summary, I support all comments by MFP and joint parties in response to the Draft EIR. I concur that the Draft EIR does not comply with CEQA and does not provide an adequate basis for action by the CPUC on the Project application. The Draft EIR must be redrafted to correct its deficiencies and recirculated for public review and comment.

Sincerely,

Kit Hamilton

26 Hillcrest Drive
Paso Robles, 93446 California
US
jayklaus@msn.com

2005/05/03

Andrew Barnsdale, CPUC
c/o Aspen Environmental Group
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 935
San Francisco, CA 94104

Comments regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report, Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant Steam Generator Replacement Project

Application No. A.04-01-009 SCH No. 2004101001

Dear Mr. Barnsdale:

I am writing in support of the comments submitted by the San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace (MFP) and its joint parties. Specifically, I emphasize the following:

1. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) “necessarily involves some degree of forecasting,” and that “an agency must use its best efforts to find out and disclose all that it reasonably can.” Furthermore, the agency cannot reach a determination of “too speculative for evaluation” without conducting a “thorough investigation.” (CEQA Guideline 15144)

The Draft EIR is deficient because it dismisses the likelihood that Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) will extend its operating license. It considers this issue “speculative” (D.1-2) and thus does not include accumulated environmental impacts that will likely occur in the years beyond 2025. This is a fatal flaw of the Draft EIR, for it provides a deceptive and incomplete picture of the probable environmental impacts.

The Draft EIR acknowledges that the Steam Generator Replacement Project (Project) may provide an “incentive” for PG&E to seek a license renewal. (D.1-2). In its scoping comments, PG&E agreed that the Project “could provide an incentive for extending the operable life of the nuclear facility beyond its current license.” (p.9) The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has already granted PG&E authorization to build a facility to store enough high level radioactive waste on site to allow operation through an extended licensing period. Despite these “clues,” the Draft EIR denies an obvious outcome of the Project and thus fails to comply with CEQA, for it does not provide an analysis of its conclusion that a license renewal is “speculative.”

The Draft EIR should consider the scenario of a license renewal and add its significant environmental effects – additional years of accumulated high level radioactive waste, marine degradation, seismic risk, terrorist threat, and the effects of prolonged operation on public safety and the environment.

2. CEQA requires the CPUC to consider the information in the EIR prior to reaching any decisions on the Project. According to a Supreme Court decision, “A fundamental purpose of an EIR is to provide decision makers with information they can use in deciding whether to approve a proposed project, not to inform them of the environmental effects of projects that they have already approved.” (Laurel Heights Improvement Assn v. Regents

of University of California, 47 Cal.3d 376, 394 (1988)) The CPUC, however, has already issued an Interim Decision – and did so before the Draft EIR had even been issued. I support the MFP finding that this defies CEQA law and undermines public confidence in the CPUC process.

3. The Draft EIR consideration of alternatives is impermissibly narrow and superficial. Considering environmentally superior alternatives is at the heart of CEQA, and this Draft EIR pays mere lip service to options available to the CPUC.

The State's energy policy requires that utilities consider a wide range of options for meeting future energy needs. The CPUC judge in the long-term resource planning case (A.04-04-003) specifically ordered PG&E to consider a future without Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant (DCNPP); it was to analyze realistic options for meeting its customers' electricity needs should DCNPP cease to operate by 2014. PG&E has not taken this order seriously, and the Draft EIR does not even mention that this long-term planning process is underway despite the fact that MFP et al's comments on the CPUC's EIR Notice of Preparation contained extensive information about this case and its relevance to the DCNPP Steam Generator Replacement Project.

The failure to compare the environmental impacts of alternatives to DCNPP's operation beyond 2014 is a glaring deficiency of the Draft EIR. The report is legally inadequate because it does not comply with CEQA's requirement to provide a detailed analysis of possible alternatives.

4. I support the Draft EIR mitigation to incorporate new earthquake data developed since publication of PG&E's Long Term Seismic Program (PG&E, 1988). This proposed update is to be used to review the seismic characteristics of the storage facility for the original steam generators. I propose that this seismic update be utilized to review the structural design of the entire Diablo Canyon facility.

In summary, I support all comments by MFP and joint parties in response to the Draft EIR. I concur that the Draft EIR does not comply with CEQA and does not provide an adequate basis for action by the CPUC on the Project application. The Draft EIR must be redrafted to correct its deficiencies and recirculated for public review and comment.

I am in full agreement with the above letter.

