

RAS 6192

DOCKET NUMBER
PROD. & UTIL. FAC. 72-26-ISFSI

DOCKETED
USNRC

March 26, 2003 (2:49PM)

WRITTEN STATEMENT
DIABLO CANYON
INDEPENDENT SPENT FUEL STORAGE INSTALLATION PROCEEDINGS
OFFICE OF SECRETARY
RULEMAKINGS AND
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

USE THIS FORM TO SUBMIT A WRITTEN LIMITED APPEARANCE STATEMENT TO THE LICENSING BOARD.

DATE: 3/24/02 SESSION (Please check): Morning; Afternoon; Evening

NOTE TO: Judge Bollwerk
Judge Kline
Judge Lam

FROM: Klaw Schumann + Jay Adams
(Green Party)
Address: 26 Hillcrest Drive
Paso Robles, Ca. 93446
Email: jayklaw@msn.com.

Attached

Signed: _____

San Luis Obispo (SLO) GREEN Party Comments

to

**the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
-Atomic Safety and Licensing Board-**

in the matter of

**Diablo Canyon Power Plant Spent Fuel Storage Installation
[Docket No. 72-26-ISFSI; ASLBP No. 02-801-01-ISFSI]**

at

**the public meeting in San Luis Obispo, California,
March 24th, 2003**

by

**Jay Adams, Ph. D., Member of the SLO GREEN Party County Council
and SLO GREENS Steering Committee
and**

**Klaus Schumann, Chair of the SLO GREENS Subcommittee on High
Level Radioactive Waste at Diablo**

**Contact: Klaus Schumann, 26 Hillcrest Drive, Paso Robles, Ca. 93446; (805) 238-
4454; jayklaus@msn.com**

We refer to all of our previous comments and submissions and ask that all be made part of
the records

SLO GREEN Party Comments

The GREEN Party is the largest political party on Earth. We are active in over 90 countries and on all five continents. Naturally, there is a wide diversity of opinion and expression. But when it comes to nuclear power, GREEN parties everywhere on Earth speak with one clear voice:

Phase out nuclear power now and stop producing the dreadful radioactive wastes.

How much sense does it make to continue with a technology which benefits just one or two generations but then burdens the next 12,000 with safeguarding the extremely toxic radioactive wastes !?! Without taxpayer subsidies, bail-outs, "recovery of stranded costs" and similar schemes, nuclear power cannot compete with benign and sustainable energy sources. Why continue to expose the residents of our planet to the risk of nuclear catastrophe if other forms of energy production are readily available?

As Ralph Nader said: "Nuclear power is the only form of generating electricity which requires an evacuation plan. There are less risky, more economical and certainly more environmentally benign ways to just boil water".

Furthermore, since 9/11, it has become clear that the plants are also a threat to National Security as well as a threat to the safety and health of anyone living within 500 miles of any of the nations 65 plant sites. In addition, at Diablo, there is the continuous damage to our marine environment.

Therefore, the SLO GREEN Party strongly urges:

Phase out Diablo NOW. Two thirds of the radioactive waste problem can still be avoided.

For the already accumulated waste, we recommend the concept of "robust storage" as developed by Dr. Gordon Thompson, which combines low density pools with fortified and dispersed dry casks. ["Robust Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel: A Neglected Issue of Homeland Security", January 2003; a report commissioned by CITIZENS AWARENESS NETWORK]

The SLO GREEN Party is particularly disappointed in your decision regarding the contentions of the local intervener groups. We agree with California State Attorney General Bill Lockyer, who describes your decision as "deficient and troubling". In fact, you have chosen not to even consider the merits of all but one of the contentions. You reject several well reasoned contentions on highly questionable legalistic grounds as correctly outlined by California's Attorney General. [Letter to Richard A. Meserve, chair NRC, dated 2/28/03].

Moreover, we find it especially offensive that you rejected the contentions on earthquake and terrorism with the absurd excuse that you were unable to calculate the risks in mathematical terms. If this is indeed so, then you had every obligation to order full hearings on the issues in question. After all, your explicit mission is to regulate the industry in the interest of public health and safety, NOT to protect the bottom line of the industry. That is precisely and by law the difference between you and the old Atomic Energy Commission. Where does your approach leave the health and safety of the people? Clearly, you have it upside down.

The SLO GREEN Party demands that you hold full hearings on all intervener contentions.

The present administration in Washington has made it abundantly clear that it views nuclear plants as prime terrorist targets. It has also indicated that the present war might only be the first of many.

According to the

New Year's poll conducted by the Associated Press, two out of three Americans believe that wars against terrorism overseas will trigger terrorist attacks at home. Your own studies indicate that, in worst case scenarios, large parts of this County could become permanently uninhabitable. Moreover, fatal, radiation-induced cancers could kill thousands of people as far away as 500 miles from the site. In this type of risk environment and with these kinds of ramifications, you must side with the people, NOT with corporate interests.

Fortunately, all these risks are completely avoidable. Improved energy efficiency and conservation and a switch to renewable forms of energy, as advocated by the GREEN Party, would generate no lethal wastes at all, and create far more jobs, a boom in the economy and a more diversified tax base in the county. The National Environmental Policy Act requires consideration of a "no project alternative". Yet so far, we have not seen any evidence that you are even contemplating sensible alternatives. PG&E's proposals are flawed, unsafe and risky. The industry has never fulfilled its promise to deliver "power too cheap to meter" and has broken its promise that its deadly wastes would be no problem. Instead we are now told that 9 times more will be stored on our coast than when the plant was first licensed and built. Residents of SLO county continue to pay 50% more for their electricity than the national average. Worst of all, PG&E proposals would leave the vulnerable "spent fuel" pools at capacity and "high density" for as long as the plant operates. With re-licensing, that would be for another half a century. These pools are located outside of the containment area and will contain 20 times as much Cesium 137 as was released in the Chernobyl accident. Remember, it was Cesium 137 which caused most of the off-site contamination at Chernobyl. Cesium 137 is a strong emitter of lethal gamma rays and has the consistency of talcum powder. It is therefore easily dispersed over a vast area. Your own studies show that much if not all of this isotope would be released into the environment in the event of a pool fire. Clean-up and health care costs would amount to hundreds of BILLIONS of dollars.

Finally, we would like to quote the renowned nuclear scientist Arjun Makhijani, who stated in May '99: **"The time at which a nuclear power plant runs out of storage space for spent fuel is an appropriate time to consider alternatives to its continued operation, since building new storage requires significant new regulatory and economic decisions."**

["Short- and Medium-Term Management of Highly Radioactive Wastes in the United States", in IEER: Energy & Security No. 9 / Science for Democratic Action V7N3, page 5]

That time at Diablo is NOW.

End of Comments