

4/16/2013  
78 FR 22576

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

6

As of: April 24, 2013  
Received: April 22, 2013  
Status: Pending Post  
Tracking No. 1jx-84xe-t8vc  
Comments Due: May 16, 2013  
Submission Type: Web

**Docket:** NRC-2013-0070

Application and Amendment to Facility Operating License Involving Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination

**Comment On:** NRC-2013-0070-0001

Application and Amendment to Facility Operating License Involving Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination; San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 2

**Document:** NRC-2013-0070-DRAFT-0003

Comment on FR Doc # 2013-08888

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Vern Cornell

**Address:**

4774 Renovo Way  
San Diego, CA, 92124

**Submitter's Representative:** Scott Peters

**Organization:** none

**Government Agency Type:** Federal

**Government Agency:** NRC

RECEIVED

2013 APR 24 AM 9:17

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
FEDERAL  
NRC

## General Comment

See attached file(s)

April 9th article on San Onofre <In the local paper..UTribune

Here is another article that Edison is again proposing running one of two reactors at 70%. We've been hearing this for almost a year...but NO action results.

We should be running one while replacing the tubes in the other, in sections of high-velocity, with larger-diameter tubes. And then bring it on at 99% while fixing the other one in a similar manner. What a waste of valuable assets. article end

Why does it take so long to get this very important, low-cost plant back onstream? Your process is too much of a burden. PLEASE ANSWER ME..!

Sincerely, Vern Cornell..San Diego

SUNSI Review Complete

Template = ADM - 013

E-RIDS= ADM-03

Add= B. Benney (b5b)

---

## Attachments

CA's 21...

VACornell1@Gmail.com

12/05/2012 04/29/2013

start

California's ISO, Independent System Operator, dispatches electricity for 85% of production. Its web:

[www.caiso.com](http://www.caiso.com)

is quite accurate. Renewables add up to between 7% and 16% daily, of total electricity usage, avg 10%...it is accurate.

The wide range 7-16% is due mainly to wind's variability, but wind's average contribution is 3 or 4%.

**Wind is the only path forward** if we want to get to 33%.

But it is costly, very costly, so is it worth it, when

we need little more electricity?

|             |         |  |                       |
|-------------|---------|--|-----------------------|
| Wind        | Wild    | 145                                      |                       |
| %-of Total, | daily   | days since start                         |                       |
| MWh         | variety |  |                       |
| >0          | 5%      | <see 1/8/20..LOW..!>                     | 1144MWh               |
| 1           | 15%     | <<wind is wild                           | or 0.18% of           |
| 2           | 15%     | one cannot depend on it                  | 621,833MWh..total     |
| 3           | 15%     | avg=3, or                                | or 2.3% of            |
| 4           | 15%     | avg=4                                    | 48,942MWh..renewables |
| 5           | 15%     |  |                       |
| 6           | 15%     |  |                       |
| 7           | 4%      |  |                       |
| <10.5%      | 1%      | << 12/26/2012(8.2%) and 1/10/2013(10.1%) |                       |
|             | 100%    | of time                                  | and 2/9/2013(10.5%)   |