Sincerely,

Klaus Schumann

475 Squire Canyon Rd.
San Luis Obispo, 93401 CA
USA
Janeslo@slonet.org

2005/05/03

Andrew Barnsdale, CPUC
c/o Aspen Environmental Group
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 935
San Francisco, CA 94104

Comments regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report, Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant Steam Generator Replacement Project

Application No. A.04-01-009 SCH No. 2004101001

Dear Mr. Barnsdale:

I am writing in support of the comments submitted by the San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace (MFP) and its joint parties. Specifically, I emphasize the following:

1. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) "necessarily involves some degree of forecasting," and that "an agency must use its best efforts to find out and disclose all that it reasonably can." Furthermore, the agency cannot reach a determination of "too speculative for evaluation" without conducting a "thorough investigation." (CEQA Guideline 15144)

The Draft EIR is deficient because it dismisses the likelihood that Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) will extend its operating license. It considers this issue "speculative" (D.1-2) and thus does not include accumulated environmental impacts that will likely occur in the years beyond 2025. This is a fatal flaw of the Draft EIR, for it provides a deceptive and incomplete picture of the probable environmental impacts.

The Draft EIR acknowledges that the Steam Generator Replacement Project (Project) may provide an "incentive" for PG&E to seek a license renewal. (D.1-2). In its scoping comments, PG&E agreed that the Project "could provide an incentive for extending the operable life of the nuclear facility beyond its current license." (p.9) The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has already granted PG&E authorization to build a facility to store enough high level radioactive waste on site to allow operation through an extended licensing period. Despite these "clues," the Draft EIR denies an obvious outcome of the Project and thus fails to comply with CEQA, for it does not provide an analysis of its conclusion that a license renewal is "speculative."

The Draft EIR should consider the scenario of a license renewal and add its significant environmental effects – additional years of accumulated high level radioactive waste, marine degradation, seismic risk, terrorist threat, and the effects of prolonged operation on public safety and the environment.

2. CEQA requires the CPUC to consider the information in the EIR prior to reaching any decisions on the Project. According to a Supreme Court decision, "A fundamental purpose of an EIR is to provide decision makers with information they can use in deciding whether to approve a proposed project, not to inform them of the environmental effects of projects that they have already approved." (Laurel Heights Improvement Assn v. Regents

of University of California, 47 Cal.3d 376, 394 (1988)) The CPUC, however, has already issued an Interim Decision – and did so before the Draft EIR had even been issued. I support the MFP finding that this defies CEQA law and undermines public confidence in the CPUC process.

3. The Draft EIR consideration of alternatives is impermissibly narrow and superficial. Considering environmentally superior alternatives is at the heart of CEQA, and this Draft EIR pays mere lip service to options available to the CPUC.

The State's energy policy requires that utilities consider a wide range of options for meeting future energy needs. The CPUC judge in the long-term resource planning case (A.04-04-003) specifically ordered PG&E to consider a future without Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant (DCNPP); it was to analyze realistic options for meeting its customers' electricity needs should DCNPP cease to operate by 2014. PG&E has not taken this order seriously, and the Draft EIR does not even mention that this long-term planning process is underway despite the fact that MFP et al's comments on the CPUC's EIR Notice of Preparation contained extensive information about this case and its relevance to the DCNPP Steam Generator Replacement Project.

The failure to compare the environmental impacts of alternatives to DCNPP's operation beyond 2014 is a glaring deficiency of the Draft EIR. The report is legally inadequate because it does not comply with CEQA's requirement to provide a detailed analysis of possible alternatives.

4. I support the Draft EIR mitigation to incorporate new earthquake data developed since publication of PG&E's Long Term Seismic Program (PG&E, 1988). This proposed update is to be used to review the seismic characteristics of the storage facility for the original steam generators. I propose that this seismic update be utilized to review the structural design of the entire Diablo Canyon facility.

In summary, I support all comments by MFP and joint parties in response to the Draft EIR. I concur that the Draft EIR does not comply with CEQA and does not provide an adequate basis for action by the CPUC on the Project application. The Draft EIR must be redrafted to correct its deficiencies and recirculated for public review and comment.

Sincerely,

L. Jane Swanson

po box 706
santa margarita, 93453 ca
usa
gull438@aol.com

2005/05/03

Andrew Barnsdale, CPUC
c/o Aspen Environmental Group
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 935
San Francisco, CA 94104

Comments regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report, Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant Steam Generator Replacement Project

Application No. A.04-01-009 SCH No. 2004101001

Dear Mr. Barnsdale:

I am writing in support of the comments submitted by the San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace (MFP) and its joint parties. Specifically, I emphasize the following:

1. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) "necessarily involves some degree of forecasting," and that "an agency must use its best efforts to find out and disclose all that it reasonably can." Furthermore, the agency cannot reach a determination of "too speculative for evaluation" without conducting a "thorough investigation." (CEQA Guideline 15144)

The Draft EIR is deficient because it dismisses the likelihood that Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) will extend its operating license. It considers this issue "speculative" (D.1-2) and thus does not include accumulated environmental impacts that will likely occur in the years beyond 2025. This is a fatal flaw of the Draft EIR, for it provides a deceptive and incomplete picture of the probable environmental impacts.

