

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

ENERGY, OCEAN RESOURCES AND FEDERAL CONSISTENCY DIVISION
45 FREMONT STREET
SUITE 2000
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94105-2219
(415) 904-5200 FAX (415) 904-5400
WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV



W9

Prepared December 07, 2017 (for the December 13, 2017 Hearing)

To: Commissioners and Interested Parties
From: Alison Dettmer, Deputy Director
Subject: **Energy, Ocean Resources and Federal Consistency Division Deputy Director's Report for December 2017**

The following coastal development permit (CDP) waivers, immaterial CDP amendments, CDP extensions, emergency CDPs, and negative determinations for the Energy, Ocean Resources and Federal Consistency Division are being reported to the Commission on December 13, 2017. Pursuant to the Commission's procedures, each item has been appropriately noticed as required, and each item is also available for review at the Commission's office in San Francisco. Staff is asking for the Commission's concurrence on the items in the Energy, Ocean Resources and Federal Consistency Division Deputy Director's report, and will report any objections received and any other relevant information on these items to the Commission when it considers the report on December 13th.

With respect to the December 13th hearing, interested persons may sign up to address the Commission on items contained in this report prior to the Commission's consideration of this report. The Commission can overturn staff's noticed determinations for some categories of items subject to certain criteria in each case (see individual notices for specific requirements).

Items being reported on December 13, 2017 (see attached)

Immaterial Amendments

- 9-14-1735-A3, Temporary Slant Test Well Project (Cemex, Inc. Lapis Plant, Lapis Road, Marina, Ca 93933)
- 9-15-0620-A1, Ellwood Pipeline Line 96 Decommissioning (Ucsb North Campus, City Of Goleta)

Negative Determinations and No Effect Letter

Administrative Items for Federal Consistency Matters

- **ND-0027-17, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Action: Concur, 11/14/2017**
NOAA Hydrographic surveys offshore San Mateo County - 5 Year authorization for training and testing using small boats to large research ships, ROVs, echo sounders, side scan sonars, sound speed profilers, conductivity, temperature, and depth recorders, and towed cameras and video equipment

Permit Revocation Requests

- **9-15-0228-REV-7**, Southern California Edison Company, Revocation Request by Bill Weigelfor Permit Approval of 9-15-0228
- **9-15-0228-REV-8**, Southern California Edison Company, Revocation Request by Gary Heidrick for Permit Approval of 9-15-0228
- **9-15-0228-REV-9**, Southern California Edison Company, Revocation Request by Robert Broska for Permit Approval of 9-15-0228

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

45 FREMONT, SUITE 2000
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2219
VOICE (415) 904-5200
FAX (415) 904-5400
TDD (415) 597-5885

**NOTICE OF PROPOSED IMMATERIAL PERMIT AMENDMENT****9-14-1735-A3 / A-3-MRA-14-0050-A3**

TO: All Interested Parties

FROM: John Ainsworth, Executive Director

DATE: November 29, 2017

SUBJECT: Application to amend Coastal Development Permits No. 9-13-1735 / A-3-MRA-14-0050 granted to California American Water Company (“Cal-Am”) for constructing, operating, and decommissioning a test well, along Monterey Bay shoreline, Monterey County.

Cal-Am has requested the above coastal development permits (“CDPs”) be amended to allow the existing test well to remain in place for an additional year. The Executive Director has determined that the requested project change as described herein may be approved as an immaterial amendment to the CDP, as it would result in only a minor change to the currently approved development.

Background and Project Description: In November 2014, the Commission approved CDPs for Cal-Am to construct, operate, and decommission a test slant well and associated monitoring wells and other infrastructure near the shoreline of Monterey Bay in the City of Marina.¹ The project purpose was to conduct a pump test program to obtain data regarding the geologic, hydrogeologic, and water quality characteristics in aquifers underlying the project area to see if the site would be suitable for wells that could be used by a long-term desalination facility. In February 2015, Cal-Am completed installation and started the pump test, which ran until June 2015 when monitoring detected that groundwater levels were approaching a permit threshold that required Cal-Am to shut down the test and obtain a permit amendment. In November 2015, the Commission approved an amendment to modify the groundwater monitoring requirements and Cal-Am restarted its pump test.² On April 15, 2016, the Commission approved a further amendment to allow Cal-Am to modify its discharge pipe and to require additional monitoring of the pipe area.

¹ The project is partially within the Commission’s retained jurisdiction and partially within the jurisdiction of the City of Marina’s certified Local Coastal Program. The Commission accepted an appeal of the City CDP decision and approved the portions of Cal-Am’s project within both jurisdictions.

² See Commission’s Final Adopted Findings for 9-14-1735-A1 and A-3-MRA-14-0050-A1, November 2015.

Requested Amendment: On November 2, 2017 Cal-Am submitted an application to the Commission requesting the CDPs be further amended to allow the existing test well to remain in place for an additional year. **Special Condition 6** of the current CDPs requires no later than February 28, 2018 that Cal-Am complete its pump test, cut off, cap, and bury the slant well head, and remove all other associated temporary facilities. Cal-Am is now requesting that deadline be changed to February 28, 2019. As part of its request, Cal-Am states that it will discontinue ongoing operations of the test well and will conduct just limited periodic maintenance pumping (i.e., up to a few hours each week) during the one-year extension.

The purpose of the requested extension is to allow the test well facilities to remain in place while Cal-Am completes its ongoing CEQA and NEPA review processes with the California Public Utilities Commission (“CPUC”) and the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (“MBNMS”). If the CPUC certifies the CEQA document and approves a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for Cal-Am’s proposed long-term desalination facility, Cal-Am may then apply for CDPs to make the existing test well part of its proposed permanent desalination facility. Should the CEQA and NEPA review process take longer than currently anticipated, Cal-Am may also request a subsequent extension of these CDPs.

Cal-Am has requested the changes shown below in strikethrough and bold underline text to **Special Condition 6** of the CDP:

“Monitoring and Removal of Temporary Structures, Well Head Burial & Well Closure/Destruction. The Permittee shall monitor beach erosion at least once per week over the duration of the project to ensure the slant well and monitoring wells remain covered. If the wellheads, linings, casings, or other project components become exposed due to erosion, shifting sand or other factors, the Permittee shall immediately take action to reduce any danger to the public or to marine life. When components of the discharge pipeline below the connection to the outfall are exposed, the Permittee shall conduct monitoring, including photographic documentation of the exposed components, at least once per day until the components are naturally reburied, after which erosion monitoring shall be done no less than once per week. When components are exposed, the Permittee shall also post notices at the nearest upcoast and downcoast vertical public access points informing the public of the exposed components. The Permittee shall provide monitoring records, photographs, and proof of the above public notices to the Executive Director upon request.

Prior to conducting any repairs or reinstallation of exposed equipment that require construction methods other than the hand methods described in Amendment 2 of this permit, the Permittee shall apply for and obtain a permit amendment unless the Executive Director determines no such amendment is necessary.

The Permittee shall complete its regular test slant well pumping operations by February 28, 2018. Thereafter, the Permittee may conduct limited periodic maintenance pumping necessary to maintain the test slant well. Upon project completion, and n~~*No later than February 28, 2018-2019, the Permittee shall cut off, cap, and bury the slant well head at least 40 feet below the ground surface, and shall completely remove all other temporary facilities approved by this coastal development*~~

*permit. To ensure timely removal, the Permittee shall post the bond or other surety device as required by **Special Condition 17** to ensure future removal measures would be appropriately supported and timed to prevent any future resurfacing of the well casing or other project components.*

FINDINGS: THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT HAS BEEN DEEMED “IMMATERIAL” FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

- **Public Access:** The proposed amendment to extend the existence of the existing facilities would delay for up to one year any required decommissioning activities. The project would remain subject to the CDP’s other special conditions, including the terms of **Special Condition 6** above that require monitoring and notification to avoid potential adverse effects to public access to the shoreline.
- **Biological and Marine Resources:** The proposed amendment would delay decommissioning activities, but the project would remain subject to the CDP’s other special conditions, including those that require biological monitoring and that provide for the approved biologist(s) to halt work activities that may affect special-status species or habitat near the project location. The proposed amendment will not result in new development in currently undisturbed areas of the site.

Immaterial Permit Amendment

Pursuant to the California Code of Regulations—Title 14, Division 5.5, Volume 19, section 13166(b)—the Executive Director has determined this amendment to be IMMATERIAL.

Pursuant to section 13166(b)(1), if no written objection to this notice of immaterial amendment is received at the Commission office within ten (10) working days of mailing said notice, the determination of immateriality shall be conclusive and the amendment shall be approved.

Pursuant to section 13166(b)(2), if a written objection to this notice of an immaterial amendment is received within ten (10) working days of mailing notice, and the executive director determines that the objection does not raise an issue of conformity with the Coastal Act or certified local coastal program if applicable, the immaterial amendment shall not be effective until the amendment and objection are reported to the Commission at its next regularly scheduled meeting. If any three (3) Commissioners object to the executive director’s designation of immateriality, the amendment application shall be referred to the Commission for action as set forth in section 13166(c). Otherwise, the immaterial amendment shall become effective.

Pursuant to section 13166(b)(3), if a written objection to this notice of an immaterial amendment is received within ten (10) working days of mailing notice, and the executive director determines that the objection does raise an issue of conformity with the Coastal Act or a certified local coastal program if applicable, the immaterial amendment application shall be referred to the Commission for action as set forth in section 13166(c).

If you wish to register an objection to this notice, please send the objection in writing to Tom Luster at the above address. If you have any questions, you may contact him at (415) 904-5248 or via email at tluster@coastal.ca.gov.

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

ENERGY, OCEAN RESOURCES AND FEDERAL CONSISTENCY DIVISION
45 FREMONT STREET
SUITE 2000
PH (415) 904-5200 FAX (415) 904-5400
WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV



NOTICE OF PROPOSED IMMATERIAL PERMIT AMENDMENT

Coastal Development Permit Amendment No. **9-15-0620-A1**

November 20, 2017

To: All Interested Parties

From: John Ainsworth, Executive Director

Subject: Permit No. **9-15-0620-A1** granted to **University of California, Santa Barbara, Office of Campus Planning & Design** for decommissioning of Segments 4 and 5 of the original Line 96 pipeline which carried oil production fluids between Venoco's Ellwood Onshore Facility (EOF) and the Ellwood Marine Terminal (EMT).

Project Site: UCSB North Campus, City of Goleta (APN(s): 073-090-026, 073-090-074, 079-210-024, 079-210-042)

The Executive Director of the California Coastal Commission has reviewed a proposed amendment to the above referenced permit, which would result in the following change(s):

The University proposes to decommission Segments 4 and 5 of Line 96 which carried oil production fluids between Venoco's Ellwood Onshore Facility (EOF) and the Ellwood Marine Terminal (EMT). Venoco was the original applicant and had received approval from the Commission on October 6, 2015 to decommission the entire length of the pipeline between the EOF and the EMT. Venoco began the work in July 2016. Work was stopped, however, after grout pumped into the pipeline failed to consolidate and a small amount of grout spilled into an excavation pit. Work was temporarily abandoned and then in April 2017, Venoco announced it had filed for bankruptcy. Venoco has not taken steps to complete the work. In November 2017, UCSB applied to take over the pipeline decommissioning work on the segments of the pipeline that are located on University property.

Before UCSB can complete the decommissioning work as described in CDP 9-15-0620 on the two pipeline segments (Segments 4 and 5) within its property, it will first open both segments to fully assess the status of the grout within the pipeline. If the grout has cured, UCSB will proceed with the removal of Segment 5 and the abandonment in place of Segment 4, as described in the permit. If the grout has not cured, it will be removed from the pipeline through a combination of gravity drainage and use of a vacuum truck. A foam pig or other similar device may also be advanced through the pipeline segments as an additional measure. If necessary, a temporary holding tank will be used to store the grout before it is

Notice of Proposed Immaterial Permit Amendment

9-15-0620-A1

disposed of at an appropriate facility. UCSB will then regROUT Segment 4 before abandoning this segment in place, and will remove Segment 5 as described in CDP 9-15-0620.

FINDINGS

Pursuant to 14 Cal. Admin. Code Section 13166(b) this amendment is considered to be IMMATERIAL and the permit will be amended accordingly if no written objections are received within ten working days of the date of this notice. If an objection is received, the amendment must be reported to the Commission at the next regularly scheduled Commission hearing. This amendment has been considered "immaterial" for the following reason(s):

Environmentally Sensitive Habitats, Wetlands and Water Quality: As described in the findings for CDP 9-15-0620, Line 96 traverses through several environmentally sensitive habitat areas and wetlands. On University property, Segment 4 traverses under a wetland mitigation site and Segment 5 is located adjacent to a small wetland. The CDP includes several Special Conditions that require pre-construction and construction monitoring of wetland and ESHA areas (Special Condition 1), post-construction monitoring and restoration (Special Condition 3), and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (Special Condition 4). The University will implement all of these conditions during decommissioning of Segments 4 and 5. In addition, to ensure that unconsolidated grout that may be present within the pipeline does not spill into adjacent habitat areas, UCSB will open the pipeline segments away from wetlands and ESHA, and will use a vacuum truck to evacuate the grout from the pipeline. To further ensure that unconsolidated grout is not released into the surrounding habitat areas, UCSB will prepare a Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasures Plan (SPCC Plan) that will include the following components: (1) preventative measures to avoid a spill, (2) description of spill containment and clean-up equipment and supplies that will be located onsite during work implementation and are adequate to clean-up the worst-case spill, and (3) procedures and protocols to address a spill, should it occur. With these measures in place, the Executive Director has determined that the project will protect sensitive habitat areas and avoid adverse impacts and maintain the quality of wetlands, and, for the reasons stated above, will be consistent with Sections 30231, 30233 and 30240 of the Coastal Act.

If you have any questions about the proposal or wish to register an objection, please contact Kate Huckelbridge at the phone number provided above.

cc: Commissioners/File

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

45 FREMONT, SUITE 2000
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2219
VOICE AND TDD (415) 904-5200
FAX (415) 904-5400



November 14, 2017

Jay Nunenkamp
Environmental Compliance Coordinator
NOAA Office of Coast Survey
1315 East West Highway, SSMC3
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Re: **ND-0027-17**, NOAA Negative Determination, Hydrographic Surveys Offshore San Mateo County, 2018-2022

Dear Mr. Nunenkamp:

The Coastal Commission staff has reviewed the above-referenced negative determination submitted by NOAA for scientific research testing and training in ocean waters (and predominantly in federal waters) offshore of San Mateo County. The project area is approximately 39 sq. nautical miles (nmi). The closest the activity would be to the shoreline is 2.65 nmi from shore. The training and testing would occur over a five year period, from 2018-2022, and would involve use of the following equipment: small boats, large research vessels, echosounders, side scan sonars, remotely operated vehicles (often tethered to a manned vessel), conductivity, temperature, and depth (CTD) profilers, and towed underwater camera and video equipment. Active acoustics used would be those typically used for common ocean navigation, remote sensing, and ocean and habitat mapping activities. Due to their high frequency, these types of equipment do not involve the kind of active acoustics that generally raise concerns over impacts to marine mammals, sea turtles, and other ocean species. Moreover, NOAA would implement a suite of Best Management Practices to protect marine resources and water quality (attached).

The Coastal Commission staff **agrees** with your conclusion that the testing and training activities as described in your negative determination would not adversely affect coastal zone resources. We therefore **concur** with your negative determination made pursuant for 15 CFR Section 930.35 of the NOAA implementing regulations. Please contact Mark Delaplaine at (415) 904-5289, if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "mark D. L.", with a stylized flourish at the end.

(for) JOHN AINSWORTH
Executive Director

Attachment

**PERMIT REVOCATION REQUEST BY
BILL WEIGEL**

9-15-0228-REV-7

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

ENERGY, OCEAN RESOURCES AND FEDERAL CONSISTENCY DIVISION
45 FREMONT STREET
SUITE 2000
PH (415) 904-5200 FAX (415) 904-5400
WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV



November 20, 2017

Via electronic mail

Bill Weigel
ltwallace@protonmail.com

Re: Request for Revocation of Coastal Development Permit No. 9-15-0228

Dear Mr. Weigel,

Coastal Commission staff has received your communication, dated October 25, 2017 and received on October 27, 2017, requesting the revocation of Coastal Development Permit (CDP) #9-15-0228 (Southern California Edison, SCE), approved by the Commission on October 6, 2015. CDP 9-15-0228 authorizes the installation and operation of a new independent spent fuel storage installation (ISFSI) at San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS).

Your request for revocation is based on two basic contentions, summarized as follows:

- (1) The long-term lease granted by the U.S. Department of the Navy (Navy) for the operation of SONGS does not allow for spent fuel storage, and thus the Commission's CDP was issued in violation of existing law;
- (2) The proposed project presented legitimate risks to the public that were known to the Commission at the time of approval. These risks are asserted to include (i) past safety violations on the part of SCE, (ii) the location of the ISFSI near major population centers, transportation corridors, and earthquake faults, and in a tsunami zone within 108 feet of the ocean; (iii) the Commission's refusal to approve the repair or reinforcement of the SONGS seawall; (iv) inadequate emergency response planning in the event of a nuclear accident; and (v) the potential for corrosion and cracking and other safety concerns associated with the dry casks to be used for waste storage. The request for revocation further suggests that the Commission's approval of the CDP, in light of these alleged risks, may constitute criminal negligence.

The grounds for revocation of a CDP are set forth in 14 Cal. Code of Regulations Section 13105 and provide, in relevant part, as follows:

- a) Intentional inclusion of inaccurate, erroneous or incomplete information in connection with a coastal development permit application, where the Commission finds that accurate and complete information would have caused the Commission to require additional or different conditions on a permit or deny an application;*
- b) Failure to comply with the notice provisions of Section 13054, where the views of the person(s) not notified were not otherwise made known to the commission and could have*

caused the commission to require additional or different conditions on a permit or deny an application.

Commission regulations (14 CCR 13106) grant the Executive Director the authority to review a revocation request and decline to initiate revocation proceedings if he determines that the request does not establish the grounds for revocation as specified in Section 13105, and is thus patently frivolous and without merit.

I have reviewed the grounds for revocation stated in your October 25, 2017 request and decline to initiate revocation proceedings because I have determined that the request does not address the grounds for revocation as specified in Section 13105. In particular, you neither assert nor provide evidence that the Applicant, SCE, either intentionally included inaccurate, erroneous or incomplete information in connection with its coastal development permit application or failed to comply with the notice provisions of Section 13054 of the Commission's regulations.

Contention #1 – Permit was issued in violation of existing law

In support of this contention, you cite language from Public Law 88-82, which authorized the Navy to grant SCE an easement for the construction and operation of a nuclear power plant on federal land at Camp Pendleton, and argue the following: (a) that interim or long-term storage of spent nuclear fuel on the leased land is outside the scope of the easement and existing federal law; and (b) that by "approving a permit for a project outside the scope of the current Federal law describing the land lease, the CCC has indirectly violated the terms and conditions held between the Secretary of the Navy and SCE." Your argument does not address the grounds for revocation as specified in 14 CCR 13105, and provides no evidence that SCE either intentionally included inaccurate, erroneous or incomplete information in connection with its coastal development permit application or failed to comply with the Commission's notice provisions.

For informational purposes, I would note that spent fuel has been stored on-site at SONGS on an interim basis since Unit 1 became operational in 1968. Most of the spent fuel from the three SONGS generating units has been stored in the spent fuel pools that are an integral component of all nuclear power plants in the United States. Since the early 2000s, some of the spent fuel has been stored in an existing ISFSI located in the North Industrial Area (former site of Unit 1). It is Commission staff's understanding that Federal law allows for such interim storage, and both wet storage (pools) and dry storage (ISFSI) at SONGS are a component of the existing site license issued by the federal Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

Contention #2 – Risks to the public were known by the Commission at the time of CDP approval

As a part of this contention, you assert that the Commission was aware of a variety of risks associated with the project, including alleged past safety violations by SCE, vulnerability of the project site to natural hazards and its close proximity of large urban areas and infrastructure, the extreme radioactivity of the spent fuel, the inadequacy of existing emergency response planning, and safety concerns associated with the dry storage casks. Again, your contention does not address the grounds for revocation, and neither asserts nor provides evidence that SCE misled the Commission or otherwise intentionally included inaccurate, erroneous or incomplete information in connection with its coastal development permit application. In fact, your argument appears to be predicated on the Commission having been fully aware of the concerns and risks you cite. Most of the risks and vulnerabilities cited in your argument relate directly to radiological safety concerns associated with the dry storage of spent fuel in the proposed ISFSI. As is stated clearly

in the Adopted Findings supporting the Commission's approval of CDP #9-15-0228, the U.S Supreme Court has found that the federal government, and in particular the NRC, has exclusive jurisdiction over the entire field of radiological safety in relation to nuclear facilities. The Commission and other state agencies are thus preempted from imposing on the operators of such facilities any regulatory requirements concerning radiation hazards and safety. For this reason, issues including the radioactivity of the spent fuel, emergency planning related to releases of radiation, the vulnerability of the surrounding population and infrastructure to such releases, and the safety of storage casks, were outside the scope of the Commission's authority over and review of the ISFSI project. Consistent with its authority under the Coastal Act, the Commission reviewed the project's potential exposure to natural hazards, including seismic and flooding hazards, and evaluated the stability and structural integrity of the ISFSI structure as a whole, but did not evaluate or condition the project with respect to nuclear safety or radiological issues. The Commission's detailed findings on natural hazards are contained in Section IV.D of the Adopted Findings.

For the reasons discussed above, I am declining to initiate revocation proceedings because I have concluded, pursuant to Commission regulations (14 CCR § 13106), that your October 25, 2017 revocation request does not address the grounds for revocation.

If you have questions about this matter, please contact Alison Dettmer, Deputy Director, or Joseph Street, Senior Environmental Scientist, in the Energy and Ocean Resources and Federal Consistency Division, at (415) 904-5240.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "John Ainsworth for".

JOHN AINSWORTH
Executive Director

cc: David Asti, SCE
Ed Yep, SCE

California Coastal Commission State of California

-) **14 CCR § 13105 Grounds for**
 -) **Revocation**
 -)
 -) **Request for Revocation of California Coastal**
 -) **Commission Permit to Southern California**
 -) **Edison Dated Oct 12 2015**
 -)
-

In accordance with *14 CCR § 13105 Grounds for Revocation*, the following evidence is hereby submitted to the California Coastal Commission (CCC) on the grounds of “Intentional inclusion of inaccurate, erroneous or incomplete information in connection with a coastal development permit application, where the commission finds that accurate and complete information would have caused the commission to require additional or different conditions on a permit or deny an application.” regarding the permit issued items are legitimate grounds for revocation of the 9-15-0228 – Southern California Edison SONGS ISFSI Project.

