Comment Set 13
Sjsiggy@aol.com

San Onofre EIR Project

From: Sjsiggy@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, May 31, 2005 7:11 AM
To: sanonofre@aspeneg.com
Subject: E. R. report

Please do not try to extend the nuclear capabilities at San Onofre. We must use a combination of clean, safe low-cost energy sources instead. 13-1

Responses to Comment Set 13
Sjsiggy@aol.com

13-1 The commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project is noted. As stated in Section A of the Draft EIR, the purpose of this EIR is to evaluate the potential environmental impacts expected to result from the Proposed Project, which is the replacement of steam generators at SONGS Units 2 and 3. The scope of this EIR, as defined by CEQA, focuses only on changes to physical conditions affected by the Steam Generator Replacement Project, and describing the significant environmental effects of the project. This EIR does not make a recommendation as to whether SCE's application should be approved or denied, but rather is purely informational in content. This EIR will ultimately be used by decision-makers in considering whether or not to approve the project as proposed or an alternative.

Extending plant operations would require license renewal, but Master Response MR-2 (License Renewal) notes that license renewal and plant operations beyond the current license expiration dates are not reasonably foreseeable consequences of the Proposed Project. The commenter also supports the use of "clean, safe low-cost energy sources," which are considered in the Draft EIR as possible scenarios under the No Project Alternative.

Comment Set 14
Meredith Gene Pearcy

San Onofre EIR Project

From: mgp [mgp@mariposagrp.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 31, 2005 11:24 AM
To: Lyn; Creed; legal@mariposagrp.com; sanonofre@aspeneg.com
Subject: Comment on the EIR for San Onofre

Andrew Barnsdale, Project Manager
CPUC c/o Aspen Environmental Group
sanonofre@aspeneg.com

Dear Mr Barnsdale:
I'm a concerned citizen, retired systems engineer (developed system test procedures on the GCEP program)
My concerns are:

- The frequent claim that "cost of waste disposal " has been factored into the process. Very interesting! I have heard of no container that has met a tenth of NRC's 300 year minimum integrity requirement let alone the 1000 year goal. How do you factor in an "unknown cost"? (Tax Payers of the future?)
- How do you dispose of material that will remain hazardous virtually forever with half lives of:
Uranium Isotopes U238 4.47 billion - U235 700 million - U234 246,000 years - Plutonium 24,390 years
- Considering that the English Channel was formed less than 5,000 years ago, and a major volcanic eruption occurred adjacent to Yucca Mountain in the last 10,000 years. where is a place on Earth where one can confidently predict its stability as a repository for high level radio active waste?

14-1

Edison's game plan seems like folly compared to San Diego Gas and Electric's option of "sustainable communities" fast track, clean, safe, affordable, small scale , abundant, energy.

The draft EIR seemed inadequate in objectivity with its assessment of benefits of the renewable/distributive energy sources, claiming them as not available 24 hours per day.

Strangely the ocean wave energy resources seem to be a power resource available 24/365. Studies indicate
32,000GigaWatt hours of electricity. (CA Ocean Wave Energy Assessment, Vol I)

Some of these companies have demonstration sites up and running.
AquaEnergy has 30MW modular units with a demo in Washington and BC

Independent Natural Resources Inc San Onofre replacement!
Footprint off shore - A 1,000 megawatt facility would be 1.25 miles by one mile area in the ocean.
Footprint on shore - Providing a flow through only system with a two minute buffer time, a tank 375 feet long by 200 feet wide by 125 feet deep or 70,125,000 gallon tank.
Startup costs - The cost to install a 1,000 megawatt site would be $1,500,000,000.00 * Cost per kilowatt? $1,500.00
Installation time line - INRI system can be installed in sections. unlike conventional power plants. So from start to producing power would be six months. The entire system would take about 2 years to install.

1

Comment Set 14, cont.
Meredith Gene Pearcy

Operational cost per kilowatt. - System produces power at 2.08 cents ($0.0208) per KWh.
MTTR of elements of the system. - The service life of the pump's frame would be the same as an oil platform 25 to 30 years. The buoyancy block is the only moving part plus the check valves would be replaced on a wear basis. We would see them lasting at least 7 to 10 years before replacement.