The Draft EIR acknowledges that the Steam Generator Replacement Project (Project) may provide an "incentive" for PG&E to seek a license renewal. (D.1-2). In its scoping comments, PG&E agreed that the Project "could provide an incentive for extending the operable life of the nuclear facility beyond its current license." (p.9) The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has already granted PG&E authorization to build a facility to store enough high level radioactive waste on site to allow operation through an extended licensing period. Despite these "clues," the Draft EIR denies an obvious outcome of the Project and thus fails to comply with CEQA, for it does not provide an analysis of its conclusion that a license renewal is "speculative."

The Draft EIR should consider the scenario of a license renewal and add its significant environmental effects – additional years of accumulated high level radioactive waste, marine degradation, seismic risk, terrorist threat, and the effects of prolonged operation on public safety and the environment.

2. CEQA requires the CPUC to consider the information in the EIR prior to reaching any decisions on the Project. According to a Supreme Court decision, "A fundamental purpose of an EIR is to provide decision makers with information they can use in deciding whether to approve a proposed project, not to inform them of the environmental effects of projects that they have already approved." (Laurel Heights Improvement Assn v. Regents

of University of California, 47 Cal.3d 376, 394 (1988)) The CPUC, however, has already issued an Interim Decision – and did so before the Draft EIR had even been issued. I support the MFP finding that this defies CEQA law and undermines public confidence in the CPUC process.

3. The Draft EIR consideration of alternatives is impermissibly narrow and superficial. Considering environmentally superior alternatives is at the heart of CEQA, and this Draft EIR pays mere lip service to options available to the CPUC.

The State's energy policy requires that utilities consider a wide range of options for meeting future energy needs. The CPUC judge in the long-term resource planning case (A.04-04-003) specifically ordered PG&E to consider a future without Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant (DCNPP); it was to analyze realistic options for meeting its customers' electricity needs should DCNPP cease to operate by 2014. PG&E has not taken this order seriously, and the Draft EIR does not even mention that this long-term planning process is underway despite the fact that MFP et al's comments on the CPUC's EIR Notice of Preparation contained extensive information about this case and its relevance to the DCNPP Steam Generator Replacement Project.

The failure to compare the environmental impacts of alternatives to DCNPP's operation beyond 2014 is a glaring deficiency of the Draft EIR. The report is legally inadequate because it does not comply with CEQA's requirement to provide a detailed analysis of possible alternatives.

4. I support the Draft EIR mitigation to incorporate new earthquake data developed since publication of PG&E's Long Term Seismic Program (PG&E, 1988). This proposed update is to be used to review the seismic characteristics of the storage facility for the original steam generators. I propose that this seismic update be utilized to review the structural design of the entire Diablo Canyon facility.

In summary, I support all comments by MFP and joint parties in response to the Draft EIR. I concur that the Draft EIR does not comply with CEQA and does not provide an adequate basis for action by the CPUC on the Project application. The Draft EIR must be redrafted to correct its deficiencies and recirculated for public review and comment.

Sincerely,

Leslie Beierle

1941 Ferrell Ave.
Los Osos, 93402 CA
USA
foster_l@charter.net

2005/05/03

Andrew Barnsdale, CPUC
c/o Aspen Environmental Group
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 935
San Francisco, CA 94104

Comments regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report, Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant Steam Generator Replacement Project

Application No. A.04-01-009 SCH No. 2004101001

Dear Mr. Barnsdale:

I am writing in support of the comments submitted by the San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace (MFP) and its joint parties. Specifically, I emphasize the following:

1. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) "necessarily involves some degree of forecasting," and that "an agency must use its best efforts to find out and disclose all that it reasonably can." Furthermore, the agency cannot reach a determination of "too speculative for evaluation" without conducting a "thorough investigation." (CEQA Guideline 15144)

The Draft EIR is deficient because it dismisses the likelihood that Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) will extend its operating license. It considers this issue "speculative" (D.1-2) and thus does not include accumulated environmental impacts that will likely occur in the years beyond 2025. This is a fatal flaw of the Draft EIR, for it provides a deceptive and incomplete picture of the probable environmental impacts.

The Draft EIR acknowledges that the Steam Generator Replacement Project (Project) may provide an "incentive" for PG&E to seek a license renewal. (D.1-2). In its scoping comments, PG&E agreed that the Project "could provide an incentive for extending the operable life of the nuclear facility beyond its current license." (p.9) The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has already granted PG&E authorization to build a facility to store enough high level radioactive waste on site to allow operation through an extended licensing period. Despite these "clues," the Draft EIR denies an obvious outcome of the Project and thus fails to comply with CEQA, for it does not provide an analysis of its conclusion that a license renewal is "speculative."