1. Permit Issued in Violation of Existing Law: The 9-15-0228 – Southern California Edison (SCE) San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS) ISFSI Project is located on Federal land established September 25, 1942. On July 30, 1963, the Secretary of the Navy granted easements for the use of lands in the Camp Joseph H. Pendleton Naval Reservation, California for a nuclear electric generating station to SCE. Public Law 88-82 defined in scope as follows:

“Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Navy be and he hereby is authorized and empowered to grant to Southern California Edison Company, a California corporation, and to each of them, their respective successors and assigns, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems necessary to protect the interests of the United States, an easement in, over, under and upon lands of the United States of America, approximately ninety acres in area within the Camp Joseph H. Pendleton Naval Reservation, California, as are necessary or desirable for the purpose of constructing, operating, maintaining, and using electric transmission and communication lines, switchyards and substations, cooling water conduits, pipelines for water, gas and sewage, railroad spur tracks, access roads and other appurtenances to said facilities and to said nuclear generating station.”

Sec. 2. Upon such terms and conditions as he deems necessary to protect the interests of the United States and within the scope set forth in Section 1, the Secretary or his successors in interest, may amend any such easement by mutual agreement of the parties thereto, or their successors in interest, in such manner as to change the lands affected thereby, either by substitution, addition or deletion, as well as to change the terms and conditions of the grant.”

This lease does not allow for the interim, or long-term storage of spent nuclear fuel on the leased land. Additionally, there can be no amendments to this lease for interim, or long term storage as it is not within the scope of the lease.

Concern of jurisdiction was brought up by W.L. Whitmire, CAPT, CEC, USN Assistant Chief of Staff, G-F Marine Corps Installation West Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton in a letter to Joseph Street of the CCC that stated:

“For the SONGS site, the instrument at issue is an easement, in which the federal agency retains even more rights to access the site subject to the easement than it does with a lease similar to that addressed by the federal district court in Manchester.

The Navy and USMC understand the commission’s reliance on the California Commission v. Granite Rock Co., (480 U.S. 572) case to assert jurisdiction under the California Coastal Act over this Federal property. The federal property in Granite Rock, though, was under the proprietorial jurisdiction where State law generally applies. The SONGS site, on the other hand, is under exclusive federal jurisdiction where State law generally does NOT apply. Thus, it is the Navy and USMC position that the Commission only has jurisdiction over the SONGS site through the consistency provisions of the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act. Therefore, the Navy and USMC object to the Commission requiring or issuing a Coastal Development Permit under the California Coastal Act for the proposed action at hand or for any other proposed action at the SONGS site.”

Furthermore, the CCC issued an Addendum to 9-15-0228 – Southern California Edison SONGS ISFSI Project, that included the following *Special Condition 1* which removed the requirement to properly attain approval by the U.S. Department of the Navy:

“1. Evidence of Landowner Approval. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF THE COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, the applicant shall submit to the Executive Director for review and approval evidence of their legal ability to undertake the development as conditioned by the Commission. ~~Such evidence shall include documentation demonstrating that the U.S. Department of the Navy has renewed or extended its existing easement for use of the Part 50 licensed area for a term encompassing the authorized development (i.e., through October 6, 2035).~~”

This exemption was justified by the CCC with the following statement in the Addendum:

“U. S. Marine Corps Comments:

On October 1, 2015, Commission staff received a letter from the United States Navy and Marine Corps asserting that the Commission lacks jurisdiction to require or issue a CDP for development occurring on the SONGS site. The basis for the Navy and Marine Corps position is that under the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA), land, “the use of which is by law subject solely to the discretion of ... the Federal Government, its officers or agents” is excluded from the definition of the coastal zone. (16 U.S.C. § 1453(1)).

The U.S. Supreme Court, however, has addressed this issue and determined that the CZMA does not pre-empt application of the California Coastal Act to private activities on federal land. It held that “[b]ecause Congress specifically disclaimed any intention to pre-empt pre-existing state authority in the CZMA, we conclude that even if all federal lands are excluded from the CZMA definition of ‘coastal zone,’ the CZMA does not automatically pre-empt all state regulation of activities on federal lands.” California Coastal Commission v. Granite Rock Co. (1987)

480 U.S. 572, 593. Thus, under Granite Rock, the Commission retains the authority under the Coastal Act to require coastal development permits for non-federal activities taking place on federal land, such as Southern California Edison's proposed project pending before the Commission.

Re: SCE – SONGS ISFSI October 5, 2015 Page 12 of 12

The U.S. Navy and Marine Corps support their argument that the Commission does not have coastal development permit jurisdiction on federal land by reference to an unpublished U.S. District Court decision, *Manchester Pacific Gateway v. California Coastal Commission* (2008 WL 5642245 (S.D. Cal.)). First, to the extent that the Manchester case is inconsistent with the Supreme Court holding in *Granite Rock*, the Supreme Court's decision in *Granite Rock* controls. Second, the Manchester case is factually distinguishable from the situation presented by the pending proposal from SCE. The Manchester case involved a Congressionally authorized public-private venture that resulted in the Navy obtaining new office space at no cost to the federal government. *Id.* at 1. The court acknowledged that the purpose of that project, as mandated by Congress, was to "provide for the use of private parties to accomplish the federal objective to construct Navy administrative facilities." *Id.* at 5. The project was authorized through legislation that spelled out the general parameters of the project and specifically authorized the project to be jointly developed by the Navy and the private developer. *Id.* at 6. Thus, the project was both a Navy and a private project.

The pending application from SCE does not involve a joint public-private venture. Thus, the facts are not analogous to those presented in the Manchester case. Thus, both under *Granite Rock* and due to factual distinctions between these facts and those raised in the Manchester case, the CZMA does not pre-empt the California Coastal Act here, and the Commission does have the jurisdiction to require a coastal development permit for the proposed development.

Finally, the Commission notes that the October 1, 2015 letter includes a statement, without elaboration, that the SONGS site is under exclusive federal jurisdiction where State law generally does not apply and the Commission only has jurisdiction over the SONGS site through the consistency provisions of the Coastal Zone Management Act. While the Commission does not disagree that it has jurisdiction over the SONGS site through the consistency provisions of the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act, the Commission finds that the singular statement in the October 1, 2015 letter neither establishes that the SONGS site is under exclusive federal jurisdiction where state law generally does not apply nor provides sufficient documentation, analysis or other supporting evidence. is direct evidence of intentional circumvention of Federal jurisdiction by eliminating the required approval for amendment by the U.S. Department of the Navy and SCE to the land lease in place."

This explanation fails to address the clearly defined scope of the Federal land lease with the U.S. Department of the Navy and SCE as being strictly limited to a nuclear electric generating station and NOT an interim, or long-term spent nuclear waste storage site. The Federal legislation allows for amendments to be made exclusively by the Secretary of the Navy and SCE. By approving a permit for a project outside the scope of the current Federal law describing the land lease, the CCC has indirectly violated the terms and conditions held between the Secretary of the Navy and SCE.

The CCC contends the California Coastal Act is not pre-empted from issuing permits over the proposed development but does NOT have the jurisdiction to approve any projects that go beyond the limitations of the existing law unless properly amended in accordance with the Federal land lease. The lease has a clearly defined scope of nuclear electric generation and in no

way allows for waste storage of any kind. A new definition in scope would require the proper legal approval.

2. Legitimate Risks to the Public Known by the CCC at Time of Approval: SCE violated the Code of Federal Regulation (CFR 50.59) requiring the safe operation of a nuclear reactor in 2011.

- Edison knowingly installed unsafe, unlicensed nuclear generators in 2011, while averting a review by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).
- The reactors were then operated outside the allowable limits for pressure and temperature, causing a radiation leak that shut the facility down in 2012
- The same engineering management team that by-passed an NRC review are now in charge of designing the nuclear waste disposal.

Southern California Edison applied to the CA Coastal Commission for a permit to bury its radioactive nuclear waste on site, and the permit was granted on October 6, 2015. The planned radioactive waste dump site is located:

- In the center of 8.5 million people who live within the 50-mile radioactive plume radius identified by the NRC.
- Near an earthquake fault (the Newport Inglewood fault, which connects to the Rose Canyon fault)
- In a tsunami zone
- 108 feet from the ocean and as little as 3 feet above the water table
- Next to an Interstate highway that carries 20,000 vehicles an hour
- Adjacent to the 2nd busiest rail corridor in the U.S.A.

Each dry canister contains a payload of 37 spent fuel assemblies. The radiation contained in each of the 75 casks is equal to 9.3 nuclear warheads. That's total a radioactive equivalent of 700 nuclear warheads.

As permitted, the site is 108 feet from the beach adjacent to the seashore and the cliffs are already seriously eroded, and the existing seawall is threatened by rising sea levels, tidal waves, and extreme storm conditions.

The Coastal Commission will not approve repair or reinforcement of a seawall that would create the only buffer between the ocean and the radioactive waste. The Coastal Commission claims that it is preserving the coastline in its natural state by refusing the reinforcement of the seawall, notwithstanding its issuance of a permit for the waste burial in the first place.

The NRC, a federal agency in charge of the safety element of the permit, authorized the elimination of required emergency planning and response to a nuclear accident at the now-

failed SONGS facility. SCE does not have an off-site emergency response budget or any method of inspecting the casks for damage from saltwater corrosion, earthquakes, or cracking from a cask drop.

Dry casks are unsafe because once the waste is interred, it will be difficult and/or impossible to move it safely:

- 1 The canisters (known as Holtec Hi-Storm) have a design life of only 60 years and are only guaranteed to last 25 years.
- 2 The waste is deadly for at least a quarter million years.
- 3 If these delicate thin-walled canisters get an invisible microscopic crack, it will release millions of curies of radiation.
- 4 One curie can be enough to kill you.
- 5 A through-the-wall crack would release all of the helium inside the cask and initiate a meltdown.
- 6 The current cask design requires passive air cooling. Once the casks are placed in their concrete silos, they are cooled by airflow around the casks. Because these casks are so close to the beach, the air spaces that allow for cooling are subject to flooding, which could eliminate the passive air cooling and start a zirconium cladding fire.

California's Legal Definition of "Criminal Negligence" refers to a mental state of disregarding known or obvious risks to human life and safety. Based upon the aforementioned information, clear evidence of "Criminal Negligence" under California law is evidenced as the mental state of disregarding known or obvious risks to human life and safety.

Once SCE buries the waste on the beach, the waste moves a step closer to becoming "bona vacantia," a legal term that means an "ownerless property for whom no-one is responsible." That means the local jurisdictions will be responsible for an incalculable risk beyond any capacity for adequate response creating an unconscionable possibility for loss of life, liberty and property.

The CCC voted unanimously to allow nuclear-waste canisters to be stored in ways that can knowingly not be inspected, repaired, maintained or adequately monitored. The cans are not transportable if they are partially cracked. The possibility of an earthquake that could crack one of the cans was known and the canisters approved have no seismic rating for the safety of the canisters. The Commission added "Special Conditions" to the permit that these problems must be solved AFTER 20 years, with no evidence that this is even possible.

Criminal Negligence is clear and present in the act of granting the permit with the facts

regarding safety concerns known to the CCC. In addition, the reckless disregard for protection of the public is present the moment unsafe storage of deadly radioactive waste begins. Granting of the permit in question also demonstrates a disregard for human life or indifference to the consequences by exempting SCE from monitoring responsibilities for the integrity of the units as they do not exist. A reasonable person in this situation would know the act naturally and probably results in harm to other people.

As evidenced in the 10/5/15 Addendum Tu1a, The CCC had knowledge of the danger that failure of containment via multiple uncontrollable factors would likely result in death or serious bodily injury to another person. Additionally, any incident would immediately decimate personal property and create unconscionable losses.

Be it known that *Suits Against Public Officials in Their Individual Capacity: TITLE 42 U.S.C THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE §1983* imposes liability without defense on state and local officials who, acting under color of law in their individual capacity, deprive plaintiffs of rights created by the Constitution and federal law.

Since the California Coastal Commission is a quasi-judicial agency, decisions made must be based on conclusions of existing law. Additionally, because of its focus on judicial acts, judicial immunity attaches to the judicial function, not the judicial office. If a court, individual judge, or prosecutor performs executive or legislative functions, immunity will be determined by the immunity applicable to the legislative or executive function performed. A clear absence of subject matter jurisdiction is grounds for loss of immunity to the following voting members:

EFFIE TURNBULL-SANDERS	DAYNA BOCHO	MARY LUÉVANO
DONNE BROWNSEY	MARY SHALLENBERGER	MARK VARGAS
RYAN SUNDBERG	AARON PESKIN	CAROL GROOM
ERIK HOWELL	ROBERTO URANGA	GREGORY COX

In conclusion, the scope of the permit issued by the CCC is specifically for the storage of spent nuclear fuel, which is in direct conflict with the terms of the Federal land lease and existing legislation.

Furthermore, the deadly nature of radioactive waste presents a clear and present danger to the right of life, liberty and property and failure to uphold the existing laws in a criminally negligent manner is actionable to the fullest extent.

We the people hereby demand an immediate Cease and Desist Order issued by the CCC to SCE for any mobilization of work related to the permit in question, followed by a full

revocation of the permit in accordance with CCC 14 CCR § 13105 *Grounds for Revocation*.

If any additional action/information is required to meet CCC 14 CCR § 13105 *Grounds for Revocation*, please send written notice within 2 business days to the email address under Certificate of Service.

Sincerely,

Bill Weigel

Certificate of service

This is to certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been digitally delivered this 25th day of October, 2017, to the CCC at the following electronic mail addresses:

Chris.Pederson@coastal.ca.gov

Joseph.Street@coastal.ca.gov

from:

ltwallace@protonmail.com

**PERMIT REVOCATION REQUEST BY
GARY HEADRICK**

9-15-0228-REV-8

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

ENERGY, OCEAN RESOURCES AND FEDERAL CONSISTENCY DIVISION
45 FREMONT STREET
SUITE 2000
PH (415) 904-5200 FAX (415) 904-5400
WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV



December 5, 2017

Gary Headrick
2837 Penasco
San Clemente, CA 92673

Re: Request for Revocation of Coastal Development Permit No. 9-15-0228

Dear Mr. Headrick,

Coastal Commission staff has received your November 6, 2017 petition, on behalf of San Clemente Green and 1051 signatories, requesting the revocation of Coastal Development Permit (CDP) #9-15-0228 (Southern California Edison), approved by the Commission on October 6, 2015. CDP 9-15-0228 authorizes the installation and operation of a new independent spent fuel storage installation (ISFSI) at San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS).

Your request for revocation is based on four contentions, summarized as follows:

- (1) The issue of chloride stress induced corrosion cracking is an "evolving, entirely new development," and thus the Commission should suspend the CDP until more research has been done;
- (2) Southern California Edison (SCE) has recently acknowledged that the fuel canisters may not, over time, meet seismic standards, despite previously representing "canister reliability ... as if in pristine condition."
- (3) During the CDP application review, Edison failed to disclose its intention to destroy the spent fuel pools during SONGS decommissioning;
- (4) The proposed Nuclear Waste Policy Amendment Act (H.R. 3053, "Shimkus/Issa bill") would allow ownership of spent fuel to be transferred to another party immediately, suggesting the need for an amendment to the CDP to specify that the special conditions be met by SCE.

The grounds for revocation of a CDP are set forth in 14 Cal. Code of Regulations Section 13105 and provide, in relevant part, as follows:

- a) Intentional inclusion of inaccurate, erroneous or incomplete information in connection with a coastal development permit application, where the Commission finds that accurate and complete information would have caused the Commission to require additional or different conditions on a permit or deny an application;*

- b) Failure to comply with the notice provisions of Section 13054, where the views of the person(s) not notified were not otherwise made known to the commission and could have caused the commission to require additional or different conditions on a permit or deny an application.*

Commission regulations (14 CCR 13106) grant the Executive Director the authority to review a revocation request and decline to initiate revocation proceedings if he determines that the request does not establish the grounds for revocation as specified in Section 13105, and is thus patently frivolous and without merit.

I have reviewed the grounds for revocation stated in your November 6, 2017 request and decline to initiate revocation proceedings because the assertions you make either do not address the grounds for revocation as specified in Section 13105 or are contradicted in the record of the permit proceedings and are not supported by evidence that the Applicant, Southern California Edison (SCE), intentionally included inaccurate, erroneous or incomplete information in connection with their coastal development permit application.

Contentions #1 – Stress Corrosion Cracking

Your first contention, regarding the various parties' awareness of the issue of stress corrosion cracking during the licensing of the Diablo Canyon dry cask storage system, purports to bring to the Commission's attention new information that warrants the suspension or modification of the CDP. However, this contention does not address the grounds for revocation as specified in 14 CCR 13105, or provide evidence that SCE either intentionally included inaccurate, erroneous or incomplete information in connection with its coastal development permit application or failed to comply with the Commission's notice provisions. The emergence of new information alone is not grounds for revocation of a CDP under the Commission's regulations.

For informational purposes, I would note that Commission is aware of the concerns related to stress corrosion cracking of the fuel canisters, and that this is an area of active research. This issue was briefly addressed in the Adopted Findings for CDP 9-15-0228, and several more detailed sources of information are included in the administrative record for this permit. However, it is important to understand that stress corrosion cracking and the long-term integrity of the fuel canisters are ultimately issues of radiological safety, and thus are the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal government and outside the scope of the Commission's authority over and review of the ISFSI project.

Contention #2 – Seismic Safety of Canisters

The third paragraph of your revocation request appears to contend that SCE may have misrepresented to the Commission the seismic safety of the fuel canisters. As part of this argument, you assert that the canisters, over time, "may not meet seismic standards, as acknowledged by Edison in a recent CEP meeting." Commission staff has reviewed the recording of the September 14, 2017 Community Engagement Panel meeting at which a question regarding the "seismic rating" of a cracked canister was posed. In his response, SCE representative Tom Palmisano indicated that the Holtec canisters are designed to withstand ground-shaking at an intensity of 1.5 g, and that in the event of cracking the canister would have to be evaluated for structural integrity, but that the available information suggests that the type of damage associated with stress corrosion cracking would not affect the seismic rating of the canister. These statements are consistent with the information provided to the Commission as part of SCE's CDP application and contained within the

administrative record. Thus, there is no evidence that SCE intentionally included inaccurate, erroneous or incomplete information in connection with its CDP application.

Again, I would note that issues related to radiological safety, such as the safety of the proposed fuel canisters, lie outside the Commission's jurisdiction. The Commission's review of the project under Coastal Act hazards policies addressed only the stability, structural integrity and exposure to seismic hazards of the ISFSI facility as a whole, and did not address the potential for a damaged canister to release radioactive materials during an earthquake.

Contention #3 – Removal of Spent Fuel Pools

In the fourth paragraph of your request, you contend that SCE failed to disclose to the Commission its intention to dismantle the existing spent fuel pools once the fuel has been transferred to dry cask storage. While a formal decision on the timing of the removal of the spent fuel pools has not been made, and is a part of the on-going CEQA review of the Units 2 and 3 decommissioning project, SCE's intention to remove the pools was known to the Commission during the application process and documented in the administrative record, specifically in several September 2014 submittals to the NRC (*Post-Shutdown Decommissioning Activities Report*, *Decommissioning Cost Estimate*, and *Irradiated Fuels Management Plan*). Thus, you have not provided evidence that SCE intentionally provided inaccurate, erroneous, or incomplete information in relation to its future plans for the spent fuel pools.

Contention #4 – New Ownership of Spent Fuel

Similarly, your fourth contention, regarding the contents of pending federal legislation (H.R. 3053) addressing the handling and storage of spent fuel, does not identify any intentional misrepresentation or omission by SCE at the time that the Commission considered the CDP for this project. In fact, the issue you raised is based on new information and events and thus could not be the basis for a revocation request.

For the reasons discussed above, I am declining to initiate revocation proceedings because I have concluded, pursuant to Commission regulations (14 CCR §13106), that your November 6, 2017 revocation request does not meet the grounds for revocation.

If you have questions about this matter, please contact Alison Dettmer, Deputy Director, or Joseph Street, Senior Environmental Scientist, in the Energy and Ocean Resources and Federal Consistency Division, at (415) 904-5240.

Sincerely,



JOHN AINSWORTH
Executive Director

cc: Ed Yep, SCE



November 6, 2017

Re: New EVIDENCE and PETITION to REVOKE Edison's permit to bury nuclear waste at San Onofre

To: Coastal Commissioners, Attorney and Staff

Subject: Southern California Edison SONGS ISFSI Project

From: Gary Headrick, San Clemente Green Founder

Honorable Protectors of our Coast:

I'd like to thank you again for hearing our concerns at your previous meeting in Chula Vista. I am hoping that our heartfelt concerns inspired more discussions within your organization. I've attached the results of an ongoing **petition** we started this month which echoes those same sentiments, with 1051 signatures and 337 passionate comments to date. Although nuclear safety is not part of your jurisdiction, **significant testimony** recently given by a federal administrative judge regarding cracking canisters, has everything to do with transportability of nuclear waste, which was one of your conditions for approval. Also, **pending legislation** (HR 3053) would allow Edison to circumvent those commitments by handing off the liability for storing nuclear waste to a third party immediately.

At the recent Diablo Canyon Independent Safety Committee, Peter Lam (DCISC member) made this disclaimer: **"I would like to offer a disclosure. Twenty years ago I served as a federal administrative judge sitting on a licensing board that approved the dry cask storage system here at Diablo Canyon. At that time the chloride stress induced corrosion cracking was not known to the licensee, was not known to the Licensing Board, was not known to Holtec, so this is an evolving entirely new development."** (see video here: goo.gl/FSEKvQ).

The matter of CSICC needs to be explored in greater depth. Canister reliability was represented as if in pristine condition, but over time, may not meet seismic standards as acknowledged by Edison in a recent CEP meeting. We ask that the Coastal Commission suspend the permit until more research has been done. This reasonable delay may prove that these canisters are not suitable for transportation, nullifying the permit until a more reliable alternative cask is proposed.

Meanwhile, progress can continue as they work on other aspects of decommissioning, like removal of reactors, steam generators and turbines. Spent fuel pools that were intended to store nuclear waste for another forty years will suffice for the time being. At the time when the permit was granted to Edison, they failed to disclose that they intend to destroy the spent fuel pools as soon as they have been unloaded. **Since the pools would be necessary for handling leaking canisters, this would eliminate their capability of meeting your conditions.** This factor alone should cause you to question how they intend to relocate nuclear waste if they can't be repaired.

Another previously unknown factor the commissioners should be aware of now is about legislation that is being proposed in Congress. The Shimkus/Issa bill H.R. 3053 Nuclear Waste Policy Amendment Act of 2017 is currently under consideration. If passed as amended, it **would allow ownership of nuclear fuel waste to be transferred to another party immediately.** This possibility brings into question if the permit should also be

amended so that your **conditions for approval must be met by Edison, before handing it off to the DOE, Holtec or some other entity.** The fact that this is an unexpected possibility points to a significant loophole concerning the intention of conditions imposed by the permit. I doubt that anyone anticipated Edison might be able to immediately shift the liability to a third party, but that seems to be the case as the permit stands now, and might call for amending the permit.

You represent our last hope to prevent nuclear waste from being interned at San Onofre until these matters have been given adequate consideration, because they could have made a difference in the outcome of the vote. Please use every tool at your disposal to suspend the permit now. The Coastal Commission did not have access to the information provided here when the permit was approved. It is not too late to stop Edison from dodging the well intended conditions you imposed on them. Please listen to our concerns and act accordingly before Edison goes any further. We are counting on you at a time when many of our most important institutions seem to be letting us down.

With hope, faith and good will,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gary Headrick". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Gary" being more prominent than the last name "Headrick".

