Accepting Nuclear “Attributes” from Diablo Canyon Would Violate MBCP’s Central Mission: Clean Power, Community Choice
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MBCP’s Promise & Mission:

1. Community Choice
2. Clean Energy
Monterey Bay Community Power

MBCP + YOU = Clean Energy

MBCP + YOU = Clean Choice
Ensuring a Bright, Clean Future
MBCP Has Also Repeatedly Pledged that it Would be Nuclear Free.
MBCP procures electricity from carbon-free sources such as solar, wind, and hydroelectric. In addition to being carbon-free, MBCP does not use power produced from nuclear energy or any fossil-based sources.
“MBCP procures electricity from carbon-free sources such as solar, wind, and hydroelectric. In addition to being carbon free, MBCP does not use power produced from nuclear energy or any fossil-based sources.”

MBCP blog article, July 2018
"it's been staff practice not to acquire energy that's generated from coal or nuclear power plants. Staff has shared this practice with the new jurisdictions from San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara and some, have partially, based their decision to join MBCP on the assumption that we'll continue that practice."

Staff Report March 4, 2020
The controversy before us today is that MBCP is being asked nonetheless to take nuclear “attributes” from PG&E.
There is no such thing as an energy “attribute” separate from the energy itself.

It is a fiction, designed to be able to tell the consumer they are getting “carbon free” energy when in fact some of the energy actually being purchased comes from system power that includes natural gas (and some coal).
It is like the “indulgences” sold by the Church for sins, a practice which led to the Protestant Reformation. You could sin all you want so long as you bought an indulgence.
If I offer to give you a dog’s attributes—constantly barking, running after skunks and bringing the stench into the house, and fleas—but retain title to the dog, you wouldn’t think it a great deal.
“b. Challenges [to accepting the nuclear allocation]:

i. Public scrutiny over accepting CFA associated with nuclear generating facility.

ii. MBCP’s Power Content Label (score card that MBCP is obligated to submit to the CEC) would include up to 20% nuclear power.”
20% NUCLEAR
46% LARGE HYDROELECTRIC
34% RENEWABLE
- Geothermal: 12%
- Solar: 11%
- Wind: 11%
- Biomass & Biowaste: 0.3%

*Annual
So, what are the “attributes” of nuclear power, and is it “clean,” consistent with MBCP’s mission?
The “attributes” of nuclear power:

1. Radioactive waste that is dangerous for tens of thousands of generations
2. Proliferation of nuclear weapons
3. Risk of meltdown and widespread contamination
4. Risk of terrorist attack releasing large amounts of radioactivity
5. Environmental justice impacts from pollution from uranium mining and milling
6. Diverts money from renewables
7. Lower carbon emissions than fossil fuels but higher than renewables; not “carbon free”
It is not Clean:

Immensely Long-Lived and Toxic Nuclear Waste
NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS have produced energy and... highly toxic nuclear waste
Nuclear Power produces immensely long-lived radioactive waste.
Irradiated nuclear fuel rods
50 Years of Power, 500,000 Years of Radioactive Waste

Existence of the United States - 244 Years

Existence of Human Civilization - ~12,000 Years

Amount of Time Nuclear Waste Remains Radioactive - 500,000 Years
Ionizing Radiation Causes Cancers, Leukemias, Genetic Defects in Offspring, Heart Disease, and Various Other Health Effects
It is not Clean: Nuclear Power Proliferates Nuclear Weapons
Diablo Canyon, for Example, Produces Half a Ton of Plutonium per Year – Enough for 250 Nuclear Bombs More Powerful Than the One That Destroyed Hiroshima
It is not Clean:

Nuclear Power Plants Can Suffer Meltdowns, Releasing Vast Amounts of Radioactivity and Rendering Large Areas Uninhabitable for Generations
SANTA
SUSANA FIELD
LABORATORY
The first reactor to produce electricity for the commercial grid was at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory on the LA-Ventura County line.
It was also the first to suffer a partial meltdown.
Melted Fuel from SRE Reactor in LA Area
It was not the last.
THREE MILE ISLAND
NUCLEAR ACCIDENT AT
THREE MILE ISLAND

