

Diablo Canyon Steam Generator Replacement Project

From: Jeannine Jacobs [earthawake@neteze.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 06, 2004 7:32 PM
To: diablo canyon@aspeneg.com
Subject: Nuclear Power Upgrade meeting

Dear Staff,

I am opposed to the whole nuclear energy industry, mostly because of the radioactive health impacts and massive expense for its waste storage and burial. I think the nuclear energy generating process is over-estimated and compromised by poor design (ie. the loss of heat from heat source being too remote), the mining of rare uranium, the transformation of it into an unnatural plutonium (am I correct?), and the danger of the isotopes being confiscated or blown up in this day and age. THIS IS A VERY EXPENSIVE WAY TO MAKE STEAM! You, who provide the service, may only be protecting your jobs when you advocate for it. I resent the whole albatross!

I realize that you can generate (possibly) more energy than alternative energy sources, but at WHAT COST? At WHAT COMPROMISE for other sustainable industries. Join the Life affirming.

Jeannine Jacobs
Earth Awake

Diablo Canyon Steam Generator Replacement Project

From: Barbara Morel [barb@armory.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2004 1:20 PM
To: diablocanyon@AspenEG.com
Subject: Comment for CPUC meeting

I consider nuclear power to be obsolete because of the dangerous nuclear waste left over from plant operation, therefore, I urge you to shut down the Diablo Canyon Nuclear plant at the earliest date possible, and recommend non-nuclear alternatives.

Barbara Morel

Diablo Canyon Steam Generator Replacement Project

From: james hart [gouldhart@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 25, 2004 10:38 AM
To: diablocanyon@AspenEG.com
Subject: Shut it down!

I can't be at the public meeting on Wednesday, but I strongly support shutting down the increasingly dangerous Diablo Canyon nuclear power plant.

James F. Hart, R.N. (retired)
1160 Islay St., Apt. A, San Luis

Obispo, CA 93401

Get ready for school! Find articles, homework help and more in the Back to School Guide! <http://special.msn.com/network/04backtoschool.armx>

Diablo Canyon Steam Generator Replacement Project

From: Janet E White [jemwhite@juno.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 26, 2004 10:41 AM
To: diablocanyon@aspeneg.com
Subject: Steam generator replacement project

DON'T DO IT AND ADD MORE TOXIC CHEMICALS INTO THE SOIL AT (FORMERLY) BEAUTIFUL AVILA. JUST GET THE HECK OUT OF TOWN UNLESS YOU CONVERT TO SOME SENSIBLE METHOD. AND DON'T PASS ON ANY COSTS TO THE CONSUMER; YOU HAVE ENOUGH MONEY.

Speed up your surfing with Juno SpeedBand.
Now includes pop-up blocker!
Only \$14.95/ month - visit <http://www.juno.com/surf> to sign up today!

Diablo Canyon Steam Generator Replacement Project

From: Bill Denneen [bdenneen@slonet.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 26, 2004 2:33 PM
To: diablocanyon@AspenEG.com
Subject: DIABLO

To: diablocanyon@AspenEG.com
TO: California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)
RE: Hearing: Wednesday, October 27, 2004 2:30pm - 4:30pm AND 7pm - 9pm San Luis Obispo Library Community Room. 995 Palm Street
COMMENT:

I am unable to attend this hearing. I wish my comments to be part of the record.

Diablo has become a nuclear waste storage site. It was not designed for this. I was arrested in front of Diablo in 1977 because PG&E did not know: #1. about an earthquake fault next to the plant , #2. what they would do with their dangerous radioactive waste.-----they STILL don't ! I do not consider storage on site next an earthquake fault an answer to the 'waste'.

If these dry casks are not dangerous as claimed by PG&E I suggest each CEO be given a dry cask (along with their bonus) to be stored in their backyards. Terrorist would then not have one concentrated storage site right behind the plant as the "waste" would be dispersed.

When Diablo Canyon was originally licensed, no seismic studies were performed. Two Shell Oil geologists subsequently released a study of an offshore fault capable of a 7.5 magnitude earthquake, and the plant was retrofitted costing ratepayers over \$2 billion. Diablo is an aging nuclear plant with aging components. Diablo should never have been built. SHUT IT DOWN ASAP!