| #####        | MWh   | <u>One day in the life of.....</u> |        |  |               | www.caiso.com | 12/26/2012   | 01/10/2013   | ##### |         |                    |
|--------------|-------|------------------------------------|--------|--|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|-------|---------|--------------------|
| Solar        | 3892  | 5.5%                               | 0.6%   | small variability  |               |               | MWh          | MWh          | MWh   |         |                    |
| Wind         | 25020 | 35.2%                              | 3.9%   | large variability, between near-zero and 10.5% see^^^above |               | 47,755        | 8.2%         | 63456        | 10.1% | 60,601  | 10.5%              |
| Small Hydro  | 9025  | 12.7%                              | 1.4%   | constant   |               |               | 1990MW..wind | 2644MW..wind |       | 2525    | ...wind            |
| Biogas       | 4414  | 13%                                | 0.7%   | constant   |               |               |              |              |       |         |                    |
| Biomass      | 8265  | 12%                                | 1.3%   | constant   |               |               |              |              |       |         | 2644               |
| Geothermal   | 20526 | 29%                                | 3.2%   | constant   |               |               |              |              |       |         |                    |
| ewablesTotal | 71142 | 100%                               | 11.2%  | varies between 7-19.3%                                     |               | 95113         | 16.0%        | 111019       | 17.6% | 111,057 | 19.30% <same total |
| Total MWh    |       |                                    | 634209 | somewhat larger than a typical day                         | <<26425MW avg | 593697        | 100%         | 630082       | 100%  | 575,306 | 100%               |
|              |       |                                    |        | (average might be 600,000)                                 |               |               |              |              |       |         |                    |

| ^from above^ | MW avg |      |     |                            |   |   |
|--------------|--------|------|-----|----------------------------|---|---|
| Hydro        | 2000   | 8%   | N-C | ..grows after dark         | <need explanation                               | CA's caiso has the information.                       |
| Imports      | 7800   | 30%  | C   | ..grows with need          | <need explanation                               | How much is hydro? <b>Why does CA import so much?</b> |
| Thermal      | 11460  | 43%  | C   | ..grows with need          | <need explanation                               | How much is natgas, how much coal?                    |
| Nuclear      | 2200   | 8%   | N-C | ..constant through 24/7... | San Onofre is off-stream (two of four reactors) |   |
| Renewables   | 2964   | 11%  | N-C | ..see table above          | <very well explained by CA's caiso              | <all in-State produced                                |
|              | 26424  | 100% |     |                            |   |   |

N-C = non-carbon electricity

|            | TWh/yr | <u>year 2008</u> | MWh/day      |               |     |                        |
|------------|--------|------------------|--------------|---------------|-----|------------------------|
| coal       | 44     | 15.5%            | 120,863      |               |     |                        |
| gas        | 133    | 46.5%            | 362,588      |               |     |                        |
| nuclear    | 42     | 14.9%            | 116,184      | four reactors |     |                        |
| hydro      | 25     | 8.6%             | 67,059       |               |     |                        |
| renewables | 38     | 13.5%            | 105,268      | 4386          | <MW | some from out of State |
|            | 285    | 100%             | 779,760      | 32490         | <MW | <???where              |
| imports-NW | 24     | 8.4%             | mostly hydro |               |     |                        |
| imp-SW     | 53     | 18.6%            | half coal    |               |     |                        |
| imp-total  | 77     | 27.0%            |              |               |     |                        |
| local      | 208    | 73.0%            |              |               |     |                        |
|            | 285    | 100.0%           |              |               |     |                        |

## 'Renewables' Vs 'Non-carbon Energy'

Renewables today are: Geothermal, Biomass, Biogas, Small hydro, Solar, and Wind...six energy sources that put no CO2 into the atmosphere. This is about 10- 11% of **California** daily usage, or 2500MW in 25,000MW.

At present, our two nuclear plants produce about 2200MW of electricity, or 8% of usage...and put no CO2 into the atmosphere. Since the only real purpose of Renewables is to knock-back carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, let's include nuclear as a seventh source. as it does the same thing. But let's go one step further and include large hydro as an eighth source. It comes in at 2000MW or 8% of usage. Total non-carbon is 27%.

**But don't we KNOW that added CO<sub>2</sub> increases photosynthesis?**

So isn't this whole thing a big hoax? And what the heck's

wrong with a little temp. increase?      Nothing.      <UT Ed Board

We're on our way to less carbon...with eight sources  
If we look at it this way, we go after the best of the eight.  
**Best concerns**=various costs, environmental damage, availability, reliability, backup needs, best&highest land use, facility life, all-in costs, decommissioning, need for infrastructure, need for utilities, reasonable life-time accounting, governmental tax or support, community support, tranmission needs, etc.