The Draft EIR should consider the scenario of a license renewal and add its significant environmental effects – additional years of accumulated high level radioactive waste, marine degradation, seismic risk, terrorist threat, and the effects of prolonged operation on public safety and the environment.

2. CEQA requires the CPUC to consider the information in the EIR prior to reaching any decisions on the Project. According to a Supreme Court decision, "A fundamental purpose of an EIR is to provide decision makers with information they can use in deciding whether to approve a proposed project, not to inform them of the environmental effects of projects that they have already approved." (Laurel Heights Improvement Assn v. Regents

of University of California, 47 Cal.3d 376, 394 (1988)) The CPUC, however, has already issued an Interim Decision – and did so before the Draft EIR had even been issued. I support the MFP finding that this defies CEQA law and undermines public confidence in the CPUC process.

3. The Draft EIR consideration of alternatives is impermissibly narrow and superficial. Considering environmentally superior alternatives is at the heart of CEQA, and this Draft EIR pays mere lip service to options available to the CPUC.

The State's energy policy requires that utilities consider a wide range of options for meeting future energy needs. The CPUC judge in the long-term resource planning case (A.04-04-003) specifically ordered PG&E to consider a future without Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant (DCNPP); it was to analyze realistic options for meeting its customers' electricity needs should DCNPP cease to operate by 2014. PG&E has not taken this order seriously, and the Draft EIR does not even mention that this long-term planning process is underway despite the fact that MFP et al's comments on the CPUC's EIR Notice of Preparation contained extensive information about this case and its relevance to the DCNPP Steam Generator Replacement Project.

The failure to compare the environmental impacts of alternatives to DCNPP's operation beyond 2014 is a glaring deficiency of the Draft EIR. The report is legally inadequate because it does not comply with CEQA's requirement to provide a detailed analysis of possible alternatives.

4. I support the Draft EIR mitigation to incorporate new earthquake data developed since publication of PG&E's Long Term Seismic Program (PG&E, 1988). This proposed update is to be used to review the seismic characteristics of the storage facility for the original steam generators. I propose that this seismic update be utilized to review the structural design of the entire Diablo Canyon facility.

In summary, I support all comments by MFP and joint parties in response to the Draft EIR. I concur that the Draft EIR does not comply with CEQA and does not provide an adequate basis for action by the CPUC on the Project application. The Draft EIR must be redrafted to correct its deficiencies and recirculated for public review and comment.

Sincerely,

Lisa Foster

136 Ritchie Court
Grover Beach, 93433 Ca
USA
ldonegan@calpoly.edu

2005/05/03

Andrew Barnsdale, CPUC
c/o Aspen Environmental Group
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 935
San Francisco, CA 94104

Comments regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report, Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant Steam Generator Replacement Project

Application No. A.04-01-009 SCH No. 2004101001

Dear Mr. Barnsdale:

I am writing in support of the comments submitted by the San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace (MFP) and its joint parties. Specifically, I emphasize the following:

1. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) “necessarily involves some degree of forecasting,” and that “an agency must use its best efforts to find out and disclose all that it reasonably can.” Furthermore, the agency cannot reach a determination of “too speculative for evaluation” without conducting a “thorough investigation.” (CEQA Guideline 15144)

The Draft EIR is deficient because it dismisses the likelihood that Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) will extend its operating license. It considers this issue “speculative” (D.1-2) and thus does not include accumulated environmental impacts that will likely occur in the years beyond 2025. This is a fatal flaw of the Draft EIR, for it provides a deceptive and incomplete picture of the probable environmental impacts.

The Draft EIR acknowledges that the Steam Generator Replacement Project (Project) may provide an “incentive” for PG&E to seek a license renewal. (D.1-2). In its scoping comments, PG&E agreed that the Project “could provide an incentive for extending the operable life of the nuclear facility beyond its current license.” (p.9) The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has already granted PG&E authorization to build a facility to store enough high level radioactive waste on site to allow operation through an extended licensing period. Despite these “clues,” the Draft EIR denies an obvious outcome of the Project and thus fails to comply with CEQA, for it does not provide an analysis of its conclusion that a license renewal is “speculative.”

The Draft EIR should consider the scenario of a license renewal and add its significant environmental effects – additional years of accumulated high level radioactive waste, marine degradation, seismic risk, terrorist threat, and the effects of prolonged operation on public safety and the environment.

