



ALLIANCE FOR NUCLEAR RESPONSIBILITY

PO Box 1328
San Luis Obispo, CA 93406
www.a4nr.org
rochelle@a4nr.org

September 10, 2010

Gregory B. Jaczko, Chairman
c/o Annette L. Vietti-Cook, Secretary of the Commission
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Mail Stop O-16G4
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Dear Chairman Jaczko,

The Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility would like to thank the NRC for hosting the recent Seismic Information Workshop in San Luis Obispo. We would like the NRC to consider this workshop "Phase one" of an "open and transparent" process to collaborate with local and state representatives and agencies.

The month before the Alliance met with you last March, we read had one of your speeches in which you quoted Ben Franklin. We may have already mentioned this, but we know you will agree it's worth repeating:

"it takes many good deeds to build a good reputation, and only one bad one to lose it."

The NRC's reputation on earthquakes and Diablo is historically tarnished. There may be disagreement on the reasons why, or how tarnished it really is, but there is a well-documented record to support the claim that the NRC's seismic credibility falters in California.

The information provided at the NRC seismic workshop was valuable to our community and to all in attendance, though there is little doubt it left more questions than answers. However, we believe those questions will now be more informed and the process will be better for expertise provided to and from all stakeholders. We thank the NRC for this *first* step in repairing the trust that has been damaged. Now we ask you to take the next step.

Collaborate with local and state appointed agency representatives and experts to review PG&E's AB 1632 seismic studies and mapping. Our community was been given a chance to listen and question those who may be involved in the peer-review and/or an NRC or PG&E seismic review. Therefore there was a great deal of value in this NRC meeting if it is "Phase one" and the NRC commits to regaining its reputation over seismic oversight in California.

In the denial of our request for a stay, our proposal for the NRC to approach seismic issues differently and in collaboration with state agencies was not addressed. There is some confusion over the origin of this Seismic Information Workshop, but the sparse attendance of this local community was not a reflection of disinterest. The NRC did make an effort to include

some jurisdictional agencies, but the outreach effort to local decision-makers was woefully inadequate. The NRC would have benefited in seeking input from either the Alliance or PG&E's advance team to better reach out and inform Californians. The Alliance offers to assist outreach in Phase 2.

The NRC's collaborative efforts to ensure AB 1632 and AB 42 seismic requirements are resolved would be in the best interest of all stakeholders. In his Opening Remarks at the NRC's workshop, our newly elected senator expressed appreciation for the workshop held in his community and expressed his willingness to work with the NRC to review PG&E's completed studies. California Energy Commission (CEC) vice-chairman James Boyd made the same offer in a letter submitted at Thursday's session, and the California Coastal Commission has already notified the NRC relicensing staff of the seismic requirements and studies needed to meet the state/federal consistency review. The Alliance encourages the NRC to accept these offers to collaborate with the state's peer-review panel once PG&E completes the seismic requirements needed to insure safe, reliable and cost effective future electric generation.

The Alliance views the willingness of the NRC to provide seismic experts in California as a valuable step towards beginning a collaborative process. At this recent workshop, many stakeholders were able to meet for the first time. We also thank you for inviting the CEC to present an overview of the history and the status of California's seismic requirements. From the candid feedback among the audience, it appears that Ms. Byron's CEC presentation was probably the only presentation understood by *everyone* in the room.

There were some very valid frustrations with the meeting (which I hope you will review), but for a first attempt—and as a first step—it went well. Our state's local, and federal representatives were there in person and/or had staff in attendance. Interestingly enough, Both Edison and PG&E sat in the same room, but no one who worked for or represented a utility had any questions of the experts (at least none they were going to ask in a public forum).

Chairman Jaczko, the NRC is asking a state—where Diablo Canyon was permitted on the belief that there were no known earthquake faults within 20 miles of the plant—to live with, invest in, and rely upon 2000 MW of generation from two controversially designed reactors. These reactors are perched above two *known* major active earthquake faults lying within three miles offshore. The Alliance is asking that the NRC to work with our state to avoid, as our senator reminded them, a radioactive BP on California's coast or a gas pipe break destroying a California community and killing four. We are asking that the NRC support California's new seismic studies and mapping before license renewal is adopted.

California has paid once for the cost of inadequate oversight and over-dependence on utility experts at Diablo Canyon. The NRC's reputation and the state's economy cannot afford a repeat of past mistakes. Now would be a good time to agree not to repeat them.

In Peace,

Rochelle Becker