William Denneen, Retired Biologist, 1040 Cielo Lane, Nipomo, 93444 929-3647

October 25 2004

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

Dear CPUC,

Thank you for coming to San Luis Obispo to speak with us regarding the EIR for Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant. I am concerned about Pacific Gas and Electric's (PG&E) pattern of cost over runs and omissions. I speak from years of experience managing public works contracts, state public school construction projects, professional contracts, and years of estimating, developing, presenting and overseeing multi-million dollar school district budgets.

Never in all the years of my professional experience have I ever seen such inadequate, insufficient, negligent budget estimates for a project of this magnitude. It truly causes me to wonder if there is deliberate intention on the part of PG&E to obfuscate the "true cost" issue of nuclear power. For if the full and true costs were know to the CPUC, federal, state, local governments, and ratepayers, and tax payers, a swift change would be demanded to shift to a less costly, safer, environmentally friendly sources of power.

PG&E has applied to the CPUC to recover the cost of replacing steam generators in Units 1 and 2 at Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant. Before the CPUC makes any decision regarding recovering costs with ratepayer revenues, we ask the Commission to look at the long history of PG&E's cost overruns and the glaring cost deficiencies noted in PG&E's current application.

PG&E's original cost estimate of some \$600 million to construct Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant was woefully understated. PG&E did not perform adequate seismic studies and was forced to redesign the project. Their "fix" to retrofit turned out to be compounding colossal error including- the infamous "reverse blue-print design." The understated cost of \$4.4 BILLION dollars was passed on to rate payers with the understanding the rate payers would NEVER absorb any cost for replacement of any future components.

Currently PG&E's application to replace the steam generators and recover the cost from taxpayers is a direct VIOLATION of the agreement. Further PG&E's application is appallingly inadequate in that it only addresses the initial capital costs of \$706 million to purchase the steam generators and FAILS to address the other known and anticipated costs of:

1. maintenance
2. continued operations
3. replacement of other aging components
4. long term storage of high level radioactive waste
5. delays in obtaining NRC licenses
6. of mitigation measures required by the County of San Luis Obispo and may be required by the California Coastal Commission
7. remediation of thermal degradation and entrainment of fish larvae
8. additional "rack" of the spent fuel pools
9. adequacy of seismic design
10. and potential security upgrades and hearing costs as a result of the United States Court of Appeal's recent decision

This is not a new industry. Actual costs and probable cost estimates should be available, or calculated for these ten itemized critical areas. Once these costs are known or estimated, how much of the total amount will ratepayers be asked to shoulder and for how long? Why does the burden financial for this outmoded, dangerous, inefficient method of producing energy fall to Ratepayers? Why are you even considering ratepayers as the financial source to ease this Corporations poor business decisions?

As complete as the above list identifying the additional ten cost areas seems, what is missing and what has not been addressed or even calculated is the cost to store this high level radio active waste produced at Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant for he long term.

PG&E plans to operate Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant at least through the year 2025 – or twenty more years. During that time the plant will produce even more highly radioactive nuclear waste. In addition, the steam generators replacement identified in the recent application may be stored on site. Additional contaminated parts may be stored on site. PG&E plans to construct a seven acre independent spent fuel storage installation to hold the highly unstable radioactive nuclear waste contained in the fuel rods that is currently on site. Perhaps

they will need a second storage installation to hold the waste generated over the next twenty years.

It is very likely that all this high level nuclear waste will be on site for decades if not longer due to the absence of a federal nuclear waste storage facility. Yucca Mountain in Nevada, the only site under consideration has a great deal of controversy swirling around it. With its construction cost to date of \$57 BILLION, it may never open. Even if Yucca Mountain should open and be able to accept the highly radioactive waste from Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant it will take forty years to transport the 14,000 plus shipments of highly unstable fuel rods to Yucca Mountain by barge, rail, and truck. Transported at what cost and borne by whom?

The reality is Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant is a nuclear waste dump. The fuel rod assemblies after ten years of cooling in the pools and in the dry casks will have lost much of their gamma and beta radiation. "After 1,000 years the activity of the remaining waste is comparable to the natural uranium ore from which the fuel was taken." according to the Advisory Commission on Radioactive Waste and Decommissioning. They estimate the annual cost for spent fuel storage to be between \$6 million for wet storage and \$2 million for dry storage. How many decades if not centuries will ratepayers and future generations be saddled with the cost of storing, encapsulating, monitoring, and guarding this deadly legacy?