Gary Headrick

2837 Penasco
San Clemente, CA 92673
(949) 218-4051



This petition has collected
1051 signatures
using the online tools at iPetitions.com

Printed on 2017-11-06

REVOKE Nuclear Waste Storage Permit at San Onofre

About this petition

Your signature on this Petition will send a message, loud and clear to the California Coastal Commission that the permit they approved for Edison was flawed and must be revoked. The Special Conditions in the Coastal Permit that are twenty years out are well intended, but should have been required from the start. Other countries currently use nuclear waste storage systems that could meet those reasonable requirements today. Their containers can be inspected, repaired, maintained, monitored and transported without cracks. The thin canisters being used at San Onofre have none of these attributes because they were only intended for temporary storage.

Signatures

1. Name: Craig Beauchamp on 2017-10-06 17:02:26
Comments: No storage in populated areas. It's a reckless disregard for human life.
Revoke!

2. Name: Ed Schlegel on 2017-10-06 20:53:54
Comments:

3. Name: Laurie Headrick on 2017-10-07 20:48:50
Comments: Stop this insane plan to bury nuclear waste in temporary storage containers on our beach! There are better alternatives.

4. Name: Gary Headrick on 2017-10-10 19:19:50
Comments:

5. Name: tiffany galaway on 2017-10-10 22:53:05
Comments:

6. Name: Rose Marie Leather on 2017-10-10 22:53:28
Comments:

7. Name: Sharon Swan on 2017-10-10 22:53:43
Comments:

8. Name: Cristina León on 2017-10-10 22:53:55
Comments:

9. Name: Debbie Naude on 2017-10-10 22:54:43
Comments:

10. Name: Brig Jorgensen on 2017-10-10 22:55:39
Comments: Ship it out and bury it deep NM or TX where the local want the crap. Get it off the coast!

11. Name: James Mulcare on 2017-10-10 22:55:45
Comments:

12. Name: Jody Gibson on 2017-10-10 22:55:56
Comments:

13. Name: Mark Reback on 2017-10-10 22:56:22
Comments: No nuclear waste right next to the ocean! Are you nuts?

-
14. Name: Aparna Bakhle on 2017-10-10 22:57:05
Comments:
-
15. Name: Rob Gordon on 2017-10-10 22:57:41
Comments:
-
16. Name: Michael Metcalf on 2017-10-10 22:58:18
Comments:
-
17. Name: Lee Grimes Evans on 2017-10-10 22:58:57
Comments:
-
18. Name: Denise Liebmann on 2017-10-10 22:59:06
Comments: Let the CCC bury this toxin in their own backyards.
-
19. Name: Mehrak Kanani on 2017-10-10 23:01:49
Comments:
-
20. Name: Janet Way on 2017-10-10 23:02:22
Comments:
-
21. Name: Charles Murray on 2017-10-10 23:02:43
Comments: NIOBY !
-
22. Name: Carroll Arkema on 2017-10-10 23:02:58
Comments:
-
23. Name: Phoebe Sorgen on 2017-10-10 23:03:27
Comments: Please wake up to sanity, or do you prefer a Ca Fukushima style nightmare?
-
24. Name: Barbara Fox on 2017-10-10 23:03:43
Comments: I consider the burial of nuclear waste at this site to be one of the biggest travesties in history. I have no intention of standing down and letting this just happen.

The public cares. I care.
-
25. Name: Marvin Dennis on 2017-10-10 23:03:45
Comments: It's a crazy notion to believe these casters would provide an adequate level of protection for any significant period of time. Don't let this happen. Revoke the permit now and insist on a better plan.
-

26. Name: Curtis McLendon on 2017-10-10 23:04:39
Comments:
-
27. Name: Elizabeth McLendon on 2017-10-10 23:05:19
Comments:
-
28. Name: Elisa Crawford on 2017-10-10 23:05:35
Comments:
-
29. Name: Susan Sayre on 2017-10-10 23:07:20
Comments: The nuclear waste is not safely stored at San Onofre and will never be. It must be stored at a location far from earthquake faults and far from the ocean.
-
30. Name: J T Smith on 2017-10-10 23:07:27
Comments:
-
31. Name: Mary Tilton on 2017-10-10 23:10:56
Comments:
-
32. Name: Lorna Farnum on 2017-10-10 23:11:19
Comments: Putting the nuclear waste so close to the ocean on an earthquake fault line is to ask for another Fukushima accident to occur in a much more densely populated area. It is recklessness for MILLIONS of CALIFORNIANS living within 12 of the San Onofre site.
-
33. Name: Bob Miller on 2017-10-10 23:11:51
Comments: I previously lived only a few miles from San Onofre.
-
34. Name: Sandra McCanne on 2017-10-10 23:12:09
Comments:
-
35. Name: Rachel Clark on 2017-10-10 23:12:31
Comments: You must be kidding!
-
36. Name: Michael Tomczyszyn on 2017-10-10 23:14:53
Comments:
-
37. Name: Alan Lawrence on 2017-10-10 23:18:08
Comments: We need to avoid another Fukushima.
-
38. Name: Margaret Elliott on 2017-10-10 23:18:36
Comments:
-

39. Name: Jessica Cresseveur on 2017-10-10 23:19:21
Comments:
-
40. Name: Gary Bandfield on 2017-10-10 23:19:22
Comments:
-
41. Name: Meryle A Korn on 2017-10-10 23:19:59
Comments: The San Onofre reactor should never have been permitted in the first place. Fukushima showed the world that an earthquake and tsunami zone is totally unsafe. A plan to store nuclear waste there is at least as ill-founded as the original reactor, and for the same reasons.
-
42. Name: Verna Rollinger on 2017-10-10 23:20:52
Comments: We need thick-wall casks
-
43. Name: Veloma M Scott on 2017-10-10 23:21:32
Comments:
-
44. Name: Julia Cato on 2017-10-10 23:25:19
Comments:
-
45. Name: Ed Schlegel on 2017-10-10 23:25:29
Comments:
-
46. Name: Peter Butt on 2017-10-10 23:29:15
Comments: The attempts to evade responsibility for the SONGS nuclear dilemma continue apace. SCE et al are responsible and liable for their waste. I'm responsible for mine. What about them?
-
47. Name: William Klock on 2017-10-10 23:29:39
Comments:
-
48. Name: Susan Goggins on 2017-10-10 23:32:21
Comments: This has to be one of the worst places to bury hazardous, nuclear waste. CCC, please revoke this permit.
-
49. Name: Cheryl Moe on 2017-10-10 23:34:10
Comments: Please do not approve this. This has the greatest effect on the public coastal resources and public health. So many young people in this area have cancer. If you approve this then there is no reason for CCC to scrutinize single family residential projects. Those are insignificant. Please focus on the big picture. This will be disastrous. Vote NO.
-
50. Name: Ellen Lubic on 2017-10-10 23:34:31

Comments:

-
51. Name: Linda Pyle on 2017-10-10 23:34:53
Comments:
-
52. Name: Todd Furuike on 2017-10-10 23:36:18
Comments: Please revoke the permit to have SONGS bury nuclear waste at San Onofre
-
53. Name: DH Higgins on 2017-10-10 23:36:40
Comments:
-
54. Name: Cody Dolnick on 2017-10-10 23:36:42
Comments:
-
55. Name: Frances Howard on 2017-10-10 23:36:52
Comments: This is not a safe place to store nuclear waste, we must find another site!
-
56. Name: Lisa Hammermeister on 2017-10-10 23:37:02
Comments: In earthquake country, NO nuclear storage!
-
57. Name: LAURA ROSS on 2017-10-10 23:38:30
Comments:
-
58. Name: David Reilly on 2017-10-10 23:38:33
Comments: No nukes ever. Bury this shit under congress and in the back yard of every energy executive.
-
59. Name: Peter Stone on 2017-10-10 23:39:22
Comments:
-
60. Name: David E Haycraft on 2017-10-10 23:39:37
Comments:
-
61. Name: Kim Atkinson on 2017-10-10 23:41:40
Comments: It would be insane to permit nuclear waste storage like this.
-
62. Name: Eva meier on 2017-10-10 23:42:34
Comments:
-
63. Name: Patricia Baley on 2017-10-10 23:42:47
Comments:
-

64. Name: Amy Steinberg on 2017-10-10 23:42:48
Comments:
-
65. Name: Jim powers on 2017-10-10 23:48:52
Comments: We need a better plan. The cheap and easy plan now will cost much more later.
-
66. Name: Michelle Veyna on 2017-10-10 23:51:00
Comments:
-
67. Name: Joseph Cope on 2017-10-10 23:53:02
Comments:
-
68. Name: Linda Pierce on 2017-10-10 23:54:06
Comments: This is too close to too many,!
-
69. Name: Shivam Kohls on 2017-10-10 23:54:24
Comments:
-
70. Name: Tanya Barach on 2017-10-10 23:54:58
Comments: Please take responsibility and end this nightmare scenario before it begins. There is a better way!!!
-
71. Name: Judy Genandt on 2017-10-10 23:56:38
Comments:
-
72. Name: Kim F Floyd on 2017-10-10 23:56:45
Comments:
-
73. Name: Nikki Alexander on 2017-10-10 23:59:50
Comments: Could we think about what's best for the planet, for once?
-
74. Name: Morris Sandel on 2017-10-11 00:00:41
Comments: Better still STOP PRODUCING NUCLEAR WASTE!!! -Morris Sandel
-
75. Name: joe sain on 2017-10-11 00:03:30
Comments:
-
76. Name: Kent Minault on 2017-10-11 00:03:36
Comments:
-
77. Name: Shari Horne on 2017-10-11 00:04:25

Comments: This is the worst environment possible for this waste.

-
78. Name: Christine Goodhue on 2017-10-11 00:05:27
Comments: Please be responsible! This negligence affects all of us in Southern California.
-
79. Name: Anne Dugaw on 2017-10-11 00:06:39
Comments:
-
80. Name: Leslie Cassidy on 2017-10-11 00:06:52
Comments:
-
81. Name: alan papscun on 2017-10-11 00:06:52
Comments:
-
82. Name: Patricia Wines on 2017-10-11 00:08:32
Comments: Nothing about the storage of this nuclear waste will be "temporary" as in an interim short-term solution to be resolved in my life time so let's at least use an appropriate container that can be transported, monitored and is as safe as possible for this "temporary" location.
-
83. Name: Jacquelyn Earnest on 2017-10-11 00:12:01
Comments:
-
84. Name: Michelle Miranda on 2017-10-11 00:16:12
Comments:
-
85. Name: Elise Kert on 2017-10-11 00:19:20
Comments:
-
86. Name: Josephine Hill on 2017-10-11 00:22:13
Comments: With increased technological knowledge about nuclear wastes, our regulatory agencies need to update their knowledge to maximize the effectiveness of their job description of protecting the public health.
-
87. Name: Marilyn Miller on 2017-10-11 00:24:24
Comments: Please keep us safe!
-
88. Name: Simone Schad Siebert on 2017-10-11 00:28:21
Comments: This is not a safe option! No nuclear waste at San Onofre.
-
89. Name: Darrell Clarke on 2017-10-11 00:29:06
Comments:

-
90. Name: Gerry Martocci on 2017-10-11 00:31:12
Comments:
-
91. Name: Diana Nolan on 2017-10-11 00:35:43
Comments: Please do not put our citizens, ocean and environment at risk with a short sighted potentially catastrophic , flawed storage system.
-
92. Name: Brian Smith on 2017-10-11 00:38:11
Comments:
-
93. Name: Skip Shaputnic on 2017-10-11 00:42:38
Comments:
-
94. Name: Joseph Shulman on 2017-10-11 00:43:46
Comments:
-
95. Name: Joseph M Tully on 2017-10-11 00:46:59
Comments: Remove all stores uranium to a federally secured site designed for long term storage.
-
96. Name: Terry Albrecht on 2017-10-11 00:47:48
Comments:
-
97. Name: david bardwick on 2017-10-11 00:48:50
Comments:
-
98. Name: christopher ericson on 2017-10-11 00:52:43
Comments:
-
99. Name: Sylvia Ruth Gray on 2017-10-11 00:53:03
Comments: This is an accident waiting to happen.
-
100. Name: Tom Arntson on 2017-10-11 00:53:26
Comments: Isn't there a BETTER option?
-
101. Name: Evie Kosower on 2017-10-11 00:53:29
Comments:
-
102. Name: nora jaffe on 2017-10-11 00:56:23
Comments: It is unconscionable that this permit was granted because it defies common sense. Please revoke it and find a better way.

-
103. Name: helgaleena on 2017-10-11 00:59:21
Comments:
-
104. Name: John Zimmermann on 2017-10-11 01:02:03
Comments:
-
105. Name: Charles Langley on 2017-10-11 01:14:12
Comments: There is such a cloud of controversy and public suspicion about the way the original permit was issued that it behooves the Commission to restore trust by suspending the permit until a proper vote and an informed public discussion can occur.
-
106. Name: Kimberly Wiley on 2017-10-11 01:16:03
Comments:
-
107. Name: Brent Rocks on 2017-10-11 01:31:22
Comments:
-
108. Name: henry moser on 2017-10-11 01:32:52
Comments:
-
109. Name: Jennifer on 2017-10-11 01:39:47
Comments:
-
110. Name: tye block on 2017-10-11 01:41:32
Comments:
-
111. Name: Sally Barron on 2017-10-11 01:56:56
Comments: The current permit is flawed and must be revoked. The lives of thousands of Californians depend on it,
-
112. Name: Susan Wingfield-Ritter on 2017-10-11 02:03:43
Comments: Thin-wall canisters are too dangerous to allow. Please act accordingly.
-
113. Name: Liz Kuhns on 2017-10-11 02:09:20
Comments: Why put lives and the future at risk? If safer storage is available, what is the reason for not choosing it?
-
114. Name: Rebecca Davis on 2017-10-11 02:11:39
Comments:
-

115.	Name: nancymcdonell	on 2017-10-11 02:14:57	Comments:
116.	Name: sundra allen	on 2017-10-11 02:15:34	Comments:
117.	Name: Cris Fulton	on 2017-10-11 02:21:22	Comments:
118.	Name: Barbara Takashima	on 2017-10-11 02:28:05	Comments:
119.	Name: Mary Krut	on 2017-10-11 02:30:39	Comments:
120.	Name: peter taft	on 2017-10-11 02:31:33	Comments:
121.	Name: JoAnne Gervase	on 2017-10-11 02:32:10	Comments: Please do not allow the radioactive waste at San Onofre to be buried near the ocean. Thank you
122.	Name: Richard L Ellison	on 2017-10-11 02:33:02	Comments:
123.	Name: Linda	on 2017-10-11 02:39:20	Comments:
124.	Name: Don McKelvey	on 2017-10-11 02:45:04	Comments: This is a no-brainer !
125.	Name: Laurenn Barker	on 2017-10-11 02:46:08	Comments: Please revoke the petition that was approved for this storage as it was improperly granted based on current knowledge and industry standards.
126.	Name: Richard and Judy Northrop	on 2017-10-11 02:49:50	Comments: This plan is absurd and dangerous!
127.	Name: Len Willie	on 2017-10-11 02:55:05	Comments:
128.	Name: Jerry Malamud	on 2017-10-11 02:57:46	

Comments:

-
129. Name: Devon Azzam on 2017-10-11 03:00:50
Comments:
-
130. Name: Prisca Gloor on 2017-10-11 03:00:58
Comments: Please save lives and nature and don't store nuclear waste near the ocean.
-
131. Name: Glenn Frieder on 2017-10-11 03:15:21
Comments: Too dangerous with our being on a earth quake fault
-
132. Name: Kay Ospital on 2017-10-11 03:24:54
Comments:
-
133. Name: CAROL COLLINS on 2017-10-11 03:30:26
Comments:
-
134. Name: Janice Burstin on 2017-10-11 03:52:20
Comments: IT'S MUCH TOO RISKY TO BURY NUCLEAR WASTE AT SAN ONOFRE IN UNSAFE CANNISTERS!! THIS IS NOT AN EXPERIMENT...WE ARE NOT GUINEA PIGS!!
-
135. Name: Mha Atma S Khalsa on 2017-10-11 03:53:13
Comments:
-
136. Name: Peter Giannola on 2017-10-11 03:53:16
Comments: Nuclear waste is the most serious environmental problem now facing us. It's our responsibility to future generations solve this problem.
-
137. Name: VINCENT E STIPA on 2017-10-11 03:55:29
Comments:
-
138. Name: Wendy Morris on 2017-10-11 04:09:25
Comments: How could you approve this? It is too dangerous to transport or to store in yucca mountain. But ok to bury next to the ocean and state park in this highly populated area. That doesn't make sense.
-
139. Name: dorothy varellas on 2017-10-11 04:11:32
Comments: Are you kidding? Doesn't anyone remember what happened at Fukushima? Doesn't anyone on the CCC know that we live on earthquake faults? Storing nuclear waste at Son Onofre on the edge of the ocean is the most stupid idea I have ever heard of, short of building Diablo Canyon on the oceans edge!

You are playing with fire and the lives of millions of people are in jeopardy. Get real and

do not authorize this terrible plan.

140. Name: Edith Ogella on 2017-10-11 04:17:33
Comments:

141. Name: Georgette Korsen on 2017-10-11 04:20:55
Comments: This is an outrageous decision that is not in the best interest of any of the 65,000 people who live in San Clemente, nor any of the hundreds of thousands that live further north or south. We have lived with those nuclear plants for years, dreading an accident or release of radiation. NOW is the time to finally keep us safe, out of harms way. PLEASE, do not store those casks on site, in harms way. PLEASE.

142. Name: John Leddy on 2017-10-11 04:27:24
Comments: Is the CCC still protecting our coast? That has been in doubt of late. The EPA and NRC are definitely hostiles. BACT is a must for decommissioning dirty nukes. CCC, do your job!

143. Name: Sharlene Bergart on 2017-10-11 04:27:44
Comments: Nuclear Waste Storage permit must be revoked. It is seriously flawed and dangerous for people and animals living nearby. It is also dangerous for the ocean. Stop this permit now.

144. Name: lisa uhrhammer on 2017-10-11 04:29:59
Comments: DO NOT LET THIS HAPPEN! THIS IS A PRIVATE COMPANY AND THE STOCKHOLDERS SHOULD PAY THE EXPENSE OF REMOVING THE NUCLEAR WASTE AND TAKING IT TO STORE IT FOR PERPETUITY. THE STOCKHOLDERS MADE MONEY AND NOW MUST FOOT THE BILL!!

145. Name: Cathy Asciutto on 2017-10-11 04:39:15
Comments:

146. Name: Jim Wells on 2017-10-11 04:40:35
Comments: What is the diplomatic way to say "What the fk was wrong with whomever of you voted before to approve the current permit for Southern California Edison to to store nuclear waste at their San Onofre site?" ? Regardless, that all of you should now revoke it is beyond question.

147. Name: Katherine James on 2017-10-11 04:40:36
Comments:

148. Name: Jeb Pronto on 2017-10-11 04:44:27
Comments:

149. Name: Daniel Headrick MD on 2017-10-11 04:45:09

-
150. Name: Stephen Joseph Libert on 2017-10-11 04:47:32
Comments: PLEASE! Find a better way.
-
151. Name: Duff Wilmoth on 2017-10-11 05:03:40
Comments: You have a nuclear reactor situated on the beach along the Pacific Ocean. Please fulfill your civic duty to Orange County, the ST CA and the charter you are mandated uphold to and be on the right side of history. .
-
152. Name: Edeltraut Renk on 2017-10-11 05:15:10
Comments:
-
153. Name: Grace van Thillo on 2017-10-11 05:18:59
Comments: The permit to store nuclear waste at SoCal Edison's San Onofre Nuclear Plant should be revoked. 8.5 million people live in the southland. Property and business values are some of the state/nation's highest. USMC Camp Pendleton is our nation's primary military base. Major north/south rail and transportation corridors pass by the stored waste. Any radioactive accident will be disastrous to human and all life and the area's land and ocean environment, and the economic viability of both state and nation. Present storage casks are not tested for long-term storage. The NRC doesn't know what to expect! The highest grade, safest storage should be employed; and when safe to do so, with viable locations, the nuclear waste should be removed; not stored in San Onofre, until a natural disaster, earthquake and tsunami happen.
-
154. Name: Carol H on 2017-10-11 05:27:56
Comments:
-
155. Name: Yoko Collin on 2017-10-11 05:41:51
Comments:
-
156. Name: Jill Estensen on 2017-10-11 05:41:59
Comments: Nuclear power without appropriate waste containment is irresponsibility in it's worst form, greed.
-
157. Name: Madge Torres on 2017-10-11 06:09:47
Comments:
-
158. Name: Michael Robert Gonzalez on 2017-10-11 06:10:07
Comments:
-
159. Name: Corey E Olsen on 2017-10-11 06:26:12
Comments:
-

160. Name: Barbara R Chavez-Rock on 2017-10-11 06:35:25
Comments:
-
161. Name: Jeanne Green on 2017-10-11 07:17:15
Comments: Inadequate storage is unacceptable. Only Thick-wall casks be used as in other civilized countries.. Revoke storage permit at San Onofre.
-
162. Name: Kay Gallin on 2017-10-11 07:31:35
Comments:
-
163. Name: Mary Pat Eberle on 2017-10-11 07:55:38
Comments:
-
164. Name: eugene burke on 2017-10-11 07:58:30
Comments:
-
165. Name: Sherry Johnson on 2017-10-11 08:02:12
Comments:
-
166. Name: Katherine Jorgensen on 2017-10-11 09:16:26
Comments: San Onofre has long been a source of apprehension especially in the event of a major earthquake and now in terms of North Korea's and Trump's bombastic threats
-
167. Name: Rita Conn on 2017-10-11 10:18:56
Comments:
-
168. Name: joe overmyer on 2017-10-11 12:32:58
Comments:
-
169. Name: Deborah Drucker on 2017-10-11 12:43:09
Comments:
-
170. Name: Jerome Kirsling on 2017-10-11 12:50:36
Comments: This is a mater of not only environmental protection but of protecting the people of the United States and the globe. We cannot afford to be careless with this dangerous an issue!
-
171. Name: Jerome Kirsling on 2017-10-11 12:51:07
Comments: This is a mater of not only environmental protection but of protecting the people of the United States and the globe. We cannot afford to be careless with this dangerous an issue!
-
172. Name: Lori Mulvey on 2017-10-11 12:54:12

Comments:

-
173. Name: Chris Connolly on 2017-10-11 12:54:35
Comments: Please make Edison treat this Nuclear waste LIKE Nuclear waste, not take the cheap way out and bury it near our most precious resource, the Pacific Ocean!
-
174. Name: Kathleen Connolly on 2017-10-11 12:55:39
Comments:
-
175. Name: Gale Darling on 2017-10-11 12:59:05
Comments:
-
176. Name: Bruce Campbell on 2017-10-11 12:59:48
Comments: At the CEP meeting when the CCC voted for a radwaste configuration on San Onofre State Beach, Dr. Singh of the Holtec Co. admitted that his company's nuclear waste canisters cannot be monitored, repackaged, or transported.
- Thus, it is highly likely that any such configuration would become permanent -- unless a number of safety regulations are waived to allow some sort of repackaging and transport!
-
177. Name: john nicksic on 2017-10-11 13:27:00
Comments:
-
178. Name: Pam Evans on 2017-10-11 13:34:16
Comments:
-
179. Name: Lisa Goff on 2017-10-11 13:40:26
Comments: no nuclear waster here!
-
180. Name: Rebecca Robles on 2017-10-11 13:47:21
Comments:
-
181. Name: Rachael Mitchell on 2017-10-11 13:56:00
Comments:
-
182. Name: Beckee Cost on 2017-10-11 14:12:42
Comments: This is completely unacceptable!
-
183. Name: Kelly Wilson on 2017-10-11 14:18:55
Comments:
-
184. Name: Rebecca Noble-Kibby on 2017-10-11 14:19:13
Comments:

-
185. Name: Lisa Tart on 2017-10-11 14:38:43
Comments: How udderly insane to even think about doing this project
-
186. Name: Lisa Kopelman on 2017-10-11 14:45:05
Comments: I'm a long time resident of San Clemente and vehemently oppose the plan to bury the waste at San Onofre.
-
187. Name: Gail Cohn on 2017-10-11 14:47:16
Comments:
-
188. Name: Andrew Ellis on 2017-10-11 14:52:53
Comments: SCE's aging mangement plan that allows inspection of only 50% of the lower half of the spent fuel canisters is a recipe for disaster. An inspection plan that covers only half of the surface area of the canisters will not be able to detect radiation leaks from the San Onofre Storage facility.
-
189. Name: Elizabeth Lerer on 2017-10-11 14:53:04
Comments: Please Coastal Commission, prove you are being true to your mission, "The Commission is committed to protecting and enhancing California's coast and ocean for present and future generations."