14-1

Other companies involved in Ocean Energy Development

* Blue Energy Canada <http://www.bluenergy.com>
* Energetech Australia <http://www.energetech.com.au/>
* Float Incorporated <http://www.floatinc.com>
* Hydam Technology Ltd <http://www.wave-power.com>
* Independent Natural Resources <http://www.inri.us>
* Marine Development Associates Inc.
<http://www.marinedevelopmentinc.com/ocean_energy.htm>
* Ocean Motion International <http://www.oceanmotion.ws>
* Ocean Power Delivery Ltd. <http://www.oceanpd.com>
* Ocean Wave Energy Company <http://www.owec.com>
* OreCON Ltd. <http://www.orecon.com>
* Sea Power International AB <http://www.seapower.se>
* S.D.E. Ltd., Sea Wave Power Plants <http://www.sde.co.il>
* WaveEnergy <http://www.waveenergy.dk> (Denmark)
* WaveDragon ApS <http://www.wavedragon.net>
* WaveGen <http://www.wavegen.co.uk>
* WavePlane International A/S <http://www.waveplane.com>

Perhaps you could enlighten me as to how these various companies listed by the CEC fail to provide viable replacement or alternative to the nuclear option?

Thanks for your attention
Meredith Gene Pearcy
7538 Royer Ave
Canoga Park, CA 91307
mgp@mariposagrp.com
818 710 8339

cc creedmail@cox.net.

2

Responses to Comment Set 14
Meredith Gene Pearcy

14-1 The comment expresses support for renewable energy projects as alternatives to the Proposed Project and expresses concerns over the generation of radioactive waste and the costs of waste handling and the project. CEQA does not address cost in the evaluation of the Proposed Project or alternatives, as noted in Draft EIR Section A and D.1.2.5. Cost issues are addressed by the CPUC in the General Proceeding (A.04-03-026) for the Proposed Project.

The ongoing operation of SONGS, which includes the production and storage or disposal of spent fuel, is part of the environmental baseline. Draft EIR Sections ES.1 and D.1.2.1 state that the environmental setting, or baseline, is based on the environmental conditions that existed in the project area in October 2004 at the time the notice of preparation was published. Please see Master Response MR-1 (Baseline).

Sections C.6.3.1, C.6.3.2, and C.6.3.3 of the Draft EIR stated that solar and wind power are intermittent in nature, and therefore are not viable options for directly replacing base-load generation. The Draft EIR does not state that distributed generation is an inadequate replacement generation source due being intermittent in nature, but rather because it generates small amounts of power (< 50 MW), and does not provide a means for SCE to offset a large portion of the energy supply lost by the shutdown of SONGS. The EIR preparers considered the option of tidal generation, but concluded that this source is untested and not a feasible technology, especially on the scale of the 2,150 MW SONGS. The City and County of San Francisco has a tidal energy pilot project. The initial project goal was to create one megawatt of tidal energy, but the project has been scaled back to 150 kW. The cost of building a 1,000 MW system was estimated to be $600 million.[1]

Please refer to Responses CC2-1 and CC2-2 regarding the adequacy of the No Project Alternative, and Response CC5-19 for more information about why alternative energy technologies are not suitable as a direct replacement of SONGS's 2,150 MW of base-load power.

[1] Llanos, Miguel. 2003. "San Francisco to test tides for energy." MSNBC website. Online at http://msnbc.msn.com/id/3339905/. Accessed on June 24, 2005.

Comment Set 15
Marjorie B. Sosa

San Onofre EIR Project

From: Marjoriesosa@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, May 31, 2005 11:23 AM
To: sanonofre@aspeneg.com
Cc: lynharris.hicks@cox.net
Subject: EIR

15-1

Please do not consider nuclear power for San Onofre. It is too expensive and no longer is the best option for today's energy needs. California is blessed with much sunshine and solar energy should be the option considered at this time, not nuclear and not natural gas. We need clean air and clean water and less threatening options for terrorist attack. Please consider solar as the option.

Thank you,
Marjorie B. Sosa
23 Maracay
San Clemente, CA 92672

Responses to Comment Set 15
Marjorie B. Sosa

15-1 The commenter's support for the use of solar energy is noted. Please refer to Sections C.6.3.1 and C.6.3.2 of the Draft EIR for a discussion of solar energy technologies as part of the No Project Alternative. Among other environmental effects such as large land requirements and visual blight, the intermittent nature of solar power makes solar thermal and photovoltaic systems unsuitable for base-load applications, such as would be necessary to replace the power generated at SONGS. Therefore, while solar technologies are an important energy source, due to their intermittent nature, they are not a viable replacement for SONGS. CEQA does not address cost in the evaluation of the Proposed Project or alternatives, as noted in Draft EIR Section A. Please also see Response 13-1 for clarification on the purpose of the Proposed Project.