

[EXT]Eric Greening comments on Diablo Decommissioning DEIR

Eric Greening <dancingsilverowl@gmail.com>

Sat 9/16/2023 12:52 PM

To:PL_Diablo <PL_Diablo@co.slo.ca.us>

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Hello!

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment, and for making hard copies of the five volumes available in public places for those of us who tire of looking at screens hour after hour!

Let me begin by endorsing the correspondence from the Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility, particularly their advocacy of a 10 mrem per year cleanup standard. Once the reactors shut down, the County, not the NRC, is responsible for setting and enforcing exposure standards, and has the responsibility to make health and safety findings for this project.

The DEIR is very detailed and thorough in many of the areas that it investigated, but has two main areas of shortcoming:

1: The recent filing by Friends of the Earth and the Mothers for Peace, and the evidence submitted as to the dangerous embrittlement of the welds on the pressure vessel of Unit One, which underlie its plea for immediate shutdown of that unit, raise the prospect that Unit Two could continue operating in isolation for five to twenty years after the shutdown of Unit One. The DEIR does not examine the impacts of the possible resultant scenarios. Would Unit One simply be mothballed for the duration of Unit Two's continued operation, with the decommissioning project then proceeding for both units after an Addendum, Supplemental, or Subsequent EIR had been prepared? If so, what would be the added impacts of the mothballing and de-mothballing? Or would some decommissioning activities proceed for Unit One while Unit Two was operating, and, if so, how would that work and what otherwise unforeseen impacts would such a situation create? What new mitigation measures would need to be deployed?

2. Impacts exported to other states do not cease to be impacts. Very large quantities of waste, much of it radioactive, are proposed for barging to the 62% Latino/a community of Boardman, Oregon, with further land transport to sites both nearby and in yet other states: Idaho and Utah. There is no evidence of any consultation with governments, municipal, county, or tribal, in the affected areas. Nor is there assessment of the impacts imposed on those places, nor are any mitigation measures offered in those areas. What inconveniences and outright hazards are being borne there, and how can these be avoided or at least offset?

Again, thank you for the opportunity to review and comment!

Eric Greening