

May 31, 2005

Andrew Barnsdale
Project Manager of
CPUC c/o Aspen Environment Group

Dear Andrew,

I am a resident of San Clemente & I'm concerned about the possibility of trying to extend the life of the nuclear reactors as suggested by Edison, instead of using a combination of other energy resources such as solar, tidal & wind.

THESE REACTORS NEED TO BE SHUT DOWN, NOT EXTENDED!

San Onofre is especially vulnerable to terrorist attacks.

It is relatively close to the Mexican border where people stream into our country every day unnoticed. It is within close proximity to Camp Pendleton, a major base for our military. And it is mid way between two populated & very wealthy cities, San Diego & Los Angeles. This makes San Onofre a good, & easy target for terrorists for a number of reasons.

Also, after seeing what happened with the terrible tragedy of the tsunami victims. It strikes me as being unnecessarily dangerous to have a nuclear power plant on the edge of the Pacific Ocean in a place of America where earthquakes are expected. Nobody knows when the next big earthquake will occur but they know that it is due anytime & that it will be of large magnitude to relieve the pressure off of the San Andreas Fault. Our community is vulnerable to liquefaction & major damage is likely. The power plant is built on sand! We know we are due for a large earthquake & that damage is inevitable especially along our beaches and in our cities where high rise buildings are. That makes San Onofre especially vulnerable. If damage occurred to the tanks in an earthquake it might be impossible to get it fixed in the hours that follow. We have only ONE road, one artery of transportation, which is the 5 freeway. I think it is safe to say the possibility of damage to that freeway is highly likely! People in the tsunami areas knew the potential of a tsunami was there, they just didn't think it would ever happen to them. This is no place to have a nuclear power plant!

The world has changed since 9-11.

San Onofre is a vulnerable place for terrorists because of its location.

It is also vulnerable to damage from a major earthquake due to its location.

The reactors are old and worn out. They don't need to be revived. They need to be removed.

S.D.Gas & Electric's idea to use solar, wind, geothermal and other alternate energies is what all nuclear power plants should be converting to. We need alternate forms of energy that are good for our environment. California has always been a leader in innovative ways to protect the environment & lead the country into tomorrow. We have that opportunity now.

Edison must adopt the renewable track of SDGE. Please SAVE our communities.

Lisa Weiss (resident of San Clemente)

May 25,2005

CPUC

Comments on Draft EIR

Proposed San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station Steam Generator
Replacment Project

My name is Wendy Morris and I am the CREED liasion to the Surfrider Foundations South Orange County Chapter.

I am against the replacement of the steam generators at Songs. The replacment would serve to extend the life of this facility. California should be replacing potentially extemely hazardous nuclear energy technology with clean, abundant renewable energy production.

I agree with San Diego Gas and Electric and other owners of SONGS that the \$680 million price tag to extend the life of nuclear energy production at Songs is too expensive. The money would be much better spent on renewable energy production.

I ask that for the comparisons between the replacement/rebuild proposal and the alternative of the sustainable energy resources be drawn into the EIR.

A thorough comparision of the wide range of benefits of renewable energy production versus the dangers of the radioactive waste of nuclear energy production must be shown in the EIR to provide a viable document.

I also have other reasons for wanting an end to the nuclear facility at Songs. All of the following ides need to be adequately addressed and resolved in the EIR.

1.Currently there is no facility to accept the nuclear waste from SONGS. So the radioactive waste is stored on site. This storage is a prime target for terrorist.

2. The facility was not designed for the long term stoage of nuclear waste that is curently going on . Since the waste is not leaving, it should be considered long term storage.

3. In case of an acccident, terrorist attack or other emergency the adjacent residents could not evacuate the area. The evacutaion plan is a joke.

4. The harm to the environment that is ongoing with the day to day operations of using 2.4 billion gallons of seawater per day needs to end sooner, not later. I object to the DEIR using the current environmental condition as a baseline to compare this project. That comparision is misleading. The comparision should be made to the environmental condition of the area previous to the building of the nuclear power plant. This is a shifting of the baseline. The continued damage to the environment has cumulative impacts. These impacts should be included in the

comparison with renewable energy alternatives.

5. There are now many warnings about eating fish in the higher levels of the food chain. Is this a result of the release of small amounts of toxic chemicals? I ask that the assessment of chemical/toxic waste streams in which zero tolerance chemicals are disposed into the ocean needs to be addressed. This dilution contends that large quantities of water can dilute lethal chemicals acceptable. This is a 'delusion of dilution'. The quantities of these chemicals are small, but still exist. As they enter and go up the food chain they concentrate. Thereby, their quantity in the food chain ever increases. This concentration of chemicals has resulted in the current warnings we have about eating many types of fish.

6. The ability, hazards and cost to dispose of the nuclear waste should be included in this EIR. The true disposal costs need to be added in when comparing the cost of nuclear energy production to renewable energy production. It doesn't matter whose jurisdiction it is, the disposal costs need to be included. They are part of the total costs of nuclear energy.

Signed,



Wendy Morris
2310 Plaza A La Playa
San Clemente, CA 92672