2. CEQA requires the CPUC to consider the information in the EIR prior to reaching any decisions on the Project. According to a Supreme Court decision, “A fundamental purpose of an EIR is to provide decision makers with information they can use in deciding whether to approve a proposed project, not to inform them of the environmental effects of projects that they have already approved.” (Laurel Heights Improvement Assn v. Regents

of University of California, 47 Cal.3d 376, 394 (1988)) The CPUC, however, has already issued an Interim Decision – and did so before the Draft EIR had even been issued. I support the MFP finding that this defies CEQA law and undermines public confidence in the CPUC process.

3. The Draft EIR consideration of alternatives is impermissibly narrow and superficial. Considering environmentally superior alternatives is at the heart of CEQA, and this Draft EIR pays mere lip service to options available to the CPUC.

The State's energy policy requires that utilities consider a wide range of options for meeting future energy needs. The CPUC judge in the long-term resource planning case (A.04-04-003) specifically ordered PG&E to consider a future without Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant (DCNPP); it was to analyze realistic options for meeting its customers' electricity needs should DCNPP cease to operate by 2014. PG&E has not taken this order seriously, and the Draft EIR does not even mention that this long-term planning process is underway despite the fact that MFP et al's comments on the CPUC's EIR Notice of Preparation contained extensive information about this case and its relevance to the DCNPP Steam Generator Replacement Project.

The failure to compare the environmental impacts of alternatives to DCNPP's operation beyond 2014 is a glaring deficiency of the Draft EIR. The report is legally inadequate because it does not comply with CEQA's requirement to provide a detailed analysis of possible alternatives.

4. I support the Draft EIR mitigation to incorporate new earthquake data developed since publication of PG&E's Long Term Seismic Program (PG&E, 1988). This proposed update is to be used to review the seismic characteristics of the storage facility for the original steam generators. I propose that this seismic update be utilized to review the structural design of the entire Diablo Canyon facility.

In summary, I support all comments by MFP and joint parties in response to the Draft EIR. I concur that the Draft EIR does not comply with CEQA and does not provide an adequate basis for action by the CPUC on the Project application. The Draft EIR must be redrafted to correct its deficiencies and recirculated for public review and comment.

Sincerely,

Lorraine Donegan

8455 Graves Creek Road
Atascadero, 93422 Ca
USA
martybrown@tcsn.net

2005/05/05

Andrew Barnsdale, CPUC
c/o Aspen Environmental Group
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 935
San Francisco, CA 94104

Comments regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report, Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant Steam Generator Replacement Project

Application No. A.04-01-009 SCH No. 2004101001

Dear Mr. Barnsdale:

I am writing in support of the comments submitted by the San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace (MFP) and its joint parties. Specifically, I emphasize the following:

1. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) “necessarily involves some degree of forecasting,” and that “an agency must use its best efforts to find out and disclose all that it reasonably can.” Furthermore, the agency cannot reach a determination of “too speculative for evaluation” without conducting a “thorough investigation.” (CEQA Guideline 15144)

The Draft EIR is deficient because it dismisses the likelihood that Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) will extend its operating license. It considers this issue “speculative” (D.1-2) and thus does not include accumulated environmental impacts that will likely occur in the years beyond 2025. This is a fatal flaw of the Draft EIR, for it provides a deceptive and incomplete picture of the probable environmental impacts.

The Draft EIR acknowledges that the Steam Generator Replacement Project (Project) may provide an “incentive” for PG&E to seek a license renewal. (D.1-2). In its scoping comments, PG&E agreed that the Project “could provide an incentive for extending the operable life of the nuclear facility beyond its current license.” (p.9) The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has already granted PG&E authorization to build a facility to store enough high level radioactive waste on site to allow operation through an extended licensing period. Despite these “clues,” the Draft EIR denies an obvious outcome of the Project and thus fails to comply with CEQA, for it does not provide an analysis of its conclusion that a license renewal is “speculative.”

The Draft EIR should consider the scenario of a license renewal and add its significant environmental effects – additional years of accumulated high level radioactive waste, marine degradation, seismic risk, terrorist threat, and the effects of prolonged operation on public safety and the environment.

2. CEQA requires the CPUC to consider the information in the EIR prior to reaching any decisions on the Project. According to a Supreme Court decision, “A fundamental purpose of an EIR is to provide decision makers with information they can use in deciding whether to approve a proposed project, not to inform them of the environmental effects of projects that they have already approved.” (Laurel Heights Improvement Assn v. Regents

of University of California, 47 Cal.3d 376, 394 (1988)) The CPUC, however, has already issued an Interim Decision – and did so before the Draft EIR had even been issued. I support the MFP finding that this defies CEQA law and undermines public confidence in the CPUC process.