Find a better way to protect the coast. Please REVOKE the nuclear waste storage permit at San Onofre.
-
190. Name: Erik Husoe on 2017-10-11 14:53:05
Comments:
-
191. Name: Joseph R Thompson on 2017-10-11 15:03:28
Comments:
-
192. Name: Patti herdell on 2017-10-11 15:14:19
Comments:
-
193. Name: Phyllis Jordanov on 2017-10-11 15:26:28
Comments:
-
194. Name: Michele Pellissier on 2017-10-11 15:32:36
Comments:
-
195. Name: Michelle Schumacher on 2017-10-11 15:36:03
Comments:
-

196.	Name: Bill Fickling	on 2017-10-11 15:48:10	Comments:
197.	Name: Trevor Bryson	on 2017-10-11 15:54:58	Comments: This is simply put a stupid idea!!
198.	Name: Robert Lieber	on 2017-10-11 16:02:56	Comments:
199.	Name: Robert Lieber	on 2017-10-11 16:05:12	Comments:
200.	Name: Lucaccioni Jana	on 2017-10-11 16:09:27	Comments:
201.	Name: adriana johnson	on 2017-10-11 16:18:36	Comments:
202.	Name: Joanna Mathews	on 2017-10-11 16:20:13	Comments: Move the waste away from the ocean. This is a disaster waiting to happen. Time for the government and utilities to accept responsibility. If nuclear plants were built and even still operating, there should be safe disposal sites built. 50+ years of waiting and doing nothing in terms of disposal is unacceptable to the health and future of our citizens.
203.	Name: Petti Van Rekom	on 2017-10-11 16:20:17	Comments: My family has lived in San Clemente for over 50 years. The threat of a disaster from nuclear waste is a threat to our safety and well being. Please do NOT let Edison continue to store the waste at San Onofre.
204.	Name: Judy Lopez	on 2017-10-11 16:26:26	Comments: Must be prevented to bury in ocean, NOT acceptable!!
205.	Name: Shirley Michael	on 2017-10-11 16:32:29	Comments:
206.	Name: Ron May Jr	on 2017-10-11 16:34:24	Comments:
207.	Name: Sarah	on 2017-10-11 16:36:01	Comments:
208.	Name: Caryn Graves	on 2017-10-11 16:49:56	

Comments:

-
209. Name: Belinda Robnett-Olsen on 2017-10-11 16:51:03
Comments:
-
210. Name: Armen Gasparian on 2017-10-11 16:56:05
Comments: Stop the madness.
-
211. Name: Nancy Princetta on 2017-10-11 16:57:40
Comments: Have we not learned anything from the disaster at Fukushima, Japan? Nuclear waste planted by water sources, our oceans and highly in inhabited densely populated areas is an UNACCEPABLE, highly DANGEROUS AND puts our quality of life at great risk.
-
212. Name: Nina Macdonald on 2017-10-11 16:59:23
Comments:
-
213. Name: Mike Craig on 2017-10-11 17:01:33
Comments:
-
214. Name: Daniel Driscoll on 2017-10-11 17:13:58
Comments: Nuclear waste near our beautiful beaches is not something to 'cut corners' on
-
215. Name: Claudia Pineda on 2017-10-11 17:15:51
Comments:
-
216. Name: robynn zender on 2017-10-11 17:16:29
Comments:
-
217. Name: Susan Morrissey on 2017-10-11 17:29:16
Comments:
-
218. Name: Brenda Cohn on 2017-10-11 17:34:14
Comments:
-
219. Name: Carolyn Yvellez on 2017-10-11 17:42:27
Comments: Keep San Diego/Oceanside safe and healthy!
-
220. Name: Susan Anderson on 2017-10-11 17:46:15
Comments:
-
221. Name: Richard Sauerheber on 2017-10-11 17:56:20

Comments:

-
222. Name: Linda Hodges on 2017-10-11 17:58:14
Comments:
-
223. Name: Pauline Yahr on 2017-10-11 17:59:19
Comments:
-
224. Name: William Crane on 2017-10-11 18:00:04
Comments: Putting nuclear waste so close to the ocean is a very BAD idea.
-
225. Name: Estee on 2017-10-11 18:06:36
Comments:
-
226. Name: Janet Pritchard on 2017-10-11 18:11:22
Comments:
-
227. Name: Cynthia Lakon on 2017-10-11 18:39:22
Comments: We must find a much safer solution for the storage of these nuclear wastes.
-
228. Name: Schwab Gabriele on 2017-10-11 18:48:33
Comments: Burying the waste at this site would be a disaster. There must be a better solution!! The consequences might be catastrophic. Those responsible should learn from history!
-
229. Name: Lucía Cash on 2017-10-11 19:10:19
Comments:
-
230. Name: Gary Miller on 2017-10-11 19:19:51
Comments:
-
231. Name: Ernest Simonin on 2017-10-11 19:28:07
Comments:
-
232. Name: Barbara Cohn on 2017-10-11 19:31:20
Comments:
-
233. Name: Julie Brown on 2017-10-11 19:34:27
Comments:
-
234. Name: Christine Shields on 2017-10-11 20:10:37
Comments: Stop this madness

-
235. Name: Shell Lavender on 2017-10-11 20:17:53
Comments: California is already suffering massive irradiation from Fukushima. They don't need the possibility of more.
-
236. Name: MC Hagerty on 2017-10-11 20:17:54
Comments: Its crazy that the "Officials" think it is OK to bury nuclear waste near the ocean, and all the earthquake faults in the area. They must not live in SoCal or they would not do this!
-
237. Name: Jill scherillo on 2017-10-11 20:19:10
Comments:
-
238. Name: Shahrokh Mirjahangir on 2017-10-11 20:29:22
Comments: Permit must be revoked.
This is point of no return.
Common sense has to prevail.

Thank you
-
239. Name: Patricia Martz on 2017-10-11 20:59:50
Comments: Do not store nuclear waste at San Onofre. It is too dangerous.
-
240. Name: Michael Epeneter on 2017-10-11 21:29:45
Comments: I implore the California Coastal Commission to revoke or at minimum suspend the Nuclear Waste Storage Permit at San Onofre. We need a better plan to deal with this waste product and one that insures the safety of our community.
-
241. Name: Patricia Plumb on 2017-10-11 21:36:28
Comments:
-
242. Name: Chris Bauman on 2017-10-11 21:36:32
Comments:
-
243. Name: Iris Edinger on 2017-10-11 21:52:52
Comments:
-
244. Name: Dina Falmagne on 2017-10-11 22:01:17
Comments:
-
245. Name: Gary T Jenkins on 2017-10-11 22:10:00
Comments:
-

246. Name: Meredith Ann Riekse on 2017-10-11 22:10:25
Comments:
-
247. Name: Beth Anderson on 2017-10-11 22:19:26
Comments:
-
248. Name: Monica Fuerst Finkelstein on 2017-10-11 22:21:07
Comments: Everyone's lives are important including the individuals not born yet.
-
249. Name: Chuck Hoblitzelle on 2017-10-11 22:36:21
Comments:
-
250. Name: Beth Brokaw on 2017-10-11 22:44:50
Comments: Please do the right thing. Protect us now and not 2 decades from now. This is a serious issue demanding timely action.
Thank you.
-
251. Name: T Bell on 2017-10-11 22:45:31
Comments: Unsafe in any Place !
Stop the Madness !
-
252. Name: Barbara Howard on 2017-10-11 23:03:19
Comments:
-
253. Name: Christina Carroll on 2017-10-11 23:09:08
Comments:
-
254. Name: Monica Andersen on 2017-10-11 23:11:14
Comments:
-
255. Name: Vincent price on 2017-10-11 23:22:29
Comments:
-
256. Name: Dede Newman on 2017-10-11 23:56:16
Comments:
-
257. Name: Virginia Timmins on 2017-10-12 00:01:37
Comments: My family lives there and I would consider moving close to them in the future. This decision could change my mind.
It is a thoughtlessly proposed option. If other countries can do better so can we. Do what is best for the people and not make it an economic issue.
-
258. Name: Dave Kisor on 2017-10-12 00:28:27

Comments: Whoever decided to use the thin wall casks should be beaten until their morale improves.

259. Name: Janelle Dodkin on 2017-10-12 00:36:28
Comments:

260. Name: Kelley Scanlon on 2017-10-12 01:07:12
Comments:

261. Name: Charles Constance on 2017-10-12 01:10:06
Comments:

262. Name: Bill Hedrick on 2017-10-12 01:30:08
Comments:

263. Name: Cheryl Harding on 2017-10-12 01:38:52
Comments:

264. Name: Annette Schlichter on 2017-10-12 02:28:44
Comments:

265. Name: Nola Wood on 2017-10-12 02:40:54
Comments:

266. Name: Libbe HaLevy on 2017-10-12 02:46:09
Comments:

267. Name: Lisa Cairo on 2017-10-12 02:55:44
Comments:

268. Name: senait forthal on 2017-10-12 03:32:04
Comments:

269. Name: Dennis Trembly on 2017-10-12 04:47:20
Comments:

270. Name: Pamela horowitz on 2017-10-12 04:49:50
Comments:

271. Name: Ann Bron on 2017-10-12 04:54:38
Comments:

272. Name: L Read on 2017-10-12 04:58:13
Comments: Store that nuke waste at Yucca Mountain--not in a heavily populated coastal city. You dumbasses are asking for another Fukushima if California gets a significant earthquake. Don't be stupid!

273. Name: Cris Mazza on 2017-10-12 11:04:14
Comments:

274. Name: nate headrick on 2017-10-12 12:09:16
Comments:

275. Name: Grant Bruso on 2017-10-12 12:59:02
Comments:

276. Name: Eleanor Fumanti on 2017-10-12 13:32:07
Comments:

277. Name: priscilla agnew on 2017-10-12 13:35:14
Comments:

278. Name: Swedina Hurt on 2017-10-12 13:49:29
Comments:

279. Name: Barbara Froehlich on 2017-10-12 16:01:03
Comments:

280. Name: S Stoneman on 2017-10-12 20:42:53
Comments:

281. Name: Dave Tallman on 2017-10-12 21:04:56
Comments:

282. Name: Gail Tallman on 2017-10-12 21:07:16
Comments:

283. Name: Marian Farber on 2017-10-12 21:21:47
Comments: NO< NO--too close to a LARGE population.

284. Name: JACK ROGGENBUCK on 2017-10-12 21:45:44
Comments:

285. Name: Debra REhn on 2017-10-12 23:06:04

Comments:

-
286. Name: Jody Gibson on 2017-10-12 23:07:24
Comments:
-
287. Name: Karl Aldinger on 2017-10-12 23:10:52
Comments:
-
288. Name: lisa weiss on 2017-10-12 23:14:38
Comments:
-
289. Name: Louisa Spinelli on 2017-10-12 23:18:04
Comments: NOT TEMPORARY STORAGE!...Please do the job right! Please keep us safe! Thank you very much!
-
290. Name: Lougene Anderson on 2017-10-12 23:19:03
Comments:
-
291. Name: Peter Butt on 2017-10-12 23:19:12
Comments:
-
292. Name: Hugh Moore on 2017-10-12 23:25:14
Comments:
-
293. Name: Judy Curry on 2017-10-12 23:28:36
Comments:
-
294. Name: James Odling on 2017-10-12 23:29:05
Comments:
-
295. Name: Richard Northrop on 2017-10-12 23:29:27
Comments:
-
296. Name: John W Dewey on 2017-10-12 23:31:08
Comments:
-
297. Name: Genevieve Riber on 2017-10-12 23:32:52
Comments:
-
298. Name: WILLIAM W BALLINGER on 2017-10-12 23:34:31
Comments:
-

299. Name: Amy Steinberg on 2017-10-12 23:37:14
Comments:
-
300. Name: Marilyn Ledoux on 2017-10-12 23:42:59
Comments: Please educate yourselves about the dangers posed by these temporary cannisters and revoke the permit for Edison to use them indefinitely.
-
301. Name: Damon Wyler on 2017-10-12 23:47:44
Comments: Thank you for helping to increase safety at one of California's most valuable stretches of coastline!
-
302. Name: James Stone on 2017-10-13 00:01:13
Comments:
-
303. Name: Brian Siebert on 2017-10-13 00:07:37
Comments:
-
304. Name: Anne Dugaw on 2017-10-13 00:11:09
Comments:
-
305. Name: Peter Lee on 2017-10-13 00:16:15
Comments: The thin temporary storage canisters being used at San Onofre can not be inspected, repaired, maintained, monitored and transported without cracks. This is Unacceptable!
-
306. Name: Mr Evans on 2017-10-13 00:17:42
Comments:
-
307. Name: Joe Glaston on 2017-10-13 00:21:32
Comments:
-
308. Name: Alan Korsen on 2017-10-13 00:23:39
Comments: Hopefully the additional information will bring the light of day to a serious condition.
-
309. Name: Dorelle Rawlings on 2017-10-13 00:30:40
Comments: The safety of many people in southern California depend upon revoking Edison's Nuclear Waste Storage Permit at San Onofre. The company has made no attempt to assure the safe storage of nuclear waste, and it is important that San Onofre not become just another superfund site awaiting taxpayer funding for cleanup, because there is no good way to clean up buried and leaking nuclear waste canisters. Don't allow them to be buried in the first place!
-
310. Name: henry moser on 2017-10-13 00:31:16

Comments:

-
311. Name: Georgette Korsen on 2017-10-13 00:32:53
Comments: The best option is to remove that nuclear waste as soon as possible. The next best option is to be absolutely sure that the storage canisters are safe over the long term, i.e. repairable, maintainable, monitored and able to be transported without the scary possibility of forming cracks. In other words, REASONABLE requests for such a serious & potentially devastating issue.
-
312. Name: Cheryl Harding on 2017-10-13 00:33:13
Comments:
-
313. Name: David Eidsvold on 2017-10-13 00:36:33
Comments: Sano is not a nuke dump
-
314. Name: Kelley Scanlon on 2017-10-13 00:59:54
Comments:
-
315. Name: Shahrokh Mirjahangir on 2017-10-13 01:08:59
Comments: This is the only option for the Residence of Southern California to prevent a major Nuclear Catastrophe in our beloved Gold Coast. Thank you for your understanding
-
316. Name: Lucila Geva on 2017-10-13 01:59:18
Comments:
-
317. Name: Patrick Bosold on 2017-10-13 02:23:34
Comments: Revoke the current permit and issue one that makes the operators do it right, and do it right starting now.
-
318. Name: Todd Snyder on 2017-10-13 02:33:26
Comments:
-
319. Name: Meryle A Korn on 2017-10-13 02:34:21
Comments: There is NO safe place to store nuclear waste, and among the most unsafe is at a beach-side site in an earthquake zone. Does the name "Fukushima" mean anything to you?
-
320. Name: Marian Cruz on 2017-10-13 02:34:22
Comments: marian.cruz2903@gmail.com
-
321. Name: Susan Belson on 2017-10-13 02:46:22
Comments:
-

322. Name: Sharon Torrissi on 2017-10-13 03:06:41
Comments:
-
323. Name: Don McKelvey on 2017-10-13 03:14:42
Comments: This is a no-brainer !
-
324. Name: Paula Taylor on 2017-10-13 03:31:50
Comments:
-
325. Name: kim stanick on 2017-10-13 03:39:27
Comments:
-
326. Name: Pierre Kent Minault on 2017-10-13 04:06:51
Comments:
-
327. Name: Cheryl King on 2017-10-13 04:14:57
Comments: Keep up the good work. Fight for our planet!
-
328. Name: Rachael ashley on 2017-10-13 04:22:44
Comments:
-
329. Name: Kathleen Lavin on 2017-10-13 04:24:47
Comments: Can we RELOCATE/MOVE the waste out of the area???? It will be too close to the water line, and is on an earthquake fault line!
-
330. Name: Morris Sandel on 2017-10-13 04:26:30
Comments: STOP PRODUCING nuclear waste!
-
331. Name: gene burke on 2017-10-13 04:31:44
Comments: Clean up the CCC's approval of the Edison permit...please! Higher quality of nuclear waste storage security needed.
-
332. Name: Terri hunting on 2017-10-13 04:59:03
Comments:
-
333. Name: Michael Tomczyszyn on 2017-10-13 05:58:00
Comments:
-
334. Name: Kimberly Wiley on 2017-10-13 06:05:16
Comments:
-
335. Name: Preston Wilson on 2017-10-13 06:07:24

Comments: All the Nuclear waste need to be put in the Clintons garage

336. Name: Lisa Goldie on 2017-10-13 06:10:26
Comments:

337. Name: Beverly Findlay-Kaneko on 2017-10-13 06:15:43
Comments:

338. Name: Mary Eberle on 2017-10-13 07:19:48
Comments:

339. Name: Alex Bay on 2017-10-13 13:45:07
Comments:

340. Name: Lee Taft on 2017-10-13 14:11:44
Comments: San Clemente deserves better!

341. Name: Kathy Epeneter on 2017-10-13 14:31:39
Comments: Revoke the Nuclear Waste Storage Permit at SanO

342. Name: Sue Hubbard on 2017-10-13 14:42:58
Comments:

343. Name: turquoise cornwall on 2017-10-13 14:52:44
Comments:

344. Name: Selene Lawrence on 2017-10-13 15:21:38
Comments: Thanks for the good work

345. Name: James Mulcare on 2017-10-13 15:29:22
Comments:

346. Name: Joseph Cope on 2017-10-13 15:40:10
Comments:

347. Name: Tyler Kubota on 2017-10-13 15:43:59
Comments:

348. Name: Mary Bennett on 2017-10-13 15:48:35
Comments:

349. Name: Steve Hathaway on 2017-10-13 16:08:00

Comments:

-
350. Name: Cyndy Pietronico on 2017-10-13 17:42:25
Comments:
-
351. Name: Mark Reback on 2017-10-13 18:36:42
Comments:
-
352. Name: Robert Cosgrove on 2017-10-13 18:40:56
Comments: We are only a few miles from this site so we are concerned for our safety and those in and around us. And what do we suggest to the nation and world when we don't remedy issues we would be critical of with others?
-
353. Name: Patricia Martz on 2017-10-13 18:49:42
Comments: Burying the nuclear waste at San Onofre is unsafe, please reconsider the permit.
-
354. Name: James Sato on 2017-10-13 18:50:35
Comments:
-
355. Name: erin yarrobino on 2017-10-13 18:53:59
Comments:
-
356. Name: Wayne Eggleston on 2017-10-13 18:59:08
Comments: Nuclear waste does not belong on the coast
-
357. Name: Lori Mulvey on 2017-10-13 19:01:05
Comments:
-
358. Name: Luis G Alvarez on 2017-10-13 19:23:03
Comments: Makes no sense for a temporary storage of waste that threatens our lives and livelihood!! Please find permanent safe solution!!
-
359. Name: Sandra Nickols Schwartz on 2017-10-13 19:34:39
Comments: Put it in the Nevada mountain we all paid for and ready to use.
-
360. Name: James Donahue on 2017-10-13 19:43:09
Comments: Get it out of here
-
361. Name: erin yarrobino on 2017-10-13 20:37:28
Comments:
-

362. Name: Mónica Álvarez Zyrkowski on 2017-10-13 21:38:12
Comments:
-
363. Name: Nancy hayes on 2017-10-13 21:57:59
Comments: please care about people not profit
-
364. Name: Grant Beresford on 2017-10-13 22:18:26
Comments:
-
365. Name: Keith Piligian on 2017-10-13 22:20:13
Comments:
-
366. Name: Yvonne Alvarez on 2017-10-13 22:21:47
Comments:
-
367. Name: Mark Lyons on 2017-10-13 22:32:43
Comments:
-
368. Name: Debbie Rose on 2017-10-13 22:33:54
Comments: Yet another example of an irresponsible and uninformed organization putting the lives of residents in OC in great danger. Has nothing been learned from the Fukushima disaster??
-
369. Name: Jill Mulato on 2017-10-13 22:49:25
Comments:
-
370. Name: Phil on 2017-10-13 23:20:35
Comments:
-
371. Name: Laura Muesse on 2017-10-13 23:39:00
Comments:
-
372. Name: Linda Rushing on 2017-10-14 00:43:38
Comments: We bought Laguna Canyon, could San Onofre be bought and handled properly? It is only a very small property on the oceanside.
-
373. Name: MICHAEL VIEW on 2017-10-14 00:48:55
Comments:
-
374. Name: Julie Mains on 2017-10-14 00:51:04
Comments:
-

375. Name: Norman Mains on 2017-10-14 00:51:28
Comments:
-
376. Name: Pat Connolly on 2017-10-14 00:57:32
Comments:
-
377. Name: GREGORY YOUNG on 2017-10-14 02:27:47
Comments:
-
378. Name: Lisa Marks on 2017-10-14 02:33:31
Comments: We need observable, monitored, transportable containers. We need nothing but the best containers. Thank you.
-
379. Name: Carol nilsen on 2017-10-14 02:37:19
Comments:
-
380. Name: Vivian Levin on 2017-10-14 02:48:25
Comments:
-
381. Name: Lorene Laguna on 2017-10-14 02:57:38
Comments:
-
382. Name: Laurenn Barker on 2017-10-14 02:57:50
Comments: This issue is critical to all the people, wildlife and environment of southern California and beyond because of nuclear radiation drift. There is no possible justification for this spent nuclear waste to be left in its present location. Please revoke the permit to do so.
-
383. Name: Carol A Teague on 2017-10-14 03:02:44
Comments:
-
384. Name: Jerry spets on 2017-10-14 03:04:37
Comments:
-
385. Name: George Lefevre on 2017-10-14 03:11:50
Comments:
-
386. Name: Stacy gavin on 2017-10-14 03:31:43
Comments:
-
387. Name: Ann Rennacker on 2017-10-14 03:46:15
Comments: No leaky nukes!
-