Below is confirming (?) evidence as to why we should be building a new Generation III reactor at San Onofre.  
Or two 600MW CCNGs, one in Victorville  
Or two 600MW clean coal plants  
And shutting down Wind and Solar.

Decide...you decide.  
  
<yes..I    cheapest in the long,long run    <UT Ed Board  
              (then Gen IV in the 2020s)

| <u>20 concerns</u>        | <u>reactor</u> | <u>wind</u>  | <u>CCNatGas</u> | <u>clean coal</u> | <u>ethanol gasoline from corn</u> |   |
|---------------------------|----------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
|                           | \$ 6,100       | \$ 6,700     | \$ 1,300        | \$ 3,300          |                                   | Donn's costs, per MW                                    |
|                           | \$ 7,320,000   | \$ 8,040,000 | \$ 1,560,000    | \$ 3,960,000      |                                   | <cost for 1200MW, millions                              |
| Initial cost-1            | 10 billion     | 10 billion   | 5 billion       | 8 billion         | 10billion                         | <my numbers are quite relative to Donn's                |
| long-term capital costs-2 | low            | high         | mid             | mid               | mid                               |   |
| operating costs-3         | tiny           | high         | low             | mid               | mid                               | are fuel costs included?                                |
| environmental damage-4    | little         | much         | little          | some              | large                             |   |
| availability-5            | constant       | wild         | high            | constant          | seasonal                          |   |
| reliability-6             | constant       | wild         | high            | high              | high                              | wild on an hourly basis                                 |
| backup needs-7            | none           | much         | none            | none              | little                            | <u>zero, now, to 5Billion for CCNG @ 33% renewables</u> |
| land use-8                | tiny           | large        | small           | large             | very large                        | including coal mines+railroads                          |
| facility life-9           | 60-80 years    | 12-15 years  | 30 years        | 30 years          | 30 years                          | renew propellor every 12-15 years                       |
| all-in-costs-10           | good for life  | renew        | renew at 30     | renew at 30       | renew at 30                       |   |
| decommissioning-11        | costly         | costly       | low             | low               | low                               |   |
| infrastructure needs-12   | little         | large        | little          | large             | large                             | coal needs rail transport                               |
| utility needs-13          | little         | some         | none            | little            | some                              |   |
| accounting needs-14       | little         | large        | some            | some              | some                              |   |
| produce tax?-15           | yes            | little       | yes             | yes               | no                                |   |
| support=governments-16    | taxed          | subsidies    | taxed           | taxed/hit         | subsidies                         | EPA gives a hit to coal                                 |
| community support-17      | yes            | yes/no       | yes             | yes/no            | yes/no                            | support near San Onofre for another reactor             |
| transmission needs-18     | little         | large        | some            | some              | some                              |   |
| CO2?=19                   | N-C            | N-C?         | some            | large             | some                              | backup carbon for wind                                  |
| emissions control-20      | some           | none         | small           | large             | some                              | coal must control emissions                             |
| GW is a hoax-then use -21 | yes            | no           | yes             | too costly        | no                                |   |
| affect food source-22     | no             | no           | no              | no                | disaster                          | 40% of corn to this                                     |
| operating factor-23       | 92%            | 20           | 60-85           | 80                | 80                                | CCNG is low <u>if used as backup, otherwise high</u>    |

**^^23 concerns^^**  
^^Compare a 1200MW reactor with 1200MW wind or 1200MW CCNG or 1200MW clean coal...^^  
Determine relative cost/benefit/damage of each of the 20 concerns?....  
....(and this isn't done here...)...except \$5billion at backup needs.It would be a very interesting calculation, discussion.  
at 92% operating factor vs 20% for wind vs 60-85% for CCNG vs 80% for clean coal/ethanol

**Because our AB32 isn't working California needs to commit to reality:**

So how do we do this?...get rid of AB32, of course, but:  
First..we should only buy the new electricity we need, no more  
Second..get away from the idea that CO2 is bad, because it  
enhances plant growth, and is not a pollutant.  
Third..look at the actual facts as presented by CA's watchdog:  
www.caiso.com We'll never reach 33%, don't try.  
Fourth..produce our own electricity..why 30% imports?

