

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

<b>As of:</b> 9/1/15 5:10 PM
<b>Received:</b> August 31, 2015
<b>Status:</b> Pending_Post
<b>Tracking No.</b> 1jz-8kv8-tjk4
<b>Comments Due:</b> August 31, 2015
<b>Submission Type:</b> Web

**Docket:** NRC-2009-0552

Notice of Receipt and Availability of Application for Renewal of Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant License

**Comment On:** NRC-2009-0552-0026

Diablo Canyon Power Plant, Units 1 and 2; Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement

**Document:** NRC-2009-0552-DRAFT-0084

Comment on FR Doc # 2015-15921

*7/1/2015  
60 FR 37664*

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Oliver Mellan

**Address:**

285 9th St.

San Francisco, CA, 94103

**Email:** olivermellan@gmail.com



RECEIVED

2015 SEP -1 PM 5:29

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

## General Comment

Thank you for hearing the voices of the public. There truly are some very bright minds in northern California and I believe that the world is benefiting greatly by the ideas generated here.

I have reviewed the license renewal proposal for the Diablo Canyon Nuclear power plant and I must say that while the studies are very extensive, they omit large amounts of information that would act as a good insight into the necessity and risk of this plant.

I was in Fukushima this past January and was told by many people that the beaches on that coast are "only for looking now"  
What was once a very active beach community is now contaminated. In the economic impact assessment of Diablo Canyon, there is a large amount of land taken into consideration in the unfortunate event of a leak or meltdown, but nowhere did I see any assessment of the economic or environmental impacts on the ocean. If California were to lose its beach culture, there would be billions of dollars lost, not to mention one of the best prides of this state.  
Fukushima Daiichi today is still releasing waste water into the ocean.

We must learn from Fukushima. That is why I traveled there and have been researching the intricacies of this disaster. I have found many similarities between TEPCO and PG&E in regards to operation safety standards and disregards for outside requests to improve safety.

*E-RFDs = ADM-03  
Call = m. ventral (mwr)*

*SUNST Belton Campbell  
Telephone = ADM-1013*

I searched through the entire License renewal and the sources that were used to put that document together and to my dismay, found that none of the sources referenced were published after 2011.

! That seems incredible !

There have been so many developments, realizations, and publications written about powerplants, safety, and the economic impact written after the meltdown at Fukushima in 2011.

## THE NEW PLANT!

If PG&E wants to stay relevant in a rapidly changing society, they must realize that their biggest service to offer is not electricity itself, but the infrastructure. When they focus on that, they will succeed greatly as a company.

There are currently so many amazing technologies being developed in the sustainable energy industry that it would be advantageous for PG&E to stop the renewal attempt on these old reactors that are clearly in safety question and repurpose that land to a multi-source power plant.

Some ideas for a repurposing of the power plant land are:

Solar Fields

Ocean Geothermal Power

Tidal generators

The onsite desalination system could be put to use making drinking water for the surrounding communities instead of of 675,000 gallons a day it creates to run through the plant and feed back into the ocean.

This power plant is old and if added up since it's opening, it is one of the most widely opposed nuclear power plants. I urge the NRC to recognize the massive communities that are against this and that if there is an accident at the plant, every single member of the NRC will be to blame for relicensing this plant. There are currently lawsuits against Japanese government regulators and TEPCO power officials that put the blame of the meltdown onto them ignoring requests like this to shut the plant down.

I hope we can all learn from Fukushima.

Thankyou for not issuing a new license for the plant.