388. Name: Dennis Trembly on 2017-10-14 03:55:09
Comments: It is past time for nuclear waste producers to be held accountable for their creation. Courses of action must be devised according to scientific fact, not corporate fantasy.
-
389. Name: Tom Painter on 2017-10-14 03:56:36
Comments: The storage of nuclear waste at San Clemente is unacceptable. The California Coastal Commission should do everything in its power to correct the situation.
-
390. Name: Roger Nilsen on 2017-10-14 04:05:13
Comments:
-
391. Name: johanna Felder on 2017-10-14 04:06:48
Comments: you must find a way to move the nuclear waste away from San Clemente.
-
392. Name: William Carrasco on 2017-10-14 04:21:42
Comments:
-
393. Name: James Cushing on 2017-10-14 06:10:27
Comments:
-
394. Name: Kate Clark on 2017-10-14 06:25:56
Comments:
-
395. Name: kay gallin on 2017-10-14 06:45:13
Comments:
-
396. Name: Sally Rosoff on 2017-10-14 08:42:30
Comments:
-
397. Name: barbara holty on 2017-10-14 13:45:44
Comments:
-
398. Name: Greg Wayer on 2017-10-14 13:57:46
Comments: Please store these out in the desert without a community close by for potential issues
-
399. Name: Ladan Masoudie on 2017-10-14 13:59:52
Comments:
-
400. Name: Sally Warrick on 2017-10-14 14:27:25
Comments:
-

401. Name: Cynthia Machuzick on 2017-10-14 14:32:53
Comments: Please get rid of these rods and keep us safe. Hold the government accountable to the contract when the sites were installed!!!
-
402. Name: Michelle Lincoln on 2017-10-14 14:32:56
Comments: The nuclear waste from San Onofre must not be stored at the current site which is an environmental hazard as well as a terrorist target!
-
403. Name: Christine Maclean on 2017-10-14 14:33:55
Comments:
-
404. Name: Philo Smith on 2017-10-14 14:34:03
Comments:
-
405. Name: Miki Bay on 2017-10-14 14:39:59
Comments: No more Fukushima here in California.
-
406. Name: Alex Bay on 2017-10-14 14:40:27
Comments:
-
407. Name: Carol on 2017-10-14 14:49:34
Comments:
-
408. Name: Mary Harley on 2017-10-14 14:50:25
Comments:
-
409. Name: Evelyn Bengston on 2017-10-14 14:54:37
Comments:
-
410. Name: Margaret Elliott on 2017-10-14 14:55:55
Comments:
-
411. Name: David Marks on 2017-10-14 14:57:38
Comments:
-
412. Name: Janice Burstin on 2017-10-14 14:59:16
Comments: UNACCEPTABLE & UNSAFE to bury radioactive waste in canisters that aren't thick enough to contain that waste!!!!
-
413. Name: Leah Vasquez on 2017-10-14 15:12:28
Comments: We are failing to protect life on this planet; moving casks to a permanent location is urgent but not at the expense of public safety, health and accountability.
-

414.	Name: Melissa Brunicardi	on 2017-10-14 15:16:31	Comments:
415.	Name: R Vinci	on 2017-10-14 15:20:53	Comments:
416.	Name: Alan Korsen	on 2017-10-14 15:37:23	Comments: Allowing nuclear waste to stay on our coast is not acceptable. To allow the waste to remain in casks subject to failure without inspection is irresponsible.
417.	Name: Debbi Mellah	on 2017-10-14 15:38:58	Comments:
418.	Name: Gordon Orsborn	on 2017-10-14 15:40:16	Comments:
419.	Name: carmen hernandez	on 2017-10-14 15:55:15	Comments: fearful of the unknown and what could happen in this area. Please do what is necessary to protect us all
420.	Name: Patricia Holloway	on 2017-10-14 16:00:07	Comments: REVOKE the permit before it's too late and waste is deposited on the beach near our homes and schools in these inadequate containers.
421.	Name: sharla short	on 2017-10-14 16:07:14	Comments:
422.	Name: Keith Wood	on 2017-10-14 16:11:54	Comments:
423.	Name: DIANE JORDAN-SMITH	on 2017-10-14 16:16:55	Comments:
424.	Name: Kristin Birdsall	on 2017-10-14 16:17:33	Comments:
425.	Name: Victoria Yesenofski	on 2017-10-14 16:22:49	Comments:
426.	Name: Marillee Carroll	on 2017-10-14 16:23:10	Comments:

427. Name: Mary Tilton on 2017-10-14 16:32:44
Comments: It is absurd to even fathom what is there now will protect the coast!!!!
Take a note from other countries' systems
-
428. Name: Rodger Elble on 2017-10-14 16:39:48
Comments:
-
429. Name: Lee Drucker on 2017-10-14 16:47:38
Comments:
-
430. Name: Victoria Bousman on 2017-10-14 17:03:28
Comments:
-
431. Name: Rhoberta Palasik on 2017-10-14 17:39:20
Comments:
-
432. Name: Christine Shields on 2017-10-14 17:39:36
Comments: Thank you for all you are doing to prevent this mass tragedy in So. Cal.
-
433. Name: Elliot Quint on 2017-10-14 18:07:06
Comments:
-
434. Name: Deborah Drucker on 2017-10-14 18:16:57
Comments:
-
435. Name: Charles Jepson on 2017-10-14 18:45:38
Comments: This is the greatest danger this region faces and should not even be considered in an earthquake (3 faults in area) zone and marine environment.
-
436. Name: Dolores Schultz on 2017-10-14 18:50:42
Comments: Without this, we will all soon glow in the dark.
-
437. Name: cameron cosgrove on 2017-10-14 19:01:26
Comments:
-
438. Name: Jolie Steers on 2017-10-14 19:14:07
Comments:
-
439. Name: Patricia Gracian on 2017-10-14 19:23:30
Comments: Inaction on this item is tantamount to dooming all Southern California communities to an eventual nuclear contamination event. I urge you to Revoke the nuclear waste storage permit for storage at or near San Onofre.
-

440. Name: CAthy Roby on 2017-10-14 19:44:42
Comments:
-
441. Name: Sandy Thurlow on 2017-10-14 20:06:04
Comments:
-
442. Name: Mary Ann Comes on 2017-10-14 20:58:32
Comments: We need a better way to store this stuff. This permit must be revoked.
-
443. Name: Lynda vogel on 2017-10-14 21:21:48
Comments: I live in SC and want to revoke nuclear waste storage permit at San Onofre!
-
444. Name: Dawne Price on 2017-10-14 22:51:44
Comments:
-
445. Name: Martha mericle on 2017-10-14 22:52:11
Comments:
-
446. Name: Larry Ulvestad on 2017-10-14 22:53:35
Comments:
-
447. Name: Charles E Hackwith Jr on 2017-10-14 23:10:49
Comments: So-called "temporary storage" for this nuclear waste without the capability of inspecting, monitoring or even repairing of these thinner storage casks for 20 years is based on too risky and unsubstantiated safety assurances. The Coastal Commission has to reconsider and demand stringent requirements now, not 20 years into an unpredictable future.
-
448. Name: Daniel Fynaardt on 2017-10-14 23:15:38
Comments:
-
449. Name: Marjorie B Sosa on 2017-10-14 23:21:47
Comments:
-
450. Name: Brad Warrick on 2017-10-15 00:03:06
Comments: Move the waste out to the middle of the Nevada desert, 100's of miles from civilization.
-
451. Name: Mantas Aukstuolis on 2017-10-15 00:32:32
Comments:
-
452. Name: Dave Patel on 2017-10-15 00:53:28
Comments:

-
453. Name: Mary Franta on 2017-10-15 01:04:15
Comments: Please help us dispose of these spent nuclear rods from our unstable beach front location in San Onofre. It needs to get moved and stored in a forever facility ASAP. Thank you
-
454. Name: Nikki Alexander on 2017-10-15 01:36:47
Comments: Let's not wait for a California Fukushima to act intelligently ~ PLEASE
-
455. Name: Ilene Blaisch on 2017-10-15 01:37:47
Comments: there is nothing so important as protecting these containers from leakage and bring them up to date - better yet remove them and the contents completely.
-
456. Name: J T Smith on 2017-10-15 01:53:06
Comments:
-
457. Name: Naomi Chianese on 2017-10-15 02:56:18
Comments:
-
458. Name: JOEL E OTTEN on 2017-10-15 03:10:04
Comments:
-
459. Name: Barbara Carr on 2017-10-15 03:24:19
Comments:
-
460. Name: Kristy Janczak on 2017-10-15 04:08:27
Comments:
-
461. Name: Edith Ogella on 2017-10-15 04:16:12
Comments:
-
462. Name: kerry dunbar on 2017-10-15 04:17:33
Comments:
-
463. Name: Janice Burstin on 2017-10-15 04:44:14
Comments:
-
464. Name: Roberta Bator on 2017-10-15 06:15:18
Comments:
-
465. Name: Anita Hammerschlag on 2017-10-15 06:58:13
Comments:
-

466.	Name: Betty Lee	on 2017-10-15 07:50:05	Comments:
<hr/>			
467.	Name: Jerome Kirsling	on 2017-10-15 11:01:30	Comments: This is an issue of Homeland Security...protection of the citizens of this country from disaster!
<hr/>			
468.	Name: Dale Shawn	on 2017-10-15 11:22:19	Comments:
<hr/>			
469.	Name: Len Willie	on 2017-10-15 13:54:01	Comments:
<hr/>			
470.	Name: Jessica Cresseveur	on 2017-10-15 13:55:50	Comments:
<hr/>			
471.	Name: Adam Schneider	on 2017-10-15 13:58:49	Comments:
<hr/>			
472.	Name: Gail Camhi	on 2017-10-15 14:00:35	Comments: Flawed equipment MUST be fixed -- NOW!
<hr/>			
473.	Name: James Padgett	on 2017-10-15 14:02:56	Comments:
<hr/>			
474.	Name: Reed Johnson	on 2017-10-15 14:04:15	Comments: The decision whether or not to store spent nuclear fuel at San Onofre, virtually on the beach, needs to be very carefully researched and evaluated as an incorrect decision will likely harm the environment and residents over a large area for a very long time.
<hr/>			
475.	Name: Jim Roby	on 2017-10-15 14:07:31	Comments:
<hr/>			
476.	Name: Ann Rennacker	on 2017-10-15 14:14:11	Comments: Keep nuclear waste safely contained, inspect canisters and store far from the Ocean and fault lines. One Fukushima disaster spilling radioactive waste into the Ocean is already affecting sea life, no more are wanted! There must be a safer plan.
<hr/>			
477.	Name: Jared Mabie	on 2017-10-15 14:18:26	Comments:

478. Name: Adrienne Moumin on 2017-10-15 14:22:13
Comments:
-
479. Name: deedee almidia on 2017-10-15 14:41:28
Comments:
-
480. Name: Victoria MacBain on 2017-10-15 14:43:53
Comments:
-
481. Name: Ed Oberweiser on 2017-10-15 14:51:09
Comments: This decision was dead wrong. San Onofre's storage system is just as bad as the reactors themselves. were. They were shut down and so should the thin walled metal casks.
-
482. Name: Melissa Atkinson on 2017-10-15 14:51:42
Comments:
-
483. Name: David Haycraft on 2017-10-15 14:55:57
Comments:
-
484. Name: CAROL COLLINS on 2017-10-15 14:59:53
Comments:
-
485. Name: Harry Muesse on 2017-10-15 15:09:33
Comments:
-
486. Name: Miriam Landman on 2017-10-15 15:10:51
Comments: Protect public health. Acknowledge and prepare for the earthquake risks. Protect our common ocean. Don't just "hope for the best." Plan for the worst-case scenarios, which are entirely possible. Do the right thing.
-
487. Name: Deb Currie on 2017-10-15 15:19:06
Comments:
-
488. Name: Eric Jacobs on 2017-10-15 15:19:27
Comments: Using the cheapest storage method for nuclear waste is not just unsafe, it's STUPID!
-
489. Name: Alessandra Colfi on 2017-10-15 15:28:50
Comments: Radioactive nuclear waste in such a vulnerable site is criminal negligence and needs to be rectified immediately
-
490. Name: James Odling on 2017-10-15 15:30:21

Comments:

-
491. Name: Adriana Johnson on 2017-10-15 15:31:49
Comments:
-
492. Name: Nancy Pirozzi on 2017-10-15 15:35:29
Comments:
-
493. Name: Athena Murphy on 2017-10-15 15:40:02
Comments:
-
494. Name: Frances Howard on 2017-10-15 15:48:00
Comments:
-
495. Name: Jane Swanson on 2017-10-15 15:54:45
Comments: Given that high level radioactive wastes are lethal for hundreds of thousands of years, it is unpardonable to allow them to be stored in any but the most robust canisters and casks.
-
496. Name: Joseph Shulman on 2017-10-15 15:58:54
Comments:
-
497. Name: Badi Jeffers on 2017-10-15 16:01:09
Comments:
-
498. Name: Gerry Martocci on 2017-10-15 16:12:27
Comments:
-
499. Name: Rickey Westbrook on 2017-10-15 16:14:13
Comments: Stop the MADNESS!!
-
500. Name: Karen Keller on 2017-10-15 16:14:48
Comments:
-
501. Name: Janice Burstin on 2017-10-15 16:16:06
Comments: It is UNSAFE to bury radioactive waste in UNACCEPTABLE canisters!!
-
502. Name: Sheila Parks on 2017-10-15 16:17:29
Comments: REVOKE the nuclear waste storage permit at San Onofre NOW. Do the right thing now. Thank you
-
503. Name: Leslie Aronson on 2017-10-15 16:18:00

Comments:

-
504. Name: Richard Dawson on 2017-10-15 16:21:22
Comments:
-
505. Name: Armand Ramirez on 2017-10-15 16:26:13
Comments:
-
506. Name: Simone Malboeuf on 2017-10-15 16:30:13
Comments: We need REAL protection for our environment and people. The CCC needs to do it's job - protecting the California Coastline environment, not just pretend to be doing it.
-
507. Name: nancymcdonell on 2017-10-15 16:32:44
Comments:
-
508. Name: Iris Edinger on 2017-10-15 16:33:17
Comments:
-
509. Name: Brenda Gaines on 2017-10-15 16:33:33
Comments:
-
510. Name: Joe and Dawn Fusco on 2017-10-15 16:34:07
Comments: Protect us and do the right thing!!
-
511. Name: Peter Butt on 2017-10-15 16:36:12
Comments: As a resident of Southern California I object to the myopic policy to store the SONGS waste on site in fragile containers. The release of the waste into the Pacific Ocean would be a global event, poisoning the entire ocean. We are all parties and victims of this policy.
-
512. Name: Kathleen vanHooser on 2017-10-15 16:37:13
Comments: This is unacceptable!
-
513. Name: Erin Vines on 2017-10-15 16:37:54
Comments:
-
514. Name: janet maker on 2017-10-15 16:40:23
Comments:
-
515. Name: helgaleena on 2017-10-15 16:43:10
Comments:
-

516.	Name: Helen Hanna	on 2017-10-15 16:48:42	Comments:
517.	Name: Patrick Bosold	on 2017-10-15 16:50:07	Comments: I helped establish the Coastal Commission in 1972. They need to do their job and end this menace, and make Edison go back and do it right.
518.	Name: Caryn Graves	on 2017-10-15 16:52:12	Comments:
519.	Name: Jym Dyer	on 2017-10-15 16:53:10	Comments:
520.	Name: Anne Dugaw	on 2017-10-15 16:59:18	Comments:
521.	Name: Irene Brace	on 2017-10-15 16:59:43	Comments: A planned disaster waiting to happen.
522.	Name: anita simons	on 2017-10-15 17:02:13	Comments:
523.	Name: Erif Thunen	on 2017-10-15 17:03:11	Comments:
524.	Name: Brent Rocks	on 2017-10-15 17:03:23	Comments:
525.	Name: Roberta R Cordero	on 2017-10-15 17:04:30	Comments:
526.	Name: Sharon Barone	on 2017-10-15 17:05:14	Comments:
527.	Name: Maryellen Redish	on 2017-10-15 17:06:46	Comments: This is too dangerous
528.	Name: Aparna Bakhle	on 2017-10-15 17:07:39	Comments:
529.	Name: Sherry Cantu	on 2017-10-15 17:10:32	Comments:

-
530. Name: Trevor Burkholder on 2017-10-15 17:15:30
Comments: Burying nuclear waste in the sand is like burying your head on the sand. The mess was made, now it needs to be cleaned up properly. This is not a project to take the cheap and easy way out!
-
531. Name: Cheriell Jensen on 2017-10-15 17:15:40
Comments: As the Coastal Commission you simply MUST protect the coast. REVOKE the Permit. Nuclear Storage does NOT belong on our precious coast. And certainly not in thin-walled canisters. Act now, BEFORE another nuclear disaster to our oceans.
-
532. Name: karen hafer on 2017-10-15 17:27:51
Comments:
-
533. Name: Jeri Buchanan on 2017-10-15 17:29:32
Comments:
-
534. Name: Alicia cali on 2017-10-15 17:31:16
Comments:
-
535. Name: Gail Camhi on 2017-10-15 17:31:32
Comments: Flawed permit, must REVOKE it NOW!
-
536. Name: ROxana finnell on 2017-10-15 17:31:34
Comments:
-
537. Name: evy justesen on 2017-10-15 17:31:36
Comments:
-
538. Name: Timothy LeBon on 2017-10-15 17:39:25
Comments: This is a very real risk to our local communities and an ongoing pollution risk to the whole world! We can't store waste for the long term on the beach in thin canisters. Protect our oceans!
-
539. Name: Judy Genandt on 2017-10-15 17:46:38
Comments:
-
540. Name: Bill Smirnow on 2017-10-15 17:57:09
Comments: Attempts to save \$\$ by using these extremely thin walled casks are completely irresponsible and criminal. They may result in catastrophic death, cancer, heart attacks, genetic, environmental and economic damage,
-
541. Name: Susan Faber on 2017-10-15 18:01:06

Comments:

-
542. Name: Susana Cohen-Cory on 2017-10-15 18:03:10
Comments:
-
543. Name: Robert McCormick on 2017-10-15 18:03:31
Comments:
-
544. Name: Marian Cruz on 2017-10-15 18:04:50
Comments: Revoke Nuclear Waste Storage at San Onofre!!!!!!
-
545. Name: James Padgett on 2017-10-15 18:15:55
Comments:
-
546. Name: Edith Ogella on 2017-10-15 18:17:33
Comments:
-
547. Name: Todd Snyder on 2017-10-15 18:21:29
Comments:
-
548. Name: Nancy Wallace Nelson on 2017-10-15 18:26:12
Comments: It is amnother disaster waiting to happen to have such ill-stored nuclear waste on an earthquake fault. Did we learn nothing from Japan's Fukishima?
-
549. Name: Sandy esque on 2017-10-15 18:28:49
Comments:
-
550. Name: Jason Bowman on 2017-10-15 18:33:26
Comments:
-
551. Name: David Reilly on 2017-10-15 18:41:00
Comments: No Nukes. Ever.
-
552. Name: Robert M Gisonno on 2017-10-15 18:43:57
Comments: Level San Onofre ship out the nuclear waste...and make the land into a park as it should be!
-
553. Name: Wendy Yoder on 2017-10-15 18:45:26
Comments: Please do not bury nuclear waste on our coastline.
-
554. Name: Randi Johnson on 2017-10-15 18:48:33
Comments:

555.	Name: Mary Eberle	on 2017-10-15 18:49:36
	Comments:	

556.	Name: Corey E Olsen	on 2017-10-15 19:00:46
	Comments: No nuclear waste storage permit for San Onofre.	

557.	Name: S STEPHENS	on 2017-10-15 19:01:52
	Comments: Nuclear waste LASTS THOUSANDS OF YEARS - California is GROUND ZERO FOR QUAKES! What part of FUKASHIMA 2.0 does NOT compute WHEN THE "BIG ONE" HITS???	

558.	Name: Jon Sherman	on 2017-10-15 19:07:25
	Comments:	

559.	Name: T Bell	on 2017-10-15 19:19:00
	Comments: WILLFUL IGNORANCE AND NUKES DON'T MIX WELL	

560.	Name: Dr Mha Atma S Khalsa	on 2017-10-15 19:21:47
	Comments:	

561.	Name: Darlene St Martin	on 2017-10-15 19:23:17
	Comments:	

562.	Name: Diane Hutchison	on 2017-10-15 19:26:16
	Comments:	

563.	Name: Beth Angel	on 2017-10-15 19:34:38
	Comments:	

564.	Name: henry	on 2017-10-15 19:39:46
	Comments:	

565.	Name: JENIFER JOHN JUSTIN MASSEY	on 2017-10-15 19:47:20
	Comments: SET A GOOD EXAMPLE BY RESCINDING YOUR PERMIT NOW TO AVOID BEING SUED LATER	

566.	Name: pamela nelson	on 2017-10-15 19:59:35
	Comments: Please use up-graded storage containers---millions of people's lives depend on you.	

567.	Name: Karen Tanner	on 2017-10-15 20:07:37
------	--------------------	------------------------

Comments: This waste is a ticking time bomb. I would question the sanity of anyone who would recommend leaving it sitting on the beach, surrounded by millions of homeowners on one side and the ocean on the other. Since this area is in a fault zone, this could easily be a repeat of Fukushima. That would be a disaster of gigantic magnitude. And...if you can't find a safe way to store nuclear waste, stop producing it. That's only common sense.