<UT Ed Board      Why imports, why not ourselves?

Thirty three need SO much backup; today's small amount doesn't...costly!  
<examine the 21 concerns and then buy CCNG, using CA shale natgas, short term,  
nuclear for the long, long term  
^UT Ed Board

**Why is getting to 33% renewables failing in CA?**

(It's at 18% and not moving upward fast enough.)  
One...we don't need more electricity  
Two..it's way too costly  
Three..it will not work  
Four..it's all a costly hoax      <CO2 in the atmos in increasing quantities is good.

**Now comes the possibility of cheap natgas from shale here in California.**

Buck should build in Victorville and along highway 14.

The Governor approved a law allowing 'fracking' in December. So the  
industry might now get started.  
Should we go for CCNG power plants...they're cheaper?  
And natgas is available here in CA regardless whether we get  
going with CA's shale deposits.  
Important is to find NGLs and oil in addition to gas

<<CCNG= Combined Cycle Natural Gas  
...a highly efficient plant to produce electricity

<UT Ed Board

Wall Street Journal...1/3/2013  
USA electricity increased up to 8%/year in the decades after WW2  
It increased 2-4% in the 1980-2000s, but now to 2040 will increase 0.6-0.7%/year

**We need no more electricity**      <UT Ed Board  
in California. It increased by  
8% per year in the 1950-1970s.  
By 2-4% in the 1980-1990s, and now  
by only 0.6-0.7% out to 2040.  
Let's slow down on enforcing  
the timing of AB32. Slow way down!  
It's way too expensive.  
And use CA shale-gas...it's cheap.      <BUCK  
Stop any subsidies.

Wall Street Journal ..1/5/2013 - Matt Ridley  
**How Fossil Fuels Have Greened the Planet**  
The story is enticing; satalites show that the  
amount of green vegetation has been  
increasing for three decades. And the  
inescapable conclusions are fossil fuels  
have caused this greening: 1st by displacing  
firewood, 2nd by warming the climate, and  
3rd by raising carbon dioxide levels, which  
raise plant growth rates.

<see WUWT 1/15/13

**AB32 is a disaster for two reasons:**

One..CARB's report: \$143billion  
in new taxes by 2020 because of law.  
Two..energy costs up 10-40%  
due to the law  
**The disaster**..CA doesn't need  
any new electricity, especially  
very-costly wind+solar.  
So: stop the tax and high costs,  
...and don't build.

< numbers from Brian Jones' 10/2/2013 letter  
He is totally against AB32. So is the editorial board of the U-T.  
And that is probably the best letter you hve ever written. Keep trying.  
email me at VACornell1@gmail.com  
do not phone 858-576-8541 as I'm very hard of hearing  
...but leave a message...

<UT Ed Board

www.Congress.org      < use this a lot...!  
Go to www.congress.org to find who the Fed4 are...names  
Go to www.congress.org to find who the CA4 are...names

Senator Feinstein's letter to me of 1/8/2013  
You said you will "keep my thoughts in mind"  
and "appriciate my support for expanding  
the use of Rrenewable energy."  
**But this isn't what I said I believe**  
renewable energies are way too costly,  
and can never be but a small part of  
our needs here in California. You didn't  
even bother to listen. Support you in Senate?