3. The Draft EIR consideration of alternatives is impermissibly narrow and superficial. Considering environmentally superior alternatives is at the heart of CEQA, and this Draft EIR pays mere lip service to options available to the CPUC.

The State's energy policy requires that utilities consider a wide range of options for meeting future energy needs. The CPUC judge in the long-term resource planning case (A.04-04-003) specifically ordered PG&E to consider a future without Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant (DCNPP); it was to analyze realistic options for meeting its customers' electricity needs should DCNPP cease to operate by 2014. PG&E has not taken this order seriously, and the Draft EIR does not even mention that this long-term planning process is underway despite the fact that MFP et al's comments on the CPUC's EIR Notice of Preparation contained extensive information about this case and its relevance to the DCNPP Steam Generator Replacement Project.

The failure to compare the environmental impacts of alternatives to DCNPP's operation beyond 2014 is a glaring deficiency of the Draft EIR. The report is legally inadequate because it does not comply with CEQA's requirement to provide a detailed analysis of possible alternatives.

4. I support the Draft EIR mitigation to incorporate new earthquake data developed since publication of PG&E's Long Term Seismic Program (PG&E, 1988). This proposed update is to be used to review the seismic characteristics of the storage facility for the original steam generators. I propose that this seismic update be utilized to review the structural design of the entire Diablo Canyon facility.

In summary, I support all comments by MFP and joint parties in response to the Draft EIR. I concur that the Draft EIR does not comply with CEQA and does not provide an adequate basis for action by the CPUC on the Project application. The Draft EIR must be redrafted to correct its deficiencies and recirculated for public review and comment.

It is imperative that all sources of alternative, clean energy be researched without prejudice. Until that time that we have substituted clean energy for nuclear, the public cannot be assured of health and safety.

Sincerely,

Marty Brown

26 Hillcrest Drive
Paso Robles, 93446 California
US
jayklaus@msn.com

2005/05/03

Andrew Barnsdale, CPUC
c/o Aspen Environmental Group
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 935
San Francisco, CA 94104

Comments regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report, Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant Steam Generator Replacement Project

Application No. A.04-01-009 SCH No. 2004101001

Dear Mr. Barnsdale:

I am writing in support of the comments submitted by the San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace (MFP) and its joint parties. Specifically, I emphasize the following:

1. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) "necessarily involves some degree of forecasting," and that "an agency must use its best efforts to find out and disclose all that it reasonably can." Furthermore, the agency cannot reach a determination of "too speculative for evaluation" without conducting a "thorough investigation." (CEQA Guideline 15144)

The Draft EIR is deficient because it dismisses the likelihood that Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) will extend its operating license. It considers this issue "speculative" (D.1-2) and thus does not include accumulated environmental impacts that will likely occur in the years beyond 2025. This is a fatal flaw of the Draft EIR, for it provides a deceptive and incomplete picture of the probable environmental impacts.

The Draft EIR acknowledges that the Steam Generator Replacement Project (Project) may provide an "incentive" for PG&E to seek a license renewal. (D.1-2). In its scoping comments, PG&E agreed that the Project "could provide an incentive for extending the operable life of the nuclear facility beyond its current license." (p.9) The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has already granted PG&E authorization to build a facility to store enough high level radioactive waste on site to allow operation through an extended licensing period. Despite these "clues," the Draft EIR denies an obvious outcome of the Project and thus fails to comply with CEQA, for it does not provide an analysis of its conclusion that a license renewal is "speculative."

The Draft EIR should consider the scenario of a license renewal and add its significant environmental effects – additional years of accumulated high level radioactive waste, marine degradation, seismic risk, terrorist threat, and the effects of prolonged operation on public safety and the environment.

2. CEQA requires the CPUC to consider the information in the EIR prior to reaching any decisions on the Project. According to a Supreme Court decision, "A fundamental purpose of an EIR is to provide decision makers with information they can use in deciding whether to approve a proposed project, not to inform them of the environmental effects of projects that they have already approved." (Laurel Heights Improvement Assn v. Regents

of University of California, 47 Cal.3d 376, 394 (1988)) The CPUC, however, has already issued an Interim Decision – and did so before the Draft EIR had even been issued. I support the MFP finding that this defies CEQA law and undermines public confidence in the CPUC process.

3. The Draft EIR consideration of alternatives is impermissibly narrow and superficial. Considering environmentally superior alternatives is at the heart of CEQA, and this Draft EIR pays mere lip service to options available to the CPUC.

The State's energy policy requires that utilities consider a wide range of options for meeting future energy needs. The CPUC judge in the long-term resource planning case (A.04-04-003) specifically ordered PG&E to consider a future without Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant (DCNPP); it was to analyze realistic options for meeting its customers' electricity needs should DCNPP cease to operate by 2014. PG&E has not taken this order seriously, and the Draft EIR does not even mention that this long-term planning process is underway despite the fact that MFP et al's comments on the CPUC's EIR Notice of Preparation contained extensive information about this case and its relevance to the DCNPP Steam Generator Replacement Project.