568. Name: Nonie Fickling on 2017-10-15 20:11:34
Comments: It is puzzling to me that the thin-wall canisters are even being considered to store San Onofre's nuclear waste when there are canisters available which would give far more protection from nuclear leaks. At one Community Engagement Panel meeting it was noted that the thin-walled canister "could" withstand a 7.0 magnitude earthquake. That leaves little margin for exceptions. This horrendous situation must be met with the highest standards available. The consequences are too great.
-
569. Name: George Stradtman on 2017-10-15 20:23:40
Comments: Radioactive poisons have already crossed the Pacific from Fukushima to the west coast of America. The last thing we need, is yet another nuclear disaster due to waste leakage that would very likely follow a major earthquake at San Onofre.
-
570. Name: mel freilicher on 2017-10-15 20:24:10
Comments:
-
571. Name: Todd Strohmeier on 2017-10-15 20:27:38
Comments: The permit that was approved for Edison is flawed and must be revoked.
-
572. Name: Myphon Hunt on 2017-10-15 20:30:55
Comments:
-
573. Name: Matthew Iskra on 2017-10-15 20:33:14
Comments:
-
574. Name: Barbara DuBois Hoag on 2017-10-15 20:39:06
Comments: Please listen to San Clemente Green and find a safe storage solution for San Onofre's nuclear waste. Thanks
-
575. Name: Gail Cohn on 2017-10-15 20:48:40
Comments:
-
576. Name: Ruth Strauss on 2017-10-15 20:48:58
Comments: This is a MUST--it would be unconscionable not to follow through on the recommendations and least that needs to be done to keep our oceans and water safe--the work has been done FOR YOU in terms of researching what NEEDS to be done--now ALL YOU HAVE TO DO IS IMPLEMENT IT.
-

577.	Name: Jolana Vanek	on 2017-10-15 21:02:14	Comments:
578.	Name: S Stoneman	on 2017-10-15 21:20:04	Comments:
579.	Name: Frances O'Neill Zimmerman	on 2017-10-15 21:21:37	Comments:
580.	Name: Denise Liebmann	on 2017-10-15 21:31:11	Comments: Please sign to keep nuclear waste from being buried on our oc coast.
581.	Name: Keith R Morrison	on 2017-10-15 21:32:32	Comments: Not There, Not ever
582.	Name: James Murphy	on 2017-10-15 21:34:29	Comments:
583.	Name: Cheryl Harding	on 2017-10-15 21:37:23	Comments:
584.	Name: Ellen Rosser	on 2017-10-15 21:49:43	Comments:
585.	Name: Jody Gibson	on 2017-10-15 21:50:03	Comments:
586.	Name: Natalie Van Leekwijck	on 2017-10-15 21:59:31	Comments:
587.	Name: Michael Mallough	on 2017-10-15 22:05:08	Comments:
588.	Name: Linda Fashing	on 2017-10-15 22:16:40	Comments:
589.	Name: Marilyn Duba	on 2017-10-15 22:18:31	Comments:
590.	Name: lolette pisoni	on 2017-10-15 22:21:41	Comments:

591.	Name: Stephen Brittle	on 2017-10-15 22:33:23
	Comments: Revoke this permit before there is a disaster!	
592.	Name: Susan Willhoit	on 2017-10-15 22:50:12
	Comments: Think beyond the cheaper cost....think of your children and grandchildren.	
593.	Name: Jim Wells	on 2017-10-15 22:50:33
	Comments:	
594.	Name: Barbara Fox	on 2017-10-15 22:50:42
	Comments:	
595.	Name: Amy Steinberg	on 2017-10-15 23:03:18
	Comments:	
596.	Name: Joe Feinstein	on 2017-10-15 23:16:07
	Comments:	
597.	Name: Patricia Baley	on 2017-10-15 23:17:59
	Comments:	
598.	Name: sandy mccanne	on 2017-10-15 23:28:03
	Comments:	
599.	Name: Bill Fickling	on 2017-10-15 23:28:34
	Comments:	
600.	Name: Paula Penn	on 2017-10-15 23:49:06
	Comments:	
601.	Name: David Hermanns	on 2017-10-15 23:52:49
	Comments:	
602.	Name: Kelley Scanlon	on 2017-10-16 00:30:02
	Comments:	
603.	Name: Cathy Deppe	on 2017-10-16 00:47:27
	Comments: Please support this call	
604.	Name: Evelyn Sato	on 2017-10-16 00:48:29
	Comments:	

605. Name: Terry on 2017-10-16 00:50:15
Comments: Please don't bury it here, so close to the surface and so close to millions of people.
-
606. Name: Deb on 2017-10-16 00:52:01
Comments:
-
607. Name: James Mulcare on 2017-10-16 01:07:11
Comments:
-
608. Name: Lanier Hines on 2017-10-16 01:39:45
Comments:
-
609. Name: Joe Glaston on 2017-10-16 01:44:41
Comments:
-
610. Name: Vina Colley on 2017-10-16 02:03:49
Comments: I am a whistleblower from the Portsmouth/Piketon , Ohio Gaseous Diffusion plant. We have a very serious problem at many site with the waste. My co-workers our dying or like me fighting health issues. Nuclear waste is very serious hazardous waste and a environmental problem now facing us all. It's our responsibility to future generations to solve this problem in a safe place.
-
611. Name: Linda hogan-estrada on 2017-10-16 02:37:15
Comments: I vote not to silently kill good AMERICANS
-
612. Name: Dorelle Rawlings on 2017-10-16 02:37:56
Comments: Fix this problem. Allowing Edison to bury nuclear waste next to the ocean in thin-walled casks is just crazy!
-
613. Name: Hisako Oba on 2017-10-16 02:39:38
Comments:
-
614. Name: Joy Hoover on 2017-10-16 02:51:59
Comments:
-
615. Name: John Krauss on 2017-10-16 02:59:52
Comments: stop this madness. clean the area & leave no trace
-
616. Name: Don McKelvey on 2017-10-16 03:05:21
Comments: This is a no-brainer !
-
617. Name: karen L black on 2017-10-16 03:12:39

Comments: Let common sense and not greed be your guide.

618. Name: Don McKelvey on 2017-10-16 03:39:35
Comments: This is a no-brainer !

619. Name: Nina Babiarz on 2017-10-16 03:40:45
Comments:

620. Name: Brandon Hill on 2017-10-16 04:09:05
Comments:

621. Name: Joe Salazar on 2017-10-16 04:17:32
Comments:

622. Name: Michelle Gordon on 2017-10-16 04:19:23
Comments:

623. Name: Michael Tomczyszyn on 2017-10-16 04:56:57
Comments:

624. Name: Jim Waide on 2017-10-16 05:09:48
Comments:

625. Name: Linda C Jones on 2017-10-16 05:13:23
Comments: The permit you approved for Edison was flawed and must be revoked. The Special Conditions in the Coastal Permit that are twenty years out are well intended, but should have been required from the start. Other countries currently use nuclear waste storage systems that could meet those reasonable requirements today. Their containers can be inspected, repaired, maintained, monitored and transported without cracks. The thin canisters being used at San Onofre have none of these attributes because they were only intended for temporary storage.

626. Name: Mona Ferner on 2017-10-16 05:39:25
Comments:

627. Name: marie inserra on 2017-10-16 05:44:13
Comments:

628. Name: Carol Huntsman on 2017-10-16 05:46:58
Comments:

629. Name: Sherry Pollack on 2017-10-16 05:56:05
Comments:

-
630. Name: Scott Atkinson on 2017-10-16 06:29:28
Comments:
-
631. Name: Roger Rudholm on 2017-10-16 08:03:42
Comments:
-
632. Name: Marleen Gillespie on 2017-10-16 08:24:02
Comments:
-
633. Name: Peter Lee on 2017-10-16 09:18:00
Comments: Too Dangerous!
-
634. Name: Fred Jakobcic on 2017-10-16 11:22:27
Comments: Waste is radioactive, waste water, dangerous and inefficient and expensive and dirty-read NUCLEAR ROULETTE
-
635. Name: Dennis Ledden on 2017-10-16 11:44:20
Comments:
-
636. Name: Eli Suissa on 2017-10-16 11:48:34
Comments:
-
637. Name: Jana Murphy on 2017-10-16 12:44:27
Comments:
-
638. Name: Lisa Tart on 2017-10-16 13:20:01
Comments:
-
639. Name: cindy stucker on 2017-10-16 13:33:12
Comments:
-
640. Name: Patricia Brumfield on 2017-10-16 13:38:17
Comments: The citizens of Southern CA are outraged and terrified at what So Ca Edison is trying to do! This permit must be stopped until an independent study is done.
-
641. Name: Patricia Mehlberg on 2017-10-16 13:54:31
Comments:
-
642. Name: Ed Oberweiser on 2017-10-16 13:56:01
Comments: PG&E has a very bad record as regards nuclear safety. They should never have built San Onofre in the first place. It sits over a right face vertical fault and it failed.

That's why it has been shut downl.

643. Name: D on 2017-10-16 14:01:40
Comments:

644. Name: James Stone on 2017-10-16 14:46:44
Comments:

645. Name: Stephanie Richards on 2017-10-16 14:54:49
Comments:

646. Name: Kay Ospital on 2017-10-16 15:08:59
Comments:

647. Name: Ronald Warren on 2017-10-16 15:25:24
Comments:

648. Name: Luanne biggs on 2017-10-16 15:58:36
Comments:

649. Name: Stephen Joseph Libert on 2017-10-16 16:19:01
Comments:

650. Name: Nancy Staek on 2017-10-16 16:25:35
Comments: permit they approved for Edison was flawed and must be revoked. The Special Conditions in the Coastal Permit that are twenty years out are well intended, but should have been required from the start. Other countries currently use nuclear waste storage systems that could meet those reasonable requirements today. Their containers can be inspected, repaired, maintained, monitored and transported without cracks. The thin canisters being used at San Onofre have none of these attributes because they were only intended for temporary storage.!!

651. Name: Linda Seeley on 2017-10-16 16:28:01
Comments:

652. Name: Ruth Cohen on 2017-10-16 16:33:27
Comments:

653. Name: Omid Kanani on 2017-10-16 16:40:26
Comments: I moved from KY to beautiful San Clemente and the last thing I ever imagined is that I will be living around 10 miles from Nuclear waste stored on my beach. Shame, Shame, Shame....

654. Name: Lisa Spinelli on 2017-10-16 16:42:23
Comments: Please rewrite your permit to have a more viable solution to removing the the dangerous and poorly constructed nuclear waste canisters at San Onofre. Our community is at risk!
-
655. Name: Gerry Martocci on 2017-10-16 17:15:07
Comments:
-
656. Name: Michael Gomel on 2017-10-16 17:30:11
Comments:
-
657. Name: Nicholas Hernandez on 2017-10-16 17:48:03
Comments:
-
658. Name: Rosemarie Marousek on 2017-10-16 17:49:45
Comments:
-
659. Name: Mark Reback on 2017-10-16 17:50:18
Comments:
-
660. Name: Judith Lang on 2017-10-16 17:59:24
Comments: Find another place for storage. You've had many years to do so. I knew the original plan probably did not provide for safe disposal elsewhere. Shame on you
-
661. Name: susan nutter on 2017-10-16 18:10:20
Comments:
-
662. Name: Joel Jatón on 2017-10-16 18:39:44
Comments: Please make restitution for the prior mistake made by approving a hazardous energy plant right next to one of our State's most crucial rail and road transportation corridors by revoking the permit to permanently store 1800 tons of high level radioactive waste generated over the history of this plant.
-
663. Name: JoAn Saltzen on 2017-10-16 18:58:11
Comments:
-
664. Name: Michael Steinberg on 2017-10-16 19:15:05
Comments:
-
665. Name: Citizen Voter on 2017-10-16 19:33:50
Comments: when will 'we' learn???
-
666. Name: Patricia Janssen on 2017-10-16 19:39:11

Comments: Yes make Edison accountable for this. Their actions are unconscionable and hurting our health and environment

667. Name: Skip Shaputnic on 2017-10-16 21:33:29
Comments:

668. Name: alan pascun on 2017-10-16 21:35:37
Comments:

669. Name: Carey Strombotne on 2017-10-16 22:15:17
Comments:

670. Name: Pegi cheatum on 2017-10-16 22:28:13
Comments:

671. Name: Ran Zirasri on 2017-10-16 23:16:09
Comments:

672. Name: Donna Walling on 2017-10-16 23:52:12
Comments:

673. Name: Rose Marie Leather on 2017-10-17 00:23:22
Comments:

674. Name: Barbara Mollure on 2017-10-17 00:59:35
Comments: It is important to our residents that this waste material is moved to a safe location somewhere else.

675. Name: Iris Edinger on 2017-10-17 01:58:03
Comments:

676. Name: Rose Marie Leather on 2017-10-17 02:27:49
Comments:

677. Name: Leslie on 2017-10-17 02:35:54
Comments:

678. Name: Linda Berry on 2017-10-17 03:48:55
Comments:

679. Name: Judy Alter on 2017-10-17 03:53:19
Comments:

-
680. Name: Carroll Arkema on 2017-10-17 03:56:10
Comments:
-
681. Name: Kumi Abe on 2017-10-17 04:23:55
Comments:
-
682. Name: Jennifer Collins on 2017-10-17 04:52:25
Comments: A nuclear waste dump storage does not belong in a highly populated area already situated on a major earthquake fault line. Period!
-
683. Name: Justin Clancy on 2017-10-17 05:09:45
Comments:
-
684. Name: Akiyo Kawabata on 2017-10-17 05:24:21
Comments:
-
685. Name: Akiyo Kawabata on 2017-10-17 05:24:21
Comments:
-
686. Name: Pamela horowitz on 2017-10-17 06:31:01
Comments:
-
687. Name: Judy Northrop on 2017-10-17 14:47:38
Comments:
-
688. Name: andy toepel on 2017-10-17 15:45:30
Comments:
-
689. Name: Bruce White on 2017-10-17 16:14:37
Comments: Perfect example of why nuclear is Bad. Who wants the hazardous waste. No One!! Especially not along our coast line. Earth quakes , etc.
-
690. Name: Margaret Elliott on 2017-10-17 16:18:22
Comments:
-
691. Name: Margaret Elliott on 2017-10-17 16:33:08
Comments:
-
692. Name: Laura Lynch on 2017-10-17 16:39:37
Comments:
-

693. Name: Margaret Elliott on 2017-10-17 16:44:48
Comments:
-
694. Name: Paula D Penn on 2017-10-17 17:42:28
Comments:
-
695. Name: Bret Burgess on 2017-10-17 18:10:30
Comments: Please, for the sake of everyone, not just San Clemente residents, let's find a better place to store nuclear waste than San Onofre State Beach!
-
696. Name: Janet Leger on 2017-10-17 18:41:00
Comments:
-
697. Name: Laura Gallagher on 2017-10-17 19:44:42
Comments: Closing down San Onofre was a great step toward protecting such a populous area located in an active seismic zone from a nuclear disaster. But it will all be for naught if the spent fuel rods are stored there. We are still in danger. Thank you, Gary and all, for your hard work and dedication to get this critical step accomplished.
-
698. Name: Bethann Chambers on 2017-10-17 23:15:48
Comments:
-
699. Name: Mary Franz on 2017-10-17 23:42:57
Comments: It seems so obvious, San Onofre is NOT a safe place to store nuclear waste.
-
700. Name: Harriette Mayo on 2017-10-18 00:06:02
Comments:
-
701. Name: Loretta Busam on 2017-10-18 00:22:09
Comments:
-
702. Name: Kelly Wilson on 2017-10-18 02:44:47
Comments:
-
703. Name: Kelly Gaughan on 2017-10-18 02:46:05
Comments:
-
704. Name: Judy Teverbaugh on 2017-10-18 03:56:42
Comments:
-
705. Name: Michelle Schumacher on 2017-10-18 04:24:59
Comments: Have the federal government use the process available to turn the waste into inert glass chips - do not bury this in the ocean ever

706.	Name: Julie Ostoich	on 2017-10-18 04:33:02	Comments:
707.	Name: Marianne Seldman	on 2017-10-18 05:05:59	Comments: Must be moved
708.	Name: Linda Rosoff	on 2017-10-18 11:13:02	Comments:
709.	Name: Veronica	on 2017-10-18 13:40:27	Comments: For obvious reasons - dangerous to human bodies.
710.	Name: Loretta L Zupancic	on 2017-10-18 15:47:23	Comments:
711.	Name: Iris Bourne	on 2017-10-18 18:03:14	Comments: revoke nuclear waste storage permit at san onofre
712.	Name: DAVID BROKAW	on 2017-10-18 18:54:20	Comments:
713.	Name: Jeanette Morck	on 2017-10-18 19:19:28	Comments:
714.	Name: Talia	on 2017-10-18 20:11:34	Comments:
715.	Name: Carey Strombotne	on 2017-10-18 20:46:19	Comments: This is more than a dangerous situation. Keeping the toxic waste so close to neighborhoods, traffic corridors and the ocean is a disaster in the making.
716.	Name: Joan Whitley	on 2017-10-18 22:34:13	Comments:
717.	Name: Norman Seldman	on 2017-10-18 23:29:00	Comments:
718.	Name: John J Gavin	on 2017-10-18 23:53:06	Comments:
719.	Name: Steve Netherby	on 2017-10-19 00:04:15	

Comments: This is the existential threat about which all we San Clementeans live in denial. And the potential disasters inherent in doing this poorly involve all of Southern California—in fact our whole country. Let's do it right—for ourselves and, especially, for our kids and grandkids.

720. Name: Lawrence Barber on 2017-10-19 00:07:51
Comments:

721. Name: Conor Hughes on 2017-10-19 00:30:25
Comments:

722. Name: Art Hanson on 2017-10-19 04:29:21
Comments: The short-term and the long-term dangers are far too great.

723. Name: Nick Alvaro on 2017-10-19 18:02:34
Comments:

724. Name: Jonathan Schara on 2017-10-19 18:21:30
Comments:

725. Name: Marian Cruz on 2017-10-20 15:41:40
Comments:

726. Name: Debra Rehn on 2017-10-20 15:42:48
Comments:

727. Name: Kevin Branstetter on 2017-10-20 15:49:29
Comments:

728. Name: Edward Maher on 2017-10-20 15:50:34
Comments: We can't afford to do anything but the safest approach. In retrospect, the cost would seem a petty obstacle if an accident happened. I would also join the fight to hold those responsible accountable.

729. Name: janet maker on 2017-10-20 15:50:45
Comments:

730. Name: Amy Steinberg on 2017-10-20 16:03:31
Comments:

731. Name: susan peirce on 2017-10-20 16:05:55
Comments:

732.	Name: Corey E Olsen	on 2017-10-20 16:07:38	Comments:
733.	Name: alan papskun	on 2017-10-20 16:12:21	Comments:
734.	Name: Miki Bay	on 2017-10-20 16:18:38	Comments:
735.	Name: Lorenz Steininger	on 2017-10-20 16:20:30	Comments:
736.	Name: richard sauerheber	on 2017-10-20 16:28:01	Comments: Plutonium and related hot waste created from fission reactions have half lives so great that no storage system is sufficient to protect from human inhalation of matter that can irradiate tissue for lifetimes. The best system available must be used to kick the can down the road as far as possible; otherwise one is simply prodding the can with a stick. .
737.	Name: Laura Roberts	on 2017-10-20 16:30:17	Comments:
738.	Name: Christine Bucklin	on 2017-10-20 16:31:53	Comments:
739.	Name: Edith Ogella	on 2017-10-20 16:32:11	Comments:
740.	Name: Leslie Cassidy	on 2017-10-20 16:37:17	Comments:
741.	Name: Erif Thunen	on 2017-10-20 16:52:13	Comments:
742.	Name: Judy Malouf	on 2017-10-20 17:17:49	Comments:
743.	Name: Margaret Mapes	on 2017-10-20 17:24:37	Comments:
744.	Name: Karen Keller	on 2017-10-20 17:26:05	Comments:

745.	Name: Mark Reback	on 2017-10-20 17:33:05	Comments:
746.	Name: Marillee Carroll	on 2017-10-20 17:50:57	Comments:
747.	Name: Shahrokh Mirjahangir	on 2017-10-20 17:57:10	Comments: Do Not Risk Future of Southern California' Gold Coast. "SCE" Executive Board: Don't be Penny wise and Pound Foolish
748.	Name: Charis Williams	on 2017-10-20 17:58:07	Comments:
749.	Name: jerry collamer	on 2017-10-20 18:11:39	Comments: Revoke the permit before it's too late
750.	Name: Ulla Barr	on 2017-10-20 19:03:12	Comments:
751.	Name: Arlene Johnson	on 2017-10-20 20:23:52	Comments: A very concerned San Clemente homeowner
752.	Name: Ann Isolde	on 2017-10-20 20:41:47	Comments:
753.	Name: Anna Barr	on 2017-10-20 21:13:10	Comments: Revoke and replace! Lives are at stake.
754.	Name: Don McKelvey	on 2017-10-20 21:43:32	Comments:
755.	Name: karen hafer	on 2017-10-20 23:55:35	Comments:
756.	Name: Linda Pierce	on 2017-10-20 23:58:11	Comments:
757.	Name: helgaleena	on 2017-10-21 01:15:15	Comments:
758.	Name: Tim Carras	on 2017-10-21 01:18:17	Comments:

-
759. Name: Kelley Scanlon on 2017-10-21 01:56:45
Comments:
-
760. Name: John Zimmermann on 2017-10-21 02:03:29
Comments:
-
761. Name: Dr Mha Atma S Khalsa on 2017-10-21 02:48:39
Comments:
-
762. Name: Dennis Ledden on 2017-10-21 11:40:09
Comments:
-
763. Name: John Leonetti on 2017-10-21 13:01:08
Comments: There should be no question about making the canisters as thick and safe as possible, like other countries, NO QUESTION!!
-
764. Name: Judy Attanasio on 2017-10-21 15:56:37
Comments:
-
765. Name: SCho on 2017-10-21 16:18:34
Comments: If it is dangerous you have to store it safe.
-
766. Name: Natalie Van Leekwijck on 2017-10-21 18:21:50
Comments:
-
767. Name: Laurel Facey on 2017-10-21 20:39:03
Comments: Do we need to wait and worry about the fault lines and the next big earthquake?
-
768. Name: Jeff Taylor on 2017-10-21 23:20:09
Comments: Hey Edison! I'm sick and tired of your penny pinching pound foolish ways. Playing God with MY future. S##T or get of the toilet and let someone with intelligence and concern finish the job you so miserably F##KED up! Do it, and do it NOW! Remember, karma has no expiration date!
-
769. Name: Pamela Nelson on 2017-10-22 02:25:55
Comments: remove from the coast---inland a bit?
-
770. Name: roger johnson on 2017-10-22 06:05:36
Comments:
-

771. Name: J Spangler on 2017-10-22 14:18:02
Comments: Nuclear power and waste pose a dire threat for generations to come. Please look to truly clean, renewable alternatives.
-
772. Name: Susan Sall on 2017-10-22 15:46:42
Comments:
-
773. Name: Gail Collins on 2017-10-22 17:11:47
Comments:
-
774. Name: Denise Schnarr on 2017-10-22 18:30:22
Comments:
-
775. Name: Emily Corbitt on 2017-10-22 19:10:46
Comments: P
-
776. Name: Craig on 2017-10-22 19:44:15
Comments: Keep san o as the beacon of the local surfing community
-
777. Name: karin michielsen on 2017-10-22 19:51:11
Comments:
-
778. Name: Erin alder on 2017-10-22 19:53:18
Comments:
-
779. Name: Kathleen Kaiser on 2017-10-22 19:53:24
Comments: I can't believe that our wonderful town is facing nuclear storage at the south and a toll road at the north.
-
780. Name: Teri on 2017-10-22 19:56:34
Comments: Not at the beach!!!
-
781. Name: ronnie theroux on 2017-10-22 20:35:09
Comments: Don't bury nuclear waste and try to fix the problem when we have a leak. There is no fix, you just want us to forget about it
-
782. Name: Joseph lopez on 2017-10-22 20:53:30
Comments:
-
783. Name: Jean Auris on 2017-10-22 20:57:50
Comments: Get serious for your safety sake.
-