Michael Lieberman at AssemblyMember Brian Maienschein  
#####

Thursday, January 10, was the windest ever...  
I tried to light my barbeque, couldn't.  
California's wind farms produced 63,500 KWhours  
of electricity to the grid, some 10.1% of total used  
by the State. Compare this to 1150KWh two days  
earlier, or only 0.2%. This information from  
www.caiso.com CA's watchdog on 85%  
of electricity produced in the State. Both  
of these **extremes might be records.**

Re: "Ignoring History and AB32" editorial..U-T  
Why is California behind on electricity?  
We import 30% of needs.  
And prices at home are way too high.  
This: because we spend on costly Renewables.  
When we have Shale gas beyond ND's Bakken.  
**We have shale gas beyond belief.**  
We must develop this resource.  
We should move on this as Gov.Brown says.  
And eventually shutdown Wind and Solar.

Compare a 1200MW nuclear with 1200MW wind farm...

|   |   |            |
|---|---|------------|
|   | nuclear                                     | wind       |
| Initial cost  | 7.3billion                                  | 8.0billion |
| Reliability   | What is its avaiability over a day or year? |            |
| Op factor-%   | 92  | 20         |
| Supplies how many?  | 600,000                                     | 600,000?   |
| Nuclear supplies electricity all the time except during planned refueling, and emergencies  |   |            |
| Wind is erratic, between zero and name-plate, in energy to the grid...so it's there but     |   |            |
| twenty percent of the time. <u>Should it pay for its unreliability?</u> Pay for the backup? |   |            |
| How to allocate...caiso responsibility?...  |   |            |
| The actual invoices that get paid are small for wind...20% of nameplate                     |   |            |
| But CA subsidizes wind construction....reasonable?  |   |            |

<Montana?

<go caiso and see these two days >>

<BUCK

...beyond Bakken and TX Ford combined  
NatGas plants, as needed, then nuclear

|  |                       |
|--|-----------------------|
| < I even believe <b>this</b> if shutdown costs are right.        | ...eventually, 2030s? |
| ...there is a bit of environmental damage from wind and solar... |                       |
| ...it's not needed and costs way too much...                     | <see line 149         |

<Donn's numbers

Wind varies from zero to 105% over hours...average, 20 for a year

...then compare at operating factor

Certainly NOT..!

Diane Feinstein's letter, answer to her beliefs:  
One..she's for "clean energy". This is not only  
Wind/Solar, her belief, but other clean energys.  
(Say nuclear, CCNG plants from natgas, maybe even  
clean coal if you believe CO2 helps the atmos and  
plant growth, and thus, us.) But she doesn't.  
Two..CA should get to 33% renewables. This is totally  
impossible using Wind/Solar, because of backup needs.  
It's very, very costly, and CA needs little more.  
Three..Dianne trusts CARB which agency says  
we're at 18% renewables now. Yet CA's watchdog...  
www.caiso.com ...says it's 10%....w/o imports  
California's people know these things , and will support  
Gov. Brown's approval to develop CA's large shale  
area, 100,000 square miles, for oil and gas.  
CA should move in Brown's direction.

Ignorance and Party

We import nearly all Wind

<UT Ed Board

<UT Ed Board

< wow...that's nuclear

< wow...damn poor

< yes, add that to the \$10billion <UT Ed Board

Yes, let's say Wind is near-zero for a week. It whould  
pay for back-up to its year-long op factor, say 20%.  
120MWfarm x 0.2 x 10C/KWh x 1000KWh/MW or,

Why should subscribes pay higher bills?...when lessor costs are available?  
Environmental damage?

One nuclear plant at 1200MW...in a small area.  
vs 1200/2MW each = 600 tall towers on XXX acres...wind  
They cost the same, yet the propellors last 12-15years..the reactor 60-80.  
How chose?...costs/ environment?...Use 21 Concerns, above. Put a price-tag on each.

| CA million barrels per year of oil refined |              |      |      |       |
|--|--------------|------|------|-------|
|  | 1985         |      | 1990 | 2011  |
| foreign                                    | 40           | 6%   | 40   | 5.6%  |
| Alaska                                     | 240          | 35%  | 335  | 47.2% |
| California                                 | 400          | 59%  | 335  | 47.2% |
|  | 680          | 100% | 710  | 100%  |
|  | 1,863,013 bd |      |      |       |

**How to get drilling going in California?**  
CA gets 38% of its oil for transportation from in-state Operators.  
It gets only 12% of natgas from in-state Operators. Why so low?  
We have not, yet, taken advantage of our shale resources.  
They are very large, bigger than ND's Bakken and TX's Eagle Ford, combined. Our in-state oil/gas operators are fully capable of moving forward on this. Let's promote them.  
Let's get drilling going...! The system, pipelines, is there to use both oil and natgas,...so let's go.