The failure to compare the environmental impacts of alternatives to DCNPP's operation beyond 2014 is a glaring deficiency of the Draft EIR. The report is legally inadequate because it does not comply with CEQA's requirement to provide a detailed analysis of possible alternatives.

4. I support the Draft EIR mitigation to incorporate new earthquake data developed since publication of PG&E's Long Term Seismic Program (PG&E, 1988). This proposed update is to be used to review the seismic characteristics of the storage facility for the original steam generators. I propose that this seismic update be utilized to review the structural design of the entire Diablo Canyon facility.

In summary, I support all comments by MFP and joint parties in response to the Draft EIR. I concur that the Draft EIR does not comply with CEQA and does not provide an adequate basis for action by the CPUC on the Project application. The Draft EIR must be redrafted to correct its deficiencies and recirculated for public review and comment.

The above letter says it all.

Sincerely,

Mary Jane Adams

361 Mesquite Lane
Arroyo Grande, 93420 CA
US
morgan@mothersforpeace.org

2005/05/02

Andrew Barnsdale, CPUC
c/o Aspen Environmental Group
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 935
San Francisco, CA 94104

Comments regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report, Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant Steam Generator Replacement Project

Application No. A.04-01-009 SCH No. 2004101001

Dear Mr. Barnsdale:

I am writing in support of the comments submitted by the San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace (MFP) and its joint parties. Specifically, I emphasize the following:

1. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) "necessarily involves some degree of forecasting," and that "an agency must use its best efforts to find out and disclose all that it reasonably can." Furthermore, the agency cannot reach a determination of "too speculative for evaluation" without conducting a "thorough investigation." (CEQA Guideline 15144)

The Draft EIR is deficient because it dismisses the likelihood that Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) will extend its operating license. It considers this issue "speculative" (D.1-2) and thus does not include accumulated environmental impacts that will likely occur in the years beyond 2025. This is a fatal flaw of the Draft EIR, for it provides a deceptive and incomplete picture of the probable environmental impacts.

The Draft EIR acknowledges that the Steam Generator Replacement Project (Project) may provide an "incentive" for PG&E to seek a license renewal. (D.1-2). In its scoping comments, PG&E agreed that the Project "could provide an incentive for extending the operable life of the nuclear facility beyond its current license." (p.9) The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has already granted PG&E authorization to build a facility to store enough high level radioactive waste on site to allow operation through an extended licensing period. Despite these "clues," the Draft EIR denies an obvious outcome of the Project and thus fails to comply with CEQA, for it does not provide an analysis of its conclusion that a license renewal is "speculative."

The Draft EIR should consider the scenario of a license renewal and add its significant environmental effects – additional years of accumulated high level radioactive waste, marine degradation, seismic risk, terrorist threat, and the effects of prolonged operation on public safety and the environment.

2. CEQA requires the CPUC to consider the information in the EIR prior to reaching any decisions on the Project. According to a Supreme Court decision, "A fundamental purpose of an EIR is to provide decision makers with information they can use in deciding whether to approve a proposed project, not to inform them of the environmental effects of projects that they have already approved." (Laurel Heights Improvement Assn v. Regents

of University of California, 47 Cal.3d 376, 394 (1988)) The CPUC, however, has already issued an Interim Decision – and did so before the Draft EIR had even been issued. I support the MFP finding that this defies CEQA law and undermines public confidence in the CPUC process.

3. The Draft EIR consideration of alternatives is impermissibly narrow and superficial. Considering environmentally superior alternatives is at the heart of CEQA, and this Draft EIR pays mere lip service to options available to the CPUC.

The State's energy policy requires that utilities consider a wide range of options for meeting future energy needs. The CPUC judge in the long-term resource planning case (A.04-04-003) specifically ordered PG&E to consider a future without Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant (DCNPP); it was to analyze realistic options for meeting its customers' electricity needs should DCNPP cease to operate by 2014. PG&E has not taken this order seriously, and the Draft EIR does not even mention that this long-term planning process is underway despite the fact that MFP et al's comments on the CPUC's EIR Notice of Preparation contained extensive information about this case and its relevance to the DCNPP Steam Generator Replacement Project.

The failure to compare the environmental impacts of alternatives to DCNPP's operation beyond 2014 is a glaring deficiency of the Draft EIR. The report is legally inadequate because it does not comply with CEQA's requirement to provide a detailed analysis of possible alternatives.