784.	Name: Deanna Polk	on 2017-10-22 20:57:54	Comments:
785.	Name: William Netherby	on 2017-10-22 21:24:56	Comments: We don't need nuclear storage on such a beautiful stretch of coastline.
786.	Name: Leeleenaka	on 2017-10-22 21:30:14	Comments:
787.	Name: Aimee Berberet	on 2017-10-22 22:17:25	Comments: The original plan, when you got your permit for the Nuc Power Plant, was to store the waste elsewhere. You need to honor that!
788.	Name: Alexander Wooton	on 2017-10-22 22:21:40	Comments:
789.	Name: Kim larson	on 2017-10-22 22:46:11	Comments:
790.	Name: Jennifer Johnson	on 2017-10-22 23:35:04	Comments:
791.	Name: Theo Bloxk	on 2017-10-23 00:03:41	Comments:
792.	Name: Sandy Highberg	on 2017-10-23 00:35:15	Comments: Nuclear waste should NEVER be stored this close to the ocean on an earthquake fault!
793.	Name: Kristen Racine	on 2017-10-23 00:55:32	Comments: For the love of God, do not bury nuclear waste at San Onofre! It's a recipe for disaster.
794.	Name: Carleen Chandler	on 2017-10-23 01:08:36	Comments:
795.	Name: Carol Keene	on 2017-10-23 01:24:39	Comments:
796.	Name: Doris Schiller	on 2017-10-23 01:32:05	Comments:

797.	Name: Maggie O'Grady	on 2017-10-23 02:55:49	Comments:
798.	Name: James McDaniel	on 2017-10-23 02:56:31	Comments:
799.	Name: Megan McDaniel	on 2017-10-23 02:59:18	Comments:
800.	Name: Laura Smith	on 2017-10-23 03:00:12	Comments: The nuclear waste must Not be stored at or anywhere near San Onofre! That is Way to Dangerous! Move it out of here NOW!
801.	Name: Lana Poppen	on 2017-10-23 03:15:55	Comments:
802.	Name: Bill Smirnow	on 2017-10-23 04:16:48	Comments: The permit issued to S Cal Edison needs to be revoked. Storing nuclear waste with over 75 times the amount of radiation that Chernobyl released in extremely thin walled cannisters 108 feet from the ocean and inches from high tides that can't be monitored or corrected is astonishingly dangerous. It threatens the Pacific Ocean, and depending on the direction of the winds massive parts of southern California, all of California, part or all of Mexico and much of the northern hemisphere with a subsequent global environmental and economic meltdown.
803.	Name: alexander lane	on 2017-10-23 06:07:47	Comments: ...been loving the coast around san onofre for the last 35 years...would like to believe it will last AT LEAST another 35 without succumbing to nuclear waste. Please use the thicker canisters!
804.	Name: Diane L	on 2017-10-23 06:15:36	Comments:
805.	Name: Sheila Parks	on 2017-10-23 07:25:38	Comments: Revoke flawed permit for Edison. What could you be thinking of?
806.	Name: Devra Rossi	on 2017-10-23 07:38:16	Comments:
807.	Name: theresa van etten	on 2017-10-23 08:41:30	Comments:
808.	Name: Jacquelyn Drechsler	on 2017-10-23 12:35:03	Comments:

-
809. Name: Jean Fallon on 2017-10-23 12:38:11
Comments: Those who make decisions like this should be required to live next to the disposal area!
-
810. Name: Sally Jane eEllert on 2017-10-23 13:04:10
Comments: Please note that I am NOT suggesting that the waste should be removed; rather, that the ON-site storage be in thick-wall canisters designed for longer, safer storage. Whether permit revocation is appropriate, or whether there are other means of achieving this, I don't know—but I do know that the current situation is not safe.
-
811. Name: Matthew Iskra on 2017-10-23 13:28:42
Comments:
-
812. Name: Daneen Lindner on 2017-10-23 14:05:53
Comments:
-
813. Name: Harvey Schaktman on 2017-10-23 14:15:31
Comments:
-
814. Name: Amy on 2017-10-23 14:48:59
Comments: No Nukes
-
815. Name: Bruce White on 2017-10-23 15:45:39
Comments:
-
816. Name: Gary Shaw on 2017-10-23 15:47:20
Comments: Just as Sally Jane Ellert wrote, I do not approve of moving high level radioactive waste off-site, but the canisters must be robust and inspect-able.
-
817. Name: Sarah Fields on 2017-10-23 16:41:29
Comments: The decisions made regarding the need for thick-walled canisters that can be inspected, repaired, monitored, and transported safely will affect not only San Onofre, but the communities near all reactor sites and the numerous communities on the transport routes. The safety of nuclear waste storage and transport systems is a matter of national importance. My county in Utah is on a major proposed route, as are many communities that may be unaware of the hazards at this time of possible transport in unsafe containers.
-
818. Name: Nancy Rohr on 2017-10-23 16:47:02
Comments:
-
819. Name: David A Kraft on 2017-10-23 16:57:58
Comments: Utilize "hardened on-site storage" (HOSS), too

-
820. Name: lynda on 2017-10-23 17:39:49
Comments:
-
821. Name: Christy Armstrong on 2017-10-23 18:54:07
Comments: Until this material is in thicker casks you cannot in good conscience allow this permit to go forward!!
-
822. Name: Erif Thunen on 2017-10-23 19:48:12
Comments:
-
823. Name: Bill Smirnow on 2017-10-23 21:16:33
Comments: Planning to bury more than 75 Chernobyls worth of nuclear waste in extremely thin walled cannisters [mostly one half inch to five eights of an inch thick] while the rest of the world uses cannisters that are 10 to 19.75 inches thick and can be checked for cracks, corrosion, etc. and fixed while these cannisters at San Onofre can't be checked or fixed is asking for a catastrophe beyond one's wildest nightmare. If one were drawing up a plan to destroy not just southern California but the United States and cause a global economic depression as well as incredible genetic damage to humans, animals and plants you couldn't have come up with a more insidious plan. Do NOT allow this. Get all the waste into the thickest cannisters possible that are able to be checked for damage and fixed and do not bury it in the beach 108 feet [for now, less as climate change brings the oceans closer] from the Ocean, inches from high tides [for now].
-
824. Name: Kate Bell on 2017-10-23 21:21:21
Comments:
-
825. Name: Noz Cavan on 2017-10-23 21:24:25
Comments:
-
826. Name: Dianne Lane on 2017-10-23 21:39:16
Comments:
-
827. Name: Joseph M Tully on 2017-10-23 22:57:05
Comments: Please help us preserve our beaches and coastline from becoming a repository for nuclear waste!
-
828. Name: Carol Huntsman on 2017-10-24 01:11:30
Comments:
-
829. Name: Molly Huddleston on 2017-10-24 04:29:48
Comments:
-
830. Name: Marc Pilisuk on 2017-10-24 06:22:51

Comments:

-
831. Name: Anita Dutt on 2017-10-24 12:20:53
Comments:
-
832. Name: Dan Fullerton on 2017-10-24 12:41:50
Comments:
-
833. Name: steve beck on 2017-10-24 16:59:14
Comments:
-
834. Name: Maureen Roy on 2017-10-24 17:01:19
Comments: These canisters must be regularly monitored forever.
-
835. Name: Scott Pearce on 2017-10-24 17:41:51
Comments: We need a safer approach to nuclear waste storage.
-
836. Name: chris johnston on 2017-10-24 17:43:34
Comments:
-
837. Name: Jim Sigafoos on 2017-10-24 20:02:41
Comments: Doesn't the Japanese experience prove how unwise it is to store nuclear waste in an ocean contingent facility in an earthquake/Tsunami zone?
-
838. Name: Skip Shaputnic on 2017-10-24 20:50:18
Comments:
-
839. Name: Daniel Weidner on 2017-10-24 21:19:13
Comments: I do not believe that the nuclear waste at San Onofre is adequately protected for extended storage and should be moved. The protective containers of this material are nearing the end of their useful, and safe, life.
-
840. Name: Michael Conlon on 2017-10-25 00:12:09
Comments:
-
841. Name: Barbara Meserve on 2017-10-25 17:07:55
Comments:
-
842. Name: Dan Moore on 2017-10-25 18:05:34
Comments: REVOKE Nuclear Waste Storage Permit at San Onofre
-
843. Name: Stephanie A Thom on 2017-10-25 18:19:42

Comments: The health and safety of residents is in jeopardy, how is this even being considered? Disgusted with our elected representatives.

844. Name: Jeanne Schuster on 2017-10-25 20:59:58
Comments:

845. Name: Louis Deneau on 2017-10-25 22:31:15
Comments: Nuclear waste storage must be conducted in a manner to optimize public safety over the full term of storage. This is an unacceptable plan.

846. Name: Ann Carli on 2017-10-26 04:02:00
Comments:

847. Name: JOHN W MULLENDER on 2017-10-26 08:08:38
Comments:

848. Name: Eileen Mahood-Jose on 2017-10-26 14:27:49
Comments:

849. Name: Michael Sall on 2017-10-26 17:00:17
Comments:

850. Name: Cindy Berg on 2017-10-27 02:23:51
Comments: UNBELIEVABLE!!!! MOVE THE CANISTER'S TO THE DESERT NOW!!!

851. Name: Stacy gavin on 2017-10-27 02:26:53
Comments:

852. Name: Alan Korsen on 2017-10-27 02:41:17
Comments:

853. Name: Jose Caballero on 2017-10-27 03:52:10
Comments:

854. Name: Deborah Schlesinger on 2017-10-27 03:58:20
Comments: Please resolve this potentially dangerous situation..

855. Name: gordon globus on 2017-10-27 04:05:10
Comments:

856. Name: Libby Shackford on 2017-10-27 11:26:42
Comments:

857.	Name: Linda Leventhal Gotskind	on 2017-10-27 13:49:01
	Comments:	
858.	Name: ANNE KELLY	on 2017-10-27 14:27:00
	Comments:	
859.	Name: Rachel Kelts	on 2017-10-27 14:31:47
	Comments:	
860.	Name: Anja Tapias	on 2017-10-27 15:46:42
	Comments:	
861.	Name: Shail Powers	on 2017-10-27 16:28:21
	Comments:	
862.	Name: Leah Vasquez	on 2017-10-27 16:31:06
	Comments:	
863.	Name: Barbara Rathbun	on 2017-10-27 16:39:02
	Comments:	
864.	Name: ann feeney	on 2017-10-27 16:52:32
	Comments:	
865.	Name: Steve Tollefsrud	on 2017-10-27 17:03:04
	Comments:	
866.	Name: Corinne Suveges	on 2017-10-27 17:35:19
	Comments:	
867.	Name: Pam Patterson	on 2017-10-27 18:58:14
	Comments: Edison has had more than 54 years to responsibly resolve the issue of where and how to store this nuclear waste. Just one more example of the mismanagement and incredibly cavalier attitude SCE, the CPUC, and the NRC have with respect to our welfare. The Coastal Commission needs to do the right thing here, and revoke the permit; and this nuclear waste needs to be properly stored, i.e., in the 10" canisters!	
868.	Name: Gary Jenkins	on 2017-10-27 21:49:02
	Comments:	
869.	Name: Marguerite Winkel	on 2017-10-27 22:28:37

Comments:

-
870. Name: Cecile Donath on 2017-10-27 23:57:40
Comments:
-
871. Name: Marla Thrift on 2017-10-28 02:57:39
Comments:
-
872. Name: Jerry Spets on 2017-10-28 03:18:49
Comments:
-
873. Name: chris Lamont on 2017-10-28 06:08:23
Comments: Please take this somewhere else that is more appropriate and safe !!! Keep this away from our beautiful beaches and residentail ares where people can be harmed.
-
874. Name: Aleana Lamont on 2017-10-28 06:24:01
Comments:
-
875. Name: Devra Rossi on 2017-10-28 08:12:11
Comments:
-
876. Name: Candice letter on 2017-10-28 13:37:22
Comments: Do damn dangerous! Don't store it by the sea wall!!!!
-
877. Name: Nancy French on 2017-10-28 16:41:17
Comments:
-
878. Name: Kathleen Selevan on 2017-10-28 16:47:20
Comments:
-
879. Name: Kimberly Lefner on 2017-10-28 17:21:47
Comments: Please revoke SCE's permit to bury nuclear waste within feet of the ocean.
-
880. Name: Lesley Donnell on 2017-10-28 18:48:48
Comments:
-
881. Name: barbara and steve szemenyei on 2017-10-28 21:02:13
Comments:
-
882. Name: Sharon and Michael Cole on 2017-10-29 00:10:12
Comments:
-

883.	Name: RBruce Denney	on 2017-10-29 16:01:02	Comments:
884.	Name: Alvin Ehrig Jr	on 2017-10-29 19:19:10	Comments:
885.	Name: Michael Laux	on 2017-10-29 19:35:41	Comments:
886.	Name: Janice Bernard	on 2017-10-29 19:48:40	Comments:
887.	Name: Ana Alvarez	on 2017-10-29 22:10:51	Comments:
888.	Name: Donna Fleming	on 2017-10-29 22:39:34	Comments:
889.	Name: PJ Douglas	on 2017-10-29 23:15:33	Comments: NO, NO, NO to burying nuclear waste at San Onofre Beach. One good storm and it will be all over.
890.	Name: Patricia Plumb	on 2017-10-30 01:08:54	Comments:
891.	Name: Diana Eagan	on 2017-10-30 04:22:48	Comments: Bad-in every conceivable way. Protect the people..protect the oceans. Put safety first.
892.	Name: Lyle Barkley	on 2017-10-30 14:37:14	Comments:
893.	Name: jack and margaret dobson	on 2017-10-30 16:49:57	Comments:
894.	Name: monica romero	on 2017-10-30 18:49:44	Comments:
895.	Name: Chris Catsimanes	on 2017-10-31 13:22:32	Comments:
896.	Name: Joseph R Thompson	on 2017-10-31 14:13:53	

Comments:

-
897. Name: Sally Barron on 2017-10-31 14:24:05
Comments: Temporary storage containers at the edge of the ocean are a disaster waiting to happen,
-
898. Name: Lougene Anderson on 2017-10-31 14:33:20
Comments: Please carefully review all the facts and I think you will come to the same conclusion: the thin canisters approved for San Onofre are inadequate and extremely dangerous.
-
899. Name: James Mulcare on 2017-10-31 14:58:53
Comments:
-
900. Name: Barbara Gildner on 2017-10-31 16:06:06
Comments:
-
901. Name: Raul Ferreira on 2017-10-31 16:18:37
Comments:
-
902. Name: Angelique Strahan on 2017-10-31 17:09:30
Comments:
-
903. Name: Stella STEPHENS on 2017-10-31 17:35:59
Comments: Calif. is ground zero for quakes...it's insane that nuclear power plants were even built here...let alone after decommissioning SONGS that Edison is being allowed to "store" the nuclear waste in thin-walled containers INCAPABLE OF SUSTAINING CONTAINMENT due to cracking, etc.
-
904. Name: Cynthia Voigt on 2017-10-31 17:36:28
Comments:
-
905. Name: Elaine Echenique on 2017-10-31 18:19:50
Comments: Secure safety for San Clemente! Nuclear waste should not be stored near our community!
-
906. Name: Roberto Brutocao on 2017-10-31 19:16:01
Comments:
-
907. Name: Barrett Miller on 2017-10-31 20:50:29
Comments: San Onofre State Beach is my home away from home she doesn't deserve to be treated like this. How would you like it if someone just decided to take a shit on your property!!!

-
908. Name: Shahrokh Mirjahangir on 2017-10-31 23:32:54
Comments: Do the right thing. No Permit without safety for our beloved Gold Coast and its residence
-
909. Name: COLLEEN ALEXIOU on 2017-10-31 23:44:35
Comments:
-
910. Name: Diane Beeny on 2017-11-01 01:46:52
Comments:
-
911. Name: chris johnston on 2017-11-01 01:51:00
Comments:
-
912. Name: Judith Ann Swanick on 2017-11-01 03:40:00
Comments:
-
913. Name: Kimberly Wiley on 2017-11-01 06:20:08
Comments:
-
914. Name: Junko ABe on 2017-11-01 10:00:10
Comments: I am a Japanese woman. As California and other US West Coast suffered Fukushima accident, we in Japan will also suffer damage on our side of the Pacific in the possible event of Nclear Waste Storage Facility at San Onofre.
-
915. Name: kim stanick on 2017-11-01 13:32:20
Comments:
-
916. Name: Tiffany Atkinson on 2017-11-01 15:19:21
Comments:
-
917. Name: Anne Crawford on 2017-11-01 15:41:07
Comments:
-
918. Name: Laura Donovan on 2017-11-01 16:30:53
Comments:
-
919. Name: Valerie Moodie on 2017-11-01 16:33:33
Comments: It is a huge nuclear accident waiting to happen given the dangers here
-
920. Name: Michelle montgomery on 2017-11-01 18:25:25
Comments:

-
921. Name: Scott Atkinson on 2017-11-01 18:42:15
Comments: Storage of this waste is not being done safely. A leak would cut off transportation at a crucial North- South artery.
-
922. Name: Miki Bay on 2017-11-01 20:06:19
Comments:
-
923. Name: erin yarrobino on 2017-11-01 20:57:30
Comments:
-
924. Name: Margaret Elliott on 2017-11-01 21:14:07
Comments:
-
925. Name: linda fiorelli on 2017-11-01 23:08:36
Comments: Federal government, keep your promise to ship this waste to a unpopulated site, ie yucca mountain.
-
926. Name: Jodi on 2017-11-01 23:44:06
Comments:
-
927. Name: Robert McCormick on 2017-11-02 13:17:09
Comments:
-
928. Name: Susan Sayre on 2017-11-02 13:27:22
Comments:
-
929. Name: Arthur and Jean Manoogian on 2017-11-02 13:40:50
Comments: Please consider the options presented as the consequences are enormous.
-
930. Name: lisa uhrhammer on 2017-11-02 13:42:31
Comments: The investors should be responsible for the waste and the cost to move the waste and pay for its storage for perpetuity.
-
931. Name: Paul Fisher on 2017-11-02 13:52:28
Comments: The long term aspects of storage make no sense. WE need to move this from the coast.
-
932. Name: Nina Babiarz on 2017-11-02 13:55:36
Comments:
-
933. Name: Jean Auris on 2017-11-02 14:14:55

Comments: This must be revoked for our health and life.

934. Name: Erik Husoe on 2017-11-02 14:30:02
Comments:

935. Name: Linda Rushing on 2017-11-02 14:48:55
Comments: Buy San Onofre get the property out of the hands of the government! They are stalling Buy San Onofre it worked for Laguna Canyon!

936. Name: Athena Murphy on 2017-11-02 15:08:37
Comments:

937. Name: Victoria MacBain on 2017-11-02 15:17:32
Comments:

938. Name: Danny Gray on 2017-11-02 15:24:55
Comments:

939. Name: barbara on 2017-11-02 15:36:52
Comments:

940. Name: Janice Frye on 2017-11-02 15:36:59
Comments:

941. Name: rosemarie button on 2017-11-02 15:46:38
Comments:

942. Name: Richard Northrop on 2017-11-02 15:55:53
Comments:

943. Name: Jack Eidt on 2017-11-02 15:57:57
Comments:

944. Name: Richard Northrop on 2017-11-02 15:58:37
Comments:

945. Name: Amy Steinberg on 2017-11-02 16:00:21
Comments:

946. Name: Ross Teasley on 2017-11-02 16:07:46
Comments:

947. Name: nikki mcdonald on 2017-11-02 16:12:23
Comments:
-
948. Name: Patricia Brumfield on 2017-11-02 16:18:18
Comments: This storage plan is dangerous and UNACCEPTABLE! Reject it now.
-
949. Name: Janice Burstin on 2017-11-02 16:18:59
Comments: DO NOT BURY RADIOACTIVE WASTE STORAGE IN CONTAINERS THAT MAY NOT CONTAIN THAT WASTE!!!!!!
-
950. Name: Tiffany Mohr on 2017-11-02 16:24:33
Comments:
-
951. Name: Mike Tiffany on 2017-11-02 16:25:18
Comments:
-
952. Name: mike uhrhammer on 2017-11-02 16:26:32
Comments: Don't increase the risk of nuclear waste polluting our ocean -- slowly and unseen for decades. Minimize it.
-
953. Name: Dorrie robes on 2017-11-02 16:34:59
Comments: No, this is dangerous to our ecosystem. Our oceans are sacred...
-
954. Name: Sherie Stark on 2017-11-02 16:35:08
Comments: This mishandling of the public trust is horrendous, and it affects not only the South Bay area and all of Southern California; it affects the whole planet!
-
955. Name: barbara and steve szemenyey on 2017-11-02 16:44:35
Comments:
-
956. Name: Janice Burstin on 2017-11-02 16:49:17
Comments: DO NOT BURY RADIOACTIVE WASTE IN INCOMPETENT CANNISTERS!!!!!!
-
957. Name: Myphon Hunt on 2017-11-02 17:01:29
Comments:
-
958. Name: Brenda Gaines on 2017-11-02 17:01:51
Comments:
-
959. Name: Donna Larner Lavery on 2017-11-02 17:10:51
Comments:
-

960. Name: Ethan Swan on 2017-11-02 17:21:05
Comments:

961. Name: Laurel Kaskurs on 2017-11-02 18:05:05
Comments: Why must San Onofre's owners continuously put profits before human health? I know it might seem off topic, but I feel compelled to point out another example of profits over safety which happened before the shut down: Read the highlighted parts of these two articles and it will be clear:

atomicinsights.com/san-onofre-steam-generators-honest-error-driven-by-search-for-perfection/

If Unit 3 had remained in operation, other tubes in the same area of the steam generator would have likely failed. The same problem does not exist in Unit 2.
<https://www.google.com/amp/www.ocregister.com/2013/09/24/nrc-blames-mitsubishi-for-san-onofre-failure/amp/>

The NRC said the error in Mitsubishi's model had a long history. Mitsubishi originally had developed the computer code in 1978 for one kind of steam generator, then modified it in 1992 for another. But the 1992 modification, used for San Onofre and four other nuclear plants, contained a flaw, according to the NRC notice to Mitsubishi.

However, of the five plants whose generators were designed using the model, only San Onofre failed.

If the design flaw in Unit 3 was not in Unit 2, that means Unit 2's steam generators were from before 1992 and therefore NOT NEW when they were SUPPOSEDLY replaced in 2009. And then Unit 3's were so crappy that they could not even make it a couple of years. That is why the wear in the tubes of Unit 2 was so "unprecedented" and, apparently, the Kobe Steel plates of Unit 3 which went between the tubes came loose during testing and the copper alloy in the tubes was substandard grade as well.

So, they have no problem using cracked steam generators with poor quality Kobe Steel and copper alloys. How are we to trust that these canisters will be of decent quality given the facts that San Onofre has a long and sordid history of doing things on the cheap? How can we trust that they did not pick up these waste canisters at the nuclear flea market? These are probably unsafe for transport already. I hope Holtec does not buy from Mitsubishi because Kobe Steel products are their sole supplier and they are recalling just about everything.

If you bury this crap on the beach, you are committing random slow murder on future generations. There is no nicer way I can put that. I agree with Gary Seadrick that we must buy the highest quality containers and let this waste cool down adequately while we use that time to apply only the best technology to our dilemma.

