

1 [Resolution Supporting AB 1632]

2

3

4

**Resolution Supporting California Assembly Bill 1632.**

5

6

7

8

9

WHEREAS, In June 2006, AB 1632 was amended to address the state’s concerns that aging nuclear plants must determine the potential vulnerability, to a major disruption due to aging or a major seismic event and assess the potential state and local costs and impacts associated with accumulating waste at California’s nuclear power plants; and

10

11

12

WHEREAS, AB 1632 has the bipartisan support of representatives from all four of California’s reactor communities and the Chairs of the Assembly and Senate Energy Committees; and,

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

WHEREAS, In February 2006. the San Francisco Board of Supervisors voted to support the California Energy Commission’s (CEC) recommended evaluation of “the long-term implications associated with the continuing accumulation of spent fuel at California’s operating [nuclear power] plants, including a case-by-case evaluation of public safety and ratepayer costs of on-site interim storage of spent fuel versus transporting spent fuel offsite for interim storage...” and stated that given “the high level of uncertainty surrounding the federal waste disposal program, California’s utilities will likely be forced to retain spent fuel in storage facilities [and] at currently operating reactor sites for an indefinite period of time; and,

21

22

23

24

25

WHEREAS, On June 2, 2006, the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit Appellate Court ruled that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission erred when it failed to allow hearings on heightened risks of terrorism, acts of malice and insanity before licensing an expanded onsite high-level radioactive waste facility on the California’s vulnerable coast; and

1           WHEREAS, In June 2006, Congress introduced a bill that would allow highly  
2 radioactive waste from reactor sites to be stored at Department of Energy sites with reactor  
3 states and in California the Lawrence Livermore Lab is the most likely DOE site; and

4           WHEREAS, 2164 highly radioactive fuels assemblies (hundreds of tons of high-level  
5 radioactive waste) are currently stored in pools originally designed to hold 540 fuel  
6 assemblies on California's fragile coast bluffs in dangerous proximity to the County; and

7           WHEREAS, If license renewals are granted to California's operating nuclear plants,  
8 additional high-level radioactive waste sites must be constructed in California; and

9           WHEREAS, The San Francisco County Board of Supervisors supports the California  
10 Energy Commission's recommendation for a cost/risk/benefit analysis of the state's continued  
11 reliance on aging nuclear facilities, recognizing that it is time for California to address how  
12 many additional tons of high-level radioactive waste we will allow to be stored on our state's  
13 earthquake-active coastal zones and what legacy this could mean for future generations;  
14 now, therefore, be it

15           RESOLVED, The San Francisco County Board of Supervisors supports the California  
16 Energy Commission's recommendation for a cost/risk/benefit analysis of the state's continued  
17 reliance on aging nuclear facilities, recognizing that it is time for California to address how  
18 many additional tons of high-level radioactive waste we will allow to be stored on our state's  
19 earthquake-active coastal zones and what legacy this could mean for future generations; and,  
20 be it

21           FURTHER RESOLVED, That the County of San Francisco supports AB 1632 and is  
22 interested in working with the CEC, the state, the CPUC, and PG&E to plan for our state's  
23 energy needs and decrease our county's risks from a radioactive release due to an act of  
24 terrorism, malice or insanity, or to earthquake or age-related accidents.  
25