4. I support the Draft EIR mitigation to incorporate new earthquake data developed since publication of PG&E's Long Term Seismic Program (PG&E, 1988). This proposed update is to be used to review the seismic characteristics of the storage facility for the original steam generators. I propose that this seismic update be utilized to review the structural design of the entire Diablo Canyon facility.

In summary, I support all comments by MFP and joint parties in response to the Draft EIR. I concur that the Draft EIR does not comply with CEQA and does not provide an adequate basis for action by the CPUC on the Project application. The Draft EIR must be redrafted to correct its deficiencies and recirculated for public review and comment.

Sincerely,

Morgan Rafferty

1745 Portola St.
San Luis Obispo, 93405 CA
USA
nreinstei805@charter.net

2005/05/03

Andrew Barnsdale, CPUC
c/o Aspen Environmental Group
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 935
San Francisco, CA 94104

Comments regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report, Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant Steam Generator Replacement Project

Application No. A.04-01-009 SCH No. 2004101001

Dear Mr. Barnsdale:

I am writing in support of the comments submitted by the San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace (MFP) and its joint parties. Specifically, I emphasize the following:

1. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) “necessarily involves some degree of forecasting,” and that “an agency must use its best efforts to find out and disclose all that it reasonably can.” Furthermore, the agency cannot reach a determination of “too speculative for evaluation” without conducting a “thorough investigation.” (CEQA Guideline 15144)

The Draft EIR is deficient because it dismisses the likelihood that Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) will extend its operating license. It considers this issue “speculative” (D.1-2) and thus does not include accumulated environmental impacts that will likely occur in the years beyond 2025. This is a fatal flaw of the Draft EIR, for it provides a deceptive and incomplete picture of the probable environmental impacts.

The Draft EIR acknowledges that the Steam Generator Replacement Project (Project) may provide an “incentive” for PG&E to seek a license renewal. (D.1-2). In its scoping comments, PG&E agreed that the Project “could provide an incentive for extending the operable life of the nuclear facility beyond its current license.” (p.9) The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has already granted PG&E authorization to build a facility to store enough high level radioactive waste on site to allow operation through an extended licensing period. Despite these “clues,” the Draft EIR denies an obvious outcome of the Project and thus fails to comply with CEQA, for it does not provide an analysis of its conclusion that a license renewal is “speculative.”

The Draft EIR should consider the scenario of a license renewal and add its significant environmental effects – additional years of accumulated high level radioactive waste, marine degradation, seismic risk, terrorist threat, and the effects of prolonged operation on public safety and the environment.

2. CEQA requires the CPUC to consider the information in the EIR prior to reaching any decisions on the Project. According to a Supreme Court decision, “A fundamental purpose of an EIR is to provide decision makers with information they can use in deciding whether to approve a proposed project, not to inform them of the environmental effects of projects that they have already approved.” (Laurel Heights Improvement Assn v. Regents

of University of California, 47 Cal.3d 376, 394 (1988)) The CPUC, however, has already issued an Interim Decision – and did so before the Draft EIR had even been issued. I support the MFP finding that this defies CEQA law and undermines public confidence in the CPUC process.

3. The Draft EIR consideration of alternatives is impermissibly narrow and superficial. Considering environmentally superior alternatives is at the heart of CEQA, and this Draft EIR pays mere lip service to options available to the CPUC.

The State's energy policy requires that utilities consider a wide range of options for meeting future energy needs. The CPUC judge in the long-term resource planning case (A.04-04-003) specifically ordered PG&E to consider a future without Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant (DCNPP); it was to analyze realistic options for meeting its customers' electricity needs should DCNPP cease to operate by 2014. PG&E has not taken this order seriously, and the Draft EIR does not even mention that this long-term planning process is underway despite the fact that MFP et al's comments on the CPUC's EIR Notice of Preparation contained extensive information about this case and its relevance to the DCNPP Steam Generator Replacement Project.

The failure to compare the environmental impacts of alternatives to DCNPP's operation beyond 2014 is a glaring deficiency of the Draft EIR. The report is legally inadequate because it does not comply with CEQA's requirement to provide a detailed analysis of possible alternatives.

4. I support the Draft EIR mitigation to incorporate new earthquake data developed since publication of PG&E's Long Term Seismic Program (PG&E, 1988). This proposed update is to be used to review the seismic characteristics of the storage facility for the original steam generators. I propose that this seismic update be utilized to review the structural design of the entire Diablo Canyon facility.

In summary, I support all comments by MFP and joint parties in response to the Draft EIR. I concur that the Draft EIR does not comply with CEQA and does not provide an adequate basis for action by the CPUC on the Project application. The Draft EIR must be redrafted to correct its deficiencies and recirculated for public review and comment.

There are much better options for energy.

Sincerely,

Nancy Reinstein