

EDO Principal Correspondence Control

FROM: DUE: 03/24/05 EDO CONTROL: G20050149
DOC DT: 02/09/05
FINAL REPLY:

Representative Randy "Duke" Cunningham
(DOE Referral)

TO:

Annette Vietti-Cook

FOR SIGNATURE OF : ** GRN ** CRC NO: 05-0108

Reyes, EDO

DESC:

San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (Harriet
Pellar)

ROUTING:

Reyes
Virgilio
Kane
Merschhoff
Silber
Dean
Burns/Cyr
Mallet, RIV

DATE: 03/03/05

ASSIGNED TO: CONTACT:

NRR

Dyer

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS OR REMARKS:

Templat: SECY-017

Elids: SECY-01

RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM
50TH DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEES:
DEFENSE

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN
SERVICES, AND EDUCATION

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE
ON INTELLIGENCE



001425

PLEASE RESPOND TO:
 2350 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-0550
(202) 225-5452
(202) 225-2558 FAX

613 WEST VALLEY PARKWAY
SUITE 320
ESCONDIDO, CA 92025
(858) 755-8382
(760) 737-8438
(760) 737-9132 FAX

E-MAIL VIA WEB SITE:
<http://www.house.gov/cunningham>

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-0550

February 9, 2005

The Honorable Spencer Abraham
Secretary
Department Of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Room 7A-257
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Secretary Abraham:

Enclosed please find an opinion from my constituent, Harriet Pellar. My constituent has expressed concern regarding San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station. Because of the specific nature of this concern, I believe your office would be best suited to answer this properly.

I have sent a letter to the constituent advising of the referral to you. I hope that you will be able to provide timely assistance.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Dusty Strawn in my Washington office.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

Randy "Duke" Cunningham
Member of Congress

RDC:ds

1/16/05

To: Congressman Randy Cunningham

From: Harriet Pellar

(Mrs. Marshall Pellar)

7224 Spoonbill Ln.

Carlsbad, Ca. 92009-5016

Re: REQUEST TO SHUT DOWN

SAN ONOFRE

NUCLEAR POWER PLANT

Dear Duke:

Our family requests
your prompt attention on the
enclosed list of reasons
for terminating this threat.

Your reply would be
appreciated.

Yours cordially,
Harriet Pellar

Shut down San Onofre

To the Editor:

Right now, San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, is in a bad way. Nearly everything in the whole facility is cracking apart. It is embrittled, frail, old. Its bones are hardened. Its arteries are clogged and stiff. It keeps popping and puffing, bursting and spilling, leaking, spraying, steaming, venting, dripping, gushing, pouring out poisons into our environment.

The tritium released from the plant alone is a major environmental concern for swimmers and surfers in the water up and down the coast from the plant. Tritium is absorbed by the body everywhere, because chemically, it is just radioactively altered water. Tritium has a half-life of about 12 years and while it does occur naturally, there is no good reason on Earth to increase the dose to people.

In the course of its daily operation the plant also releases Cesium-137, Strontium-90, uranium, plutonium (both in a variety of isotopes) and more than 200 other radioactive "daughter products" of the nuclear reaction. The nuclear industry and the lame-duck, industry-flunky "regulators" who watch it assert that these releases are harmless. It is foolhardy to agree with them when so many of the mechanisms for damage by radioactivity are well-known in the scientific community and undeniable to any unbiased observer.

When the nuclear industry started promoting its dogma about how clean nuclear power was, far fewer of these facts were established, such as the role of "free-radicals" in the creation of cancer. Now, these things are much better known, but the entire nuclear industry refuses to acknowledge these issues. They still try to convince people that a little of their radiation, scattered into your body randomly through pollution, might even be good for you. It isn't. One atomic decay inside your body can directly destroy 20,000 of those chemical bonds — creating tritium inside your body, for instance, or breaking apart a delicate protein — the structure of life. One damaged DNA strand can lead to fetal deformities or cancer.

San Onofre's "steam generators" need to all be replaced — two per plant, two plants — total cost: estimated conservatively by the company at about \$600 million — it will probably be a lot more. And they'll have to slice into the uni-body "containment dome" to do the replacement, seriously and permanently weakening that structure. And the replacement parts, unlike the originals (which were never supposed to need to be replaced, but they aged much more rapidly than expected), won't even be made in America, subject to American inspections, or made to American standards of quality (what's left of those standards, anyway).

San Onofre's "water heaters" also all need to be replaced (about 30 per unit). Cost? Just another \$7 million for each plant, but there's more:

Pipes have been cracking — probably they all need to be replaced, too (especially if the recent accident in Japan that killed five workers teaches us anything). That's a couple more hundred million dollars that could go to renewable energy solutions instead.

Strapping for crane lifts has gotten old and failed. This reportedly cost over \$5 million to fix.

The plant is a wreck waiting to happen. Radiation ages things (including humans). Salty air destroys most metals. San Onofre is breaking down far faster than "industry standards" because many nukes in America use fresh-water lakes and rivers for coolant. Not San Onofre — it uses sea water.

But despite San Onofre's accelerated aging, the plant's owners are usually behind the eight ball when it comes to repairing things. "Let it fail, then fix it quietly" seems to be their operating motto.

Even fork lift tines have dropped suddenly, due to aging. That should never happen.

Transformers have exploded because they were old, throwing shards of glass onto the nearby railway and freeway (they are so close!). Old breakers have exploded and burned, causing hundred-million dollar outages. (But in keeping with their motto, the 130-or so similar breakers were not replaced.)

Workers have been exposed to radiation. Releases to the public have occurred, and there have even been threats of domestic sabotage directed against the plant — for example, from an extremely well-armed disgruntled worker who knew the plant intimately because he had broad access privileges before being demoted and eventually fired.

It's time to shut San Onofre down. Its power is replaceable. Our land and our lives are not.

The choice to keep San Onofre's twin reactors generating 500 pounds of extremely toxic waste every day because we are too lazy to build large-scale renewable energy systems is a deadly sin we should stop committing.

But even if we did not convert to renewable energy, consider this: It's fairly easy to prove that nuclear power does not generate any "net" energy whatsoever, anyway. That's reason enough right there to get rid of the plants. This assertion stems from the incredibly energy-intensive processes need to mine and refine uranium into fuel, as well as construction costs (and reconstruction

costs), and dismantling costs. But there are even more costs — for example, the energy that will be needed to take care of the waste for the next million years, including the dismantled pieces and the "spent" fuel. Such equations also ignore any energy expended on caring for the millions of sick and dying that would result from a serious nuclear accident.

Nuclear energy is a financial rat-hole as well as a terrorist's primary target. San Onofre makes money only for its immediate owners, who are practically given uranium fuel by the U.S. Government, which also promises (but so far has failed) to take it away after it has been turned into radioactive waste (at great profit) by Southern California Edison.

San Onofre can and should be shut down now. While operating, it is thousands of times more vulnerable to terrorism or forces of nature than when it is shut down, even though the fuel will still be there long after the last watt of electricity is produced, and it will still be a danger. But it's much more dangerous now, and now is a perfect time to cut our losses.

Russell Hoffman
Carlsbad



Department of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

February 23, 2005

Ms. Annette Vietti-Cook
Executive Secretariat
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1 White Flint North Building
11555 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20852

Dear Ms. Vietti-Cook:

Because the subject of the attached letter does not fall within the purview of the Department of Energy, we are forwarding it to your agency for response.

If you have any questions, please call me on (202) 586-8923.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Brenda Mackall".

Brenda L. Mackall

Work Group Leader

Correspondence and Records Management

Office of the Executive Secretariat