Ladies and Gentlemen: ...of the Assembly... **Maienschein talking...**  
Today I want to talk about an opportunity we have here in California that can produce real prosperity, real money, for our State.  
I will talk about the oil and gas potential in our Monterey Shale deposits, which are very, very big on any scale. Listen...!  
It's fortunate that we have an excellent in-State internet site to understand this  
you use this site to study our situation and our potential. From it you can see that...  
CA gets 38% of its oil for transportation from in-state Operators....Good

We have not, yet, taken advantage of our shale resources.  
They are very large, bigger than ND's Bakken and TX's Eagle Ford, combined. Our in-state oil/gas operators are fully capable of moving forward on this. Let's promote them. Let's get drilling going...!  
The system, our pipelines, is there to accept both oil and natgas,...so let's go.  
Doing this will create many jobs, permanent jobs, and reduce our unemployed. It will bring prosperity to California.  
And what is really interesting is that by drilling this stuff, you get both oil and gas.  
We need to make it easier for these Operators by:

- 1...approve fracking procedures, those that are 'safe.'...straight forward, we know what they are.
  - 2...contact the Operators, what do you need?
  - 3...contact Gov. Perry's oil/gas friends in Texas...come join us.
- We should move along on this... **do I have a vote?**...on what I want us to do which is :
- a...  
b... Michael...fill this in...

120x0.2x\$0.10x1000=\$2400/day for that week.  
Above 20% this wind-farm would get a free ride.  
Is this fair? Paying nothing does not seem fair.  
\$2400 x 365/2 = \$438,000 per year, or \$4,380,000 for 1200MW

|           |               |      |         |
|-----------|---------------|------|---------|
| top 20    | 10            | 0.02 | 210240  |
| 20        | 20            | 0.04 | 420480  |
| 20        | 40            | 0.08 | 840960  |
| 20        | 20            | 0.04 | 420480  |
| bottom 20 | 10            | 0.02 | 210240  |
| ^ time    | ^ % of op fac | 0.2  | 2102400 |

2102400 MWh/yr  
5760 MWh/day  
240 MW  
1200 Capacity

www.energyalmanac.ca.gov  
This source says we have 69,709 MW of capacity. Yet in 2009 we used 23,401 MW average for the year. Total capacity is in 1008 plants for that large total.  
^^is this true?

<UT Ed Board...  
did you recognize this?

<BUCK

<BUCK

<fed4Feb14  
<CA4Feb15

Michael Liebermann...this was just sent to your boss...enjoy  
Maienschein, Assemblyman  
....a smaller version...

<UT Editorial Board...MOVE!

c...  
d...

Note...one can talk quite a bit about the good job the Operators do on the 38%...they are ready..  
...the 38% is respectable...but we can go way beyond this...

What can I do to help Maeinschein get his speech, his efforts, meaningful?  
(...if he choses to get California's Shale in Monterey drilled.....)

**Sempra Oil and Gas Corp?**  
A new venture in California...  
Should Sempra buy a small CA oil company,as foundation., and  
then a Texas oil company that knows 'fracking'...to get going  
here in our Monterey Shale?  
YES, Yes, yes...!

UT editorial March 3, 2013 .."State Goes Green, but Neglects the Basics" <wrong?