Sincerely,

Carmela A. Vignocchi
831 North Sixth Street
Grover Beach, CA 93433

Education

Masters in Business Administration
Pepperdine University, 1990
BA in Psychology
Pepperdine University, 1976

Professional Experience

Director of Public Relations, Consumer Credit Counseling Service, 1996 – Present
Assistant Superintendent for Business Services, Moorpark Unified School District 1989 - 1996
Director of Fiscal Services, Pleasant Valley School District, 1982 – 1989

Diablo Canyon Steam Generator Replacement Project

From: Carmela Vignocchi [CarmelaV@gotdebt.org]
Sent: Wednesday, October 27, 2004 1:36 PM
To: diablocanyon@AspenEG.com
Subject: EIR for Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant

October 25 2004

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

Dear CPUC,

Thank you for coming to San Luis Obispo to speak with us regarding the EIR for Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant.

The Public never gave Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant the right to kill.

Why are we continuing to allow the manufacture of products with toxic substances that are **deadly** to humans and the environment? Nobody asked for these toxins. Nobody asked for an industrial system that would destroy the world!

Regulations attempt to protect the population from these poisonous materials, but regulations are signals of design failure. Regulations are the Government stepping into commerce saying, "The public never gave you the right to kill. We will tell you at what rate you can dispense death."

For the well being and safety of our community, all Californians, and the world, we strongly recommend the reduction and phasing out of nuclear power production at Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant. The No Project Alternative includes a suggestion of replacement of the generation facilities. This is the environmentally superior idea, but go one step further and replace the deadly nuclear generation facility with a state of the art RENEWABLE and SUSTAINABLE generation facility.

We understand that the CPUC cannot regulate Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant concerning nuclear safety, licensing, and many other issues under the preview of the NRC. However, we feel very strongly that the CPUC must use every means available to protect the citizens of San Luis Obispo and California, including forwarding these recommendations and concerns on to the NRC.

Let us not forget that Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant processes the **most dangerous and deadly materials** in existence. Currently there is **NO** safe method of disposing this material. There is **NO** permanent repository. There is **NO** safe transportation plan to a Federal repository. Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant was not designed for storage of highly radioactive, deadly nuclear waste. By replacing the steam generators and storing this highly radioactive waste on site, you are allowing the site to turn into a NUCLEAR WASTE STORAGE FACILITY.

Ultimately, nuclear power, as it is currently configured, is the most **irresponsible** form of energy production. Scientists, operators and regulators have not been able to come up with a way to make nuclear waste safe. For this reason alone we must not promote nor operate nuclear power plants. In addition efficiencies in transmission and end uses offer a realistically credible option of decommissioning DCNPP.

10/27/04

One of the most serious crimes of our nuclear energy production system is that **we are forcing future generations into a kind of nuclear serfdom**. They must always attend to prevent nuclear materials release. Every generation must continually transfer nuclear material from cask to cask. How many of our heirs will be subject to lethal exposures from our nuclear waste? How can those currently involved in this field not consider this legacy being given to the future?

Once again, the best management practice, the most feasible, the most viable, the most environmentally superior alternative would be to phase out production and decommission Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant and replace the generation of the facility with a sustainable and renewable energy generation facility.

Sincerely,

Carmela A. Vignocchi
831 North Sixth Street
Grover Beach, CA 93433

Diablo Canyon Steam Generator Replacement Project

From: Donald Koors [koorsdonald@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 27, 2004 2:20 PM
To: diablocanyon@aspeneg.com
Subject: proposed rate increases

We are very opposed to any increase in rates to prolong the life of the Diablo Canyon reactor. The nuclear waste from Diablo is still not adequately dealt with. We can not go on creating it!!! Nancy and Don Koors

Do you Yahoo!?
[Y! Messenger](#) - Communicate in real time. Download now.



CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION (CPUC)

Scoping Comments

Proposed Diablo Canyon Power Plant Steam Generator Replacement Project

Wednesday, October 27, 2004

Name*: SYLVIA ROSENBERG

Affiliation (if any)*: Ø

Address*: 1468 4th ST.