962. Name: Deborah Reed on 2017-11-02 18:18:47
Comments:

963.	Name: Anna Marc	on 2017-11-02 18:20:53	Comments:
964.	Name: Kimberly Santore	on 2017-11-02 18:34:24	Comments:
965.	Name: Elisa Crawford Harris	on 2017-11-02 18:35:43	Comments:
966.	Name: Marjie Schlegel	on 2017-11-02 19:18:21	Comments:
967.	Name: Alex Fierro-Clarke	on 2017-11-02 19:36:23	Comments:
968.	Name: Austin Hurwitz	on 2017-11-02 19:39:38	Comments:
969.	Name: Rita	on 2017-11-02 19:52:56	Comments: Waste storage should be addressed properly. Reasonable and safe requirements are imperative.
970.	Name: Leslie Cassidy	on 2017-11-02 19:58:36	Comments:
971.	Name: andee shill	on 2017-11-02 20:28:53	Comments: stop it
972.	Name: Terri Wiley	on 2017-11-02 20:30:35	Comments:
973.	Name: Victoria Korosei	on 2017-11-02 20:39:14	Comments: Preserve our planet and our future - you know very well what that stuff can do to living organisms.
974.	Name: Lisa Seipel	on 2017-11-02 20:41:43	Comments:
975.	Name: barbara and steve szemenyei	on 2017-11-02 20:56:07	Comments:
976.	Name: Susan Willhoit	on 2017-11-02 21:02:22	

Comments: 10" to 19.75" thick walls, PLEASE....THINK about our future generations...like your children, grandchildren etc., etc., etc.

977. Name: Tony Fiorelli on 2017-11-02 21:19:48
Comments:

978. Name: Lori Boehm on 2017-11-02 21:28:42
Comments:

979. Name: Jeffrey Erbs on 2017-11-02 21:36:14
Comments:

980. Name: David Lopes on 2017-11-02 21:39:09
Comments: Who makes these kind of decisions, what is wrong with you people?

981. Name: Lisa Kopelman on 2017-11-02 21:40:01
Comments: please do not store nuclear waste at San Onofre Beach. This is extremely dangerous due to risk of earthquake and the proximity to a densely populated community (San Clemente & Orange County).

982. Name: Jo Kenney on 2017-11-02 21:55:42
Comments: Please do not store nuclear waste at San Onofre. If nuclear technology cannot figure out how to deal with waste, they should not create it in the first place. The storage canisters being used at San Onofre cannot be inspected, repaired, maintained, monitored, or transported without cracks. This is unacceptable. We will all pay the cost if these flawed canisters are used.

983. Name: Mimi Wolin on 2017-11-02 21:59:19
Comments: Do not bury nuclear waste!!

984. Name: kingsley osborn on 2017-11-02 22:20:50
Comments:

985. Name: Craig Barry on 2017-11-02 22:39:22
Comments:

986. Name: Libbe HaLevy on 2017-11-02 22:44:25
Comments: ARE YOU OUT OF YOUR MINDS? This is an insane, avoidable risk. Think ahead! Use canisters that can be inspected, repaired, maintained, monitored and transported without cracks.

987. Name: Kelly Merrick on 2017-11-02 22:52:38
Comments:

-
988. Name: mary goldman on 2017-11-02 23:16:11
Comments:
-
989. Name: Annika on 2017-11-02 23:37:12
Comments:
-
990. Name: Mark Glasser on 2017-11-02 23:39:15
Comments: let's use common sense
-
991. Name: Kevin Higgins on 2017-11-03 00:02:53
Comments:
-
992. Name: Jere Licciardello on 2017-11-03 00:16:53
Comments:
-
993. Name: chris johnston on 2017-11-03 00:39:54
Comments:
-
994. Name: Joe Hiney on 2017-11-03 00:44:44
Comments: Stop the insanity. Stop killing
-
995. Name: Kenneth Gibson on 2017-11-03 00:53:46
Comments: 1. Please stop creating nuclear waste anywhere. 2. Please don't store nuclear waste near the ocean or any freshwater resource. 3. Use the safest containment system imaginable at the expense of shareholders who have profited during the life of the nuclear power plant.
-
996. Name: ronnie theroux on 2017-11-03 00:58:23
Comments:
-
997. Name: Todd Schoedel on 2017-11-03 01:27:26
Comments: This is insane storing Nuclear Waste at San Onofre, nearly in the water
-
998. Name: Kent Rone on 2017-11-03 01:48:58
Comments:
-
999. Name: Henry Peters on 2017-11-03 02:04:03
Comments: Any thing short of realistic LONG TERM vision, is NOT satisfactory resolution (no real solution to nuclear wastes, except not to make it in the first place...).

Constant supervision, adequate containment according to the hazardous life of the isotopes so contained). Not to mention potential geological event, etc..

-
1000. Name: Constance Boone on 2017-11-03 02:08:18
Comments:
-
1001. Name: Ann Dorsey on 2017-11-03 03:46:13
Comments:
-
1002. Name: Swedina Hurt on 2017-11-03 03:50:54
Comments:
-
1003. Name: Karen Berger on 2017-11-03 03:55:12
Comments:
-
1004. Name: jamie jung on 2017-11-03 04:41:45
Comments:
-
1005. Name: Nancy Barcellona on 2017-11-03 08:16:56
Comments:
-
1006. Name: Tom Kortkamp on 2017-11-03 08:26:39
Comments:
-
1007. Name: JoDell Christensen on 2017-11-03 14:34:52
Comments:
-
1008. Name: Betty Lee on 2017-11-03 14:39:08
Comments:
-
1009. Name: Faith Boucher on 2017-11-03 14:55:39
Comments:
-
1010. Name: Philip Petrie on 2017-11-03 15:56:50
Comments:
-
1011. Name: Sandy Barnett on 2017-11-03 16:05:49
Comments:
-
1012. Name: Morgan Wilkerson on 2017-11-03 16:23:15
Comments:
-
1013. Name: R Vinci on 2017-11-03 17:05:30
Comments:

1014.	Name: Micah Marshall	on 2017-11-03 17:45:30	Comments:
1015.	Name: Margaret Bruno	on 2017-11-03 18:07:24	Comments: Get the waste out to the desert disposal where it belongs. Bury it on our coastline? Trust them to do it right? Ignorant!
1016.	Name: Maria Simmons	on 2017-11-03 19:48:44	Comments: Lets get it done!
1017.	Name: Richard Cromie	on 2017-11-03 21:19:52	Comments:
1018.	Name: Elizabeth Holmes	on 2017-11-03 21:23:51	Comments:
1019.	Name: Kelly rients	on 2017-11-03 23:25:50	Comments:
1020.	Name: Carolyn Bolton	on 2017-11-04 00:11:33	Comments: No!
1021.	Name: Barbara Johnson	on 2017-11-04 01:35:31	Comments:
1022.	Name: Jennifer Pardinas	on 2017-11-04 01:52:28	Comments:
1023.	Name: Gene Stone	on 2017-11-04 03:20:50	Comments:
1024.	Name: Christine Becker	on 2017-11-04 04:02:31	Comments: Put it in a more suitable place, this is not safe.
1025.	Name: Mitch Panek	on 2017-11-04 19:04:08	Comments: steel cask too thin, too many assemblies per cask. Criticality analysis ? Too close to water for corrosion and criticality.
1026.	Name: john thomas	on 2017-11-04 22:55:26	Comments:

1027.	Name: Kent Johnson	on 2017-11-05 04:20:10	Comments:
1028.	Name: Romi Elnagar	on 2017-11-05 05:38:19	Comments: Start caring about the people of this state, and not the monied interests!!!!
1029.	Name: Jason Berteotti	on 2017-11-05 06:19:07	Comments:
1030.	Name: Sam Friedman	on 2017-11-05 09:32:15	Comments:
1031.	Name: Amy Harlib	on 2017-11-05 12:42:09	Comments: SHUT DOWN ALL NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS AND GO SOLAR AND WIND POWER!
1032.	Name: TC R	on 2017-11-05 13:33:30	Comments:
1033.	Name: John Costello	on 2017-11-05 16:42:24	Comments:
1034.	Name: Ellen Thomas	on 2017-11-05 17:15:06	Comments:
1035.	Name: Patricia Akers	on 2017-11-05 17:29:19	Comments: It is time for the people of San Diego and Orange County to not be under the thumb of this old and tired nuclear plant ! Too many times OUR lives were mitigated. No more.
1036.	Name: Marlene Metcalf	on 2017-11-05 17:34:45	Comments:
1037.	Name: Cynthia Papermaster	on 2017-11-05 17:53:24	Comments:
1038.	Name: David Lopes	on 2017-11-05 19:28:31	Comments:
1039.	Name: Patricia McArdle	on 2017-11-05 20:54:39	Comments: The California coastline on a fault line is not a safe storage place for spent nuclear fuel.

1040.	Name: Wythe Holt	on 2017-11-05 21:17:10	Comments:
1041.	Name: Citizen Voter	on 2017-11-05 22:30:17	Comments: NO! NO! NO!
1042.	Name: Terri Wiley	on 2017-11-06 01:26:45	Comments: This is so very sad.
1043.	Name: Leslie Cassidy	on 2017-11-06 01:27:10	Comments:
1044.	Name: Robert Broska	on 2017-11-06 05:07:20	Comments: Not on an earthquake fault, For God sake!
1045.	Name: Timothy E Starbright	on 2017-11-06 05:29:34	Comments:
1046.	Name: Kassy Clem	on 2017-11-06 05:35:22	Comments: All this debris needs to be neutralized immediately!
1047.	Name: michael murphy	on 2017-11-06 05:59:32	Comments: stop the insanity
1048.	Name: Eva Kerckhove	on 2017-11-06 13:48:47	Comments:
1049.	Name: Judith Ann Swanick	on 2017-11-06 14:01:41	Comments:
1050.	Name: Nancy McLaughlin	on 2017-11-06 16:32:21	Comments: Nuclear waste should never be stored next to the Pacific Ocean. This is not an issue to be decided by a dollar bottom line.
1051.	Name: Gaetan Chevalier	on 2017-11-06 16:47:56	Comments:

**PERMIT REVOCATION REQUEST BY
ROBERT BROSKA**

9-15-0228-REV-9

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

ENERGY, OCEAN RESOURCES AND FEDERAL CONSISTENCY DIVISION
45 FREMONT STREET
SUITE 2000
PH (415) 904-5200 FAX (415) 904-5400
WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV



December 5, 2017

Via electronic mail

Robert Broska
rbroska@gmail.com

Re: Request for Revocation of Coastal Development Permit No. 9-15-0228

Dear Mr. Broska,

Coastal Commission staff has received your November 7, 2017 petition (with 34 signatories) requesting the revocation of Coastal Development Permit (CDP) #9-15-0228 (Southern California Edison), approved by the Commission on October 6, 2015. CDP 9-15-0228 authorizes the installation and operation of a new independent spent fuel storage installation (ISFSI) at San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS).

Your request for revocation is based on three assertions, summarized as follows:

- (1) The permit violates the Commission's own mission statement;
- (2) The permit does not meet Coastal requirements to assure stability and structural integrity relating to seismic and other hazards;
- (3) The permit does not meet Coastal requirements that the radioactive waste be transportable.

The grounds for revocation of a CDP are set forth in 14 Cal. Code of Regulations Section 13105 and provide, in relevant part, as follows:

- a) Intentional inclusion of inaccurate, erroneous or incomplete information in connection with a coastal development permit application, where the Commission finds that accurate and complete information would have caused the Commission to require additional or different conditions on a permit or deny an application;*
- b) Failure to comply with the notice provisions of Section 13054, where the views of the person(s) not notified were not otherwise made known to the commission and could have caused the commission to require additional or different conditions on a permit or deny an application.*

Commission regulations (14 CCR 13106) grant the Executive Director the authority to review a revocation request and decline to initiate revocation proceedings if he determines that the request

does not establish the grounds for revocation as specified in Section 13105, and is thus patently frivolous and without merit.

I have reviewed the grounds for revocation stated in your November 7, 2017 request and decline to initiate revocation proceedings because I have determined that the request does not address the grounds for revocation as specified in Section 13105. In particular, you neither assert nor provide evidence that the Applicant, Southern California Edison, either intentionally included inaccurate, erroneous or incomplete information in connection with its coastal development permit application or failed to comply with the notice provisions of Section 13054 of the Commission's regulations.

If you have questions about this matter, please contact Alison Dettmer, Deputy Director, or Joseph Street, Senior Environmental Scientist, in the Energy and Ocean Resources and Federal Consistency Division, at (415) 904-5240.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "John Ainsworth", is positioned above the printed name.

JOHN AINSWORTH
Executive Director

cc: Ed Yep, SCE,

From: [Robert Broska](#)
To: Street_Joseph@Coastal
Cc: donnagilmore@gmail.com
Subject: Please see attached Petitions to revoke the CC permit to dump nuclear waste locally
Date: Tuesday, November 07, 2017 8:56:54 PM

See attachments below:

Robert Broska
760-630-5891
Good Neighbor Community Builders
Promoting Sustainable Living

PETITION

REVOKE CA Coastal Commission Nuke Waste Dump Permit

To Governor Brown and California Coastal Commissioners:

We the undersigned demand you **REVOKE Coastal Development Permit 9-15-0228** allowing **unsafe storage of tons of radioactive nuclear waste on our public beach near San Onofre State Park**. Coastal Commission permit requirements cannot be met under the current Southern California Edison plan.

1. **The Permit VIOLATES COASTAL COMMISSION'S OWN MISSION STATEMENT TO PROTECT AND ENHANCE CALIFORNIA'S COAST AND OCEAN FOR PRESENT AND FUTURE GENERATIONS.** The permit allows Southern California Edison to irresponsibly store up to 75 thin-wall nuclear waste containers that must be stored for over 250,000 years in a highly populated coastal area. Holtec vendor only warrants the system for 10 years.
2. **NOT EARTHQUAKE SAFE. The permit does not meet Coastal requirements to assure stability and structural integrity relating to seismic and other hazards (Coastal Act Section 30253).** Tom Palmisano (SoCal Edison) admitted at the September 14, 2017 Community Engagement Panel (CEP) meeting that **canisters with even partial cracks have no seismic rating** and admitted they have **no current method to inspect for cracks, repair cracks or otherwise maintain spent fuel canisters (inside or out)** in a seismically and structurally safe manner. A similar 2-year old Diablo Canyon canister was found to be susceptible to cracking from moist salt air.
3. **NOT TRANSPORTABLE.** The permit does not meet Coastal requirements that the radioactive waste be transportable. At the September 14th CEP meeting, Tom Palmisano revealed plans to **destroy empty spent fuel pools**, eliminating the only approved method to transfer spent fuel to an undamaged container for inspection and transport.

NAME BILL EMEVO

STREET ADDRESS 1822 York Pl

CITY/STATE/ZIP VISTA

E-MAIL/PHONE 760 893-6366

NAME David Clouser

STREET ADDRESS 1393 Bonair Rd.

CITY/STATE/ZIP Vista Ca 92084

E-MAIL/PHONE 442.273.7109

NAME HARRY R. LOCKRIDER

STREET ADDRESS 1822 YORK Rd.

CITY/STATE/ZIP VISTA, Ca, 92084

E-MAIL/PHONE 760-893-6366

NAME Victor Hernandez

STREET ADDRESS 1147 Madera Ln.

CITY/STATE/ZIP Vista, Ca 92084

E-MAIL/PHONE victor2031005@gmail.com

NAME ANNA VARNELL

STREET ADDRESS 5343 Monroe Ave

CITY/STATE/ZIP San Diego CA 92115

E-MAIL/PHONE AlFlame777@yahoo.com

PETITION

REVOKE CA Coastal Commission Nuke Waste Dump Permit

To Governor Brown and California Coastal Commissioners:

We the undersigned demand you **REVOKE Coastal Development Permit 9-15-0228** allowing **unsafe storage of tons of radioactive nuclear waste on our public beach near San Onofre State Park**. Coastal Commission permit requirements cannot be met under the current Southern California Edison plan.

1. **The Permit VIOLATES COASTAL COMMISSION'S OWN MISSION STATEMENT TO PROTECT AND ENHANCE CALIFORNIA'S COAST AND OCEAN FOR PRESENT AND FUTURE GENERATIONS.** The permit allows Southern California Edison to irresponsibly store up to 75 thin-wall nuclear waste containers that must be stored for over 250,000 years in a highly populated coastal area. Holtec vendor only warrants the system for 10 years.
2. **NOT EARTHQUAKE SAFE.** The permit does not meet Coastal requirements to assure stability and structural integrity relating to seismic and other hazards (Coastal Act Section 30253). Tom Palmisano (SoCal Edison) admitted at the September 14, 2017 Community Engagement Panel (CEP) meeting that **canisters with even partial cracks have no seismic rating** and admitted they have **no current method to inspect for cracks, repair cracks or otherwise maintain spent fuel canisters (inside or out)** in a seismically and structurally safe manner. A similar 2-year old Diablo Canyon canister was found to be susceptible to cracking from moist salt air.
3. **NOT TRANSPORTABLE.** The permit does not meet Coastal requirements that the radioactive waste be transportable. At the September 14th CEP meeting, Tom Palmisano revealed plans to **destroy empty spent fuel pools**, eliminating the only approved method to transfer spent fuel to an undamaged container for inspection and transport.

NAME Alex Fuentes

CITY/STATE/ZIP Escondido, CA 92022

STREET ADDRESS 405 Beech St Suite 101

E-MAIL/PHONE 760-741-0703

NAME Kurt Yeager

CITY/STATE/ZIP Vista CA

STREET ADDRESS 1393 Bonair Rd

E-MAIL/PHONE 760 829 8414

NAME Scott Sedman

CITY/STATE/ZIP Carlsbad

STREET ADDRESS 3334 Euclid Place

E-MAIL/PHONE therapy33@sbcglobal.net

NAME Ricky Estrada

CITY/STATE/ZIP Vista, CA 92083

STREET ADDRESS 1333 Olive Ave

E-MAIL/PHONE 760 295-5075

NAME Derek Smith

CITY/STATE/ZIP Encinitas, Ca, 92024

STREET ADDRESS 270 N. El Camino Real #F244

E-MAIL/PHONE 760-421-8325

REVOKE CA Coastal Commission Nuke Waste Dump Permit

NAME	Garuda	STREET ADDRESS	
CITY/STATE/ZIP	Encinitas CA	E-MAIL/PHONE	garudaishlar@gmail.com
NAME	Denny Marechuk	STREET ADDRESS	Chama Ave
CITY/STATE/ZIP	Encinitas	E-MAIL/PHONE	wiphotob@gmail.com
NAME	G.G. Fenton	STREET ADDRESS	1441 Elevation Rd. 92110
CITY/STATE/ZIP	S.D. CA.	E-MAIL/PHONE	Frejoshua@gmail.com
NAME	Tim Johns	STREET ADDRESS	541 Chingnapin
CITY/STATE/ZIP		E-MAIL/PHONE	
NAME	John Fullmer	STREET ADDRESS	1145 BarHAM #176
CITY/STATE/ZIP	San Marcos Ca	E-MAIL/PHONE	(760) 626-5654
NAME	MARC PUCKETT	STREET ADDRESS	3928 ARISTO WAY
CITY/STATE/ZIP	Oceanside, CA 9208	E-MAIL/PHONE	mpuckett@simplywed.net/760 5253491
NAME	LESLIE GOMEZ	STREET ADDRESS	2297 MORGAN RD
CITY/STATE/ZIP	CARLSBAD/CA/92008	E-MAIL/PHONE	DSNSBYL@GMAIL.COM 7608460652
NAME	DAVID GOMEZ	STREET ADDRESS	2297 MORGAN ROAD 760-583-7846
CITY/STATE/ZIP	CARLSBAD/CA/92008	E-MAIL/PHONE	SRFN872@ROADRUNNER.COM
NAME	DIANE DYNES	STREET ADDRESS	1536 ALTA VISTA DR.
CITY/STATE/ZIP	VISTA CA 92084	E-MAIL/PHONE	bill@getmbt.com
NAME	Suzanne Ryan	STREET ADDRESS	699 Eaton St #36
CITY/STATE/ZIP	Oceanside, CA 92084	E-MAIL/PHONE	zeneryan@aol.com 760 271-2222
NAME	Diana Schmidt	STREET ADDRESS	3644 Lake Ridge Rd
CITY/STATE/ZIP	Fallbrook CA 92028	E-MAIL/PHONE	
NAME	GABE ENG	STREET ADDRESS	1337 INDEPENDENCE WAY VISTA CA 92084
CITY/STATE/ZIP	VISTA CA 92084	E-MAIL/PHONE	760 945 5539

REVOKE CA Coastal Commission Nuke Waste Dump Permit

NAME <u>RON SEWELL</u>	STREET ADDRESS <u>504 W. VISTA WAY</u> <u>VISTA, CA 92084</u>
CITY/STATE/ZIP <u>LA MESA, CA</u>	E-MAIL/PHONE <u>RSEWELL@MHSINC.ORG</u> 760-940-1836
NAME <u>TIFINI FERRARA</u>	STREET ADDRESS <u>6907 EL CAMINO DEL MAR</u>
CITY/STATE/ZIP <u>Rancho Santa Fe</u>	E-MAIL/PHONE <u>tifini lee 2012@gmail.com</u>
NAME <u>Austin North</u>	STREET ADDRESS <u>1920 Crystal Ridge</u>
CITY/STATE/ZIP <u>Vista CA</u>	E-MAIL/PHONE <u>Austintaylor62@aol.com</u>
NAME <u>Jonathan Fox</u>	STREET ADDRESS <u>1020 LA HALLAZ CANYON</u>
CITY/STATE/ZIP <u>Falbrook CA 92083</u>	E-MAIL/PHONE <u>1-760-871 3247</u>
NAME <u>Justin Grondys</u>	STREET ADDRESS <u>1272 Conway St</u>
CITY/STATE/ZIP <u>ESCO, CA, 92027</u>	E-MAIL/PHONE <u>442-257-5757</u>
NAME <u>Rob Sunkees</u>	STREET ADDRESS <u>1234 Division Street #6</u>
CITY/STATE/ZIP <u>Oceanside, CA, 92054</u>	E-MAIL/PHONE <u>(760) 997-2622</u>
NAME <u>Adrian Coriasco</u>	STREET ADDRESS <u>1028 La Hala Canyon Rd</u>
CITY/STATE/ZIP <u>VISTA CA 92081</u>	E-MAIL/PHONE <u>760 913 7496</u>
NAME <u>NICHOLAS EDGEE</u>	STREET ADDRESS <u>955 CREST VIEW RD</u>
CITY/STATE/ZIP <u>VISTA, CA, 92081</u>	E-MAIL/PHONE <u>949-701-8005</u>
NAME <u>MERRILL LEEDS</u>	STREET ADDRESS <u>2251 CATALINA AVE</u>
CITY/STATE/ZIP <u>VISTA, CA 92084</u>	E-MAIL/PHONE <u>mpleeds@cox.net</u>
NAME <u>Nicolle Leeds</u>	STREET ADDRESS <u>2251 Catalina Ave.</u>
CITY/STATE/ZIP <u>VISTA, CA 92084</u>	E-MAIL/PHONE <u>VISTA, CA 92084</u> <u>nikkileeds@cox.net</u>
NAME <u>Caroline Ballard</u>	STREET ADDRESS <u>space 138,</u> <u>1144 North El Camino</u>
CITY/STATE/ZIP <u>Encinitas, California 92024</u>	E-MAIL/PHONE <u>760 691 0449</u>
NAME <u>Nima Parsce</u>	STREET ADDRESS <u>4216 Kerwood Court</u>
CITY/STATE/ZIP <u>Del Mar, CA 92130</u>	E-MAIL/PHONE <u>Nimafarse@yahoo.com</u>