

Public Comment on San Onofre Irradiated Nuclear Fuel Issue

By Sarah Brady (sarahhbrady@gmail.com)

Committee to Bridge the Gap

Before the San Onofre Community Engagement Panel on June 27th 2018

Hello board and community members, my name is Sarah Brady. I am an Encinitas native and 3rd generation member of the San Onofre Surfing Club. As an undergrad student at UC Santa Cruz, I have been studying the current issues at San Onofre with my previous teacher Daniel Hirsch through his nuclear safety nonprofit organization called Committee to Bridge the Gap.

From all that I have researched, the events I have attended, and friends and community members that I have spoken with, my current understanding is that right now we are presented with two bad options: storing nuclear waste on the beach at San Onofre or forcing it onto another community in Texas or New Mexico.

As you all know, the current storage site is located about 100 feet from the ocean at San Onofre State Surfing Beach. This is the beach where my dad taught me to surf and where he learned to surf as a kid too. The storage site is a mere 40 feet above sea level, and anyone who spends time at San Onofre knows that the beach is eroding rapidly. Storing nuclear waste so close to the ocean in the face of sea level rise from climate change is extremely irresponsible. In addition, the current storage site is approachable from the ocean as well as from the publicly accessible State Park, making it vulnerable to a possible terrorist attack. Anyone with common sense can see that the current situation is a terrible mistake.

The other option that has been discussed would require shipping the waste twice rather than once; first from San Onofre to another interim storage site in Texas or New Mexico, and then again to its final destination at a federal repository. Shipping nuclear waste across the country is extremely dangerous both in terms of risk of accident and risk of terrorist attack, and it would have to be shipped either through San Diego or through Orange County and Los Angeles. Furthermore, residents nearby the proposed interim storage sites in Texas and New Mexico have already expressed their opposition to this. It is our moral responsibility not to dump our burden on someone else.

We need a third, less-bad option, which I believe is moving the waste further east on Camp Pendleton where it can be safely stored, monitored, and defended. One example of such a possible storage site would be the Mesa site. The Mesa is a piece of land across the I-5 freeway from the current storage site. Edison has leased and used this land in the past. This site is 120 feet above sea level, 80 feet higher than the current storage site and far above the level of expected sea level rise from climate change. It is essentially not visible from the freeway because

a hill blocks it out of sight. Canisters could be transported on Edison's service road that goes underneath the freeway and connects to the Mesa site. In the process of relocating the fuel, alternative storage methods should be explored such as indoor storage with thick-walled canisters that can be monitored, inspected, and repaired should damage occur.

This is the most ethical option because we would not be dumping the waste on another community or storing it excessively close to the ocean. Although we all want this waste off the beach, we have a moral responsibility to not hastily push our burden onto someone else. I understand why Pendleton would not want this on their land, but it *already is* on their land, and on the least defensible part of it, so we need to move it somewhere better. I want to ask everyone here tonight to consider this third, least-bad option of moving the waste further back into Camp Pendleton where it could be better protected against possible terrorist attack and would not be vulnerable to sea level rise. Thank you for your time.