City, State, Zip Code*: LOS. OSOS. CA 93402

Telephone Number*: 805 534-1458

Email*: Sylviarosenberg@hotmail.com

As an 8 year resident of Los Osos, I am acutely aware of the proximity to Diablo Canyon Nuclear Plant.

There are many reasons why replacing the failing generators and therefore increasing the plant's life span is bad.

There has been no acceptable solution to the spent fuel rod storage, or disposal, adding to the life span of the plant will only worsen this dilemma. This is a problem that can last for 1000's of years, long after the plant is closed. We must develop ^{alternative} ~~more~~ and environmentally safer re-newable energy such as Wind Power, Solar Power etc.

Since 9-11-01 the likelihood of a terrorist attack on the plant has increased and with the proximity to an ever growing population center, it is horrendous to imagine the result of such an attack on San Luis Obispo County.

Proximity to the known offshore earthquake fault, plus increased recent seismic activity adds to the danger, particularly in the spent fuel rod storage areas.

I fully support the NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE and ask that while performing the EIR,

for this project you take into consideration all of the above concerns.

Please either deposit this sheet at the sign-in table before you leave today, or fold, stamp, and mail. Insert additional sheets if needed. Comments must be postmarked by November 1, 2004. Comments may also be faxed to the project hotline at (805) 888-2750 or emailed to diablocanyon@spenec.com.



CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION (CPUC)

Scoping Comments

Proposed Diablo Canyon Power Plant Steam Generator Replacement Project

Wednesday, October 27, 2004

Name*: Barbara Akle

Affiliation (if any)*: None

Address*: 1586 Third St. #

City, State, Zip Code*: Los Osos, CA 93402

Telephone Number*: _____

Email*: _____

In addition to earthquake and terrorism concerns, we still have no acceptable means of storing and disposing of spent fuel, therefore I am against any actions that would prolong the lifespan of use of diablo canyon nuclear power plant. Any money ~~would~~ would be better spent on renewable & environmentally friendly energy sources.

I am certainly against the rate payers footing the bill for the benefit of PG & E.

Barbara Akle

10/28/04

**Please print. Your name, address, and comments become public information and may be released to interested parties if requested.*

Please either deposit this sheet at the sign-in table before you leave today, or fold, stamp, and mail. Insert additional sheets if needed. Comments must be postmarked by November 1, 2004. Comments may also be faxed to the project hotline at (805) 888-2750 or emailed to diablocanyon@aspenerg.com.



CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION (CPUC)

Scoping Comments

Proposed Diablo Canyon Power Plant Steam Generator Replacement Project

Wednesday, October 27, 2004 (2:30-4:30pm)

Name*: Ariel Roads

Affiliation (if any):* _____

Address*: 1040 Cielo Lane

City, State, Zip Code*: Nipomo, CA

Telephone Number*: 660-353-9327

Email*: Considering the placement of the reactor and storage site along a fault, the amount of waste generated & continually stored on the site, the repeated cost every 20 years or so, and the very long life of the radioactive material, I disagree with the plan to start a pile of nuclear material which could never become less of a hazard, only more. Despite the greater initial cost, I would prefer a closing of the plant & a change to renewable energy when the time comes. I prefer to pay more in funds and less in long term health & environmental damage. Thanks.

**Please print. Your name, address, and comments become public information and may be released to interested parties if requested.*

Please either deposit this sheet at the sign-in table before you leave today, or fold, stamp, and mail. Insert additional sheets if needed. Comments must be postmarked by November 1, 2004. Comments may also be faxed to the project hotline at (805) 888-2750 or emailed to diablocanyon@aspeneg.com.



CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION (CPUC)

Scoping Comments

Proposed Diablo Canyon Power Plant Steam Generator Replacement Project

Wednesday, October 27, 2004 (2:30-4:30 pm)

Name*: Kathy Teufel

Affiliation (if any):*

Address*: 6445 Corral de Piedra

City, State, Zip Code:* SLO CA 93401

Telephone Number:*

Email:*

I agree with the Mothers for Peace law suit and would appreciate the items addressed.

*Please print. Your name, address, and comments become public information and may be released to interested parties if requested.

Please either deposit this sheet at the sign-in table before you leave today, or fold, stamp, and mail. Insert additional sheets if needed. Comments must be postmarked by November 1, 2004. Comments may also be faxed to the project hotline at (805) 888-2750 or emailed to diablocanyon@aspenerg.com.