You guys are overdoing it a bit here.  
Let's put emphasis in the right places, as your editorial "The Energy Revolution" does <UTEditorial Board  
in the very same edition. ...take another look  
Look at line 208 above. This source says we have 69,709MW of capacity.  
Yet average use was 23,401MW. The lights will not go out, as you suggest.  
You say California has 44% more capacity. The above source says it's  
298%. Aren't there extremes here? Take another look.

In 2011 we used 23401MW of electricity yet we have a 69,709MW capacity. <Fed4Mar8  
This information from [www.energyalmanac.ca.gov](http://www.energyalmanac.ca.gov) <State4Mar8  
Why keep pressing Wind and Solar? At large costs? When CA has <3NewspapersMar8  
plenty of extra capacity? We will never have a blackout, nor a brownout.  
Should investors construct more plants? Sure, if they can make money.  
But, NO subsidies! And our watchdog [www.caiso.com](http://www.caiso.com)  
...our watchdog will use their electricity at the right price.  
Want to bet? With or w/o subsidies? There will be failures, a lot

March 16 Opinion Article.."Using Solar Power'  
"Profits depend on building more generating  
plants...." "...and what if those rooftop...plants  
didn't use any fossil fuels?.." Wrong.  
UT Editorial people  
...why do you promote such articles...?...  
...w/o allowing a rebuttal article..?...  
The truth is that solar electricity is so dated, daytime only,

that we need fossil plants to back them up. They're  
unreliable.  
"...neighborhood power plants..." are very expensive.  
They increase the average customer's costs a lot.  
"...building gas-powered plants on vanishing ...space..."  
What baloney. They occupy very tiny spaces. But Solar  
uses very large spaces. So...wrong,again.  
"...they claim their power is more reliable and will cost  
less..." This is true...solar is very expensive, is a fungus  
on monthly bills.  
"...stop building 20th century power plants..." Of course, true.  
We need no more 20th nor 21st...ones. California has enough,  
Re: Using Solar Power <UTLetters on March 18  
"It is proven the most cost-effective  
investment, creating the most <sent UTEditorial people 3/18/13  
sustainable, long-term jobs is the whole damn thing was sent..  
energy efficiency and neighborhood  
solar.." No one would argue with  
efficiency; it always comes in at  
low cost. But all studies, all, that I have  
seen place Solar as the MOST expensive;  
and its day-time only avails must be  
backed up, another cost unrecognized.  
Let's go with our country's 104 Nuclear



now...build no more. But do not build solar that needs backup.  
And which then adds to costs.  
"...the sun is beating down and Solar provides electricity  
in the afternoon for air conditioning..." Fine, but how about winter?  
**Solar isn't needed** but must be allowed into the system...**forced in.**  
This increases my monthly electricity statement...and yours.  
"...solar is the most cost-effective, long-term jobs producing..."  
Wrong. It is expensive. And it is unneeded. And few jobs.

April 9th article on San Onofre  
Here is another article that Edison is again proposing  
running one of two reactors at 70%. We've been  
hearing this for almost a year...but NO action results.  
We should be running one while replacing the tubes  
in the other, in sections of high-velocity, with larger-diameter  
tubes. And then bring it on at 99% while fixing the other one  
in a similar manner. **What a waste of valuable assets.**

Art: go to [www.caiso.com](http://www.caiso.com) ...and check on yesterday's wind...click on it..lower left  
...on This wind electricity is from Montana..85%..not California  
19-Apr We had wind yeasterday..reason for leaves on tennis court this morning.  
Art went off to the UK...and does not want anything to do with this...for two weeks...

Reactors at 2C per KWh Vs 15C/KWh  
for Solar. **Mr. Powell is wrong.**  
Bring San Onofre back soon.

<<see above^^

<UT Editorial Board? to UT Letters?

**Published in UT Letters (Apr10?)**  
Same day a Section B front-page article says 70% ok,  
but need more public input first. NRC is SO slow..  
NRC is SO slow..! NRC is SO slow..!  
NRC is SO slow..! NRC is SO slow..!  
NRC is SO slow..! NRC is SO slow..!