On March 28, 1979, and for several days
thereafter -- as a result of technical
malfunctions and human error -- Three
Mile Island's Unit 2 Nuclear Generating
Station was the scene of the nation's
worst commercial nuclear accident.
Radiation was released, a part of the
nuclear core was damaged, and thousands
of residents evacuated the area. Events
here would cause basic changes through-
out the world's nuclear power industry.
CHERNOBYL
FUKUSHIMA DAIICHI
Fukushima smoldering after the March 2011 earthquake and tsunami.
David Brower’s Definition of a Nuclear Reactor:

“A Complex Technological Device For Locating Earthquake Faults In California”
Diablo Canyon Nuclear Plant Was Designed and Permitted Based on the Assertion of No Active Earthquake Faults within 30 km

Shortly Thereafter, Hosgri Fault Was Discovered, Coming Within 4 km of the Reactors
Subsequently, the San Luis Bay Fault was discovered to be active near Diablo.

The Los Osos Fault was also found to be an active fault near the reactors.
In 2007, the Shoreline Fault was discovered, coming within 600 meters of the reactors.

Instead of no active faults within 30 km and no interconnections, it is now known that there are four nearby faults and several interconnections.
The second part of MBCP’s mission is COMMUNITY CHOICE.

That means the community decides the power content, rather than has it imposed on them.
“Good ends...can be achieved only by the employment of the appropriate means. The end cannot justify the means, for the simple and obvious reason that the means employed determine the nature of the ends produced.”

Aldous Huxley

*Ends and Means*
“This matter returns to the Board following a February 26, 2020 Community Advisory Council meeting and the March 4, 2020 Policy Board meeting, each of which was conducted in compliance with public notice requirements and with the full opportunity for public input.”

June 10 Staff Report

[Note: Nuclear Not Even Mentioned]
At the March Policy Board meeting, there were several statements made that many MBCP consumers would be very upset with the proposal to accept the nuclear offer from PG&E, and so the Board should approve it before the public learned of the proposal, and then mount a PR campaign to sell the decision after the fact.
Once the decision became public, and substantial public dismay resulted, repeated requests by Mothers for Peace for reconsideration to be placed on the agenda of the CAC and Policy Board received no response. They had to make the requests again and again. Their requests for written explanation of the changing staff cost estimates have still not been met.
This is “no way to run a railroad.” Nor for an entity that was supposed to be an alternative to PG&E, and based on community choice.

This needs to be fixed, by reversing the decision and taking time for consultation with stakeholders and attempting to reach an honorable consensus consistent with MBCP’s mission.
CCA'S THAT HAVE REJECTED THE NUCLEAR OFFER:

Peninsula Clean Energy
Marin Clean Energy
East Bay Community Energy
Sonoma Clean Power
Clean Power SF
Valley Clean Energy
Redwood Coast Energy Authority
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency*</th>
<th>Did the CCA take the Nuclear?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCA - CleanPowerSF</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA - East Bay Community Energy</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA - Marin Clean Energy</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA - Peninsula Clean Energy Authority</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA - Redwood Coast Energy Authority</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA - Sonoma Clean Power</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA - Valley Clean Energy Alliance</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA - San José Clean Energy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA - Silicon Valley Clean Energy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA - Pioneer Community Energy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No information available regarding King City Community Power
There is a substantial reputational cost to MBCP/CCCE if the nuclear offer is accepted under these circumstances. The “good will” asset could be significantly hit.

Consumers, if they feel MBCP/CCCE is little different than PG&E, might opt out. Localities that are considering joining MBCP/CCCE could choose not to; localities that joined based on the representation that it doesn’t take nuclear might reconsider.
66% LARGE HYDROELECTRIC

34% RENEWABLE
- Geothermal: 12%
- Solar: 11%
- Wind: 11%
- Biomass & Biowaste: 0.3%
20% Nuclear

46% Large Hydroelectric

34% Renewable
- Geothermal 12%
- Solar 11%
- Wind 11%
- Biomass & Biowaste 0.3%

*Annual
The “soul” of MBCP/CCCE is CLEAN POWER, COMMUNITY CHOICE.

Do not sell that soul. 50 cents a month is not worth it.
20% NUCLEAR

46% LARGE HYDROELECTRIC

34% RENEWABLE
- Geothermal 12%
- Solar 11%
- Wind 11%
- Biomass & Biowaste 0.3%

*Annual