



Re: San Onofre, local businesses

David G. Victor

to:

Michael Snow - SnowPure

08/04/2014 10:52 AM

Cc:

"Manuel.Camargo@sce.com"

Hide Details

From: "David G. Victor" <david.victor@ucsd.edu>

To: Michael Snow - SnowPure <michael.snow@snowpure.com>,

Cc: "Manuel.Camargo@sce.com" <Manuel.Camargo@sce.com>

Dear Michael

Thanks so much for your note—it offers an extremely useful and distinct perspective that has not been much discussed at our meetings. With your permission, may I share this note with the full membership of the Community Engagement Panel?

(Manuel Camargo, copied, will share this with the pre-meeting materials for our next meeting—with your permission.)

All best

David

---

**From:** Michael Snow - SnowPure <[michael.snow@snowpure.com](mailto:michael.snow@snowpure.com)>

**Date:** Monday, August 4, 2014 at 9:46 AM

**To:** "David G. Victor" <[david.victor@ucsd.edu](mailto:david.victor@ucsd.edu)>

**Subject:** San Onofre, local businesses

Dear David,

I read the summary of your perspective on San Onofre, and am pleased that you are articulating the lack of policy.

I am both a local concerned citizen (Chemical Engineer, MIT) and a local business owner (user of electrical power). In general I am a supporter of nuclear energy, it is clean, safe (if done well), and inexpensive (marginal cost). I call myself a practical environmentalist--knowing that we can solve our environmental challenges without shutting things down.

There are 2 issues that I think also need to be addressed, availability and cost:

1) With the closing of San Onofre, the availability of power has been significantly lessened, and this is a threat to my company and to my employees. We need power to manufacture. It is not too long ago that California was at 99% of capacity with brownouts threatened. And at that time San Onofre was in full production. I know there are plans to "replace" the power lost with 60% natural gas and 40% renewables, but this is not yet in place, so there is a large risk. We have had some of our energy curtailed by SDG&E involuntarily.

2) We pay \$0.31/kWhr, which is a huge cost for us, and a huge competitive disadvantage. Our

competitors in other countries pay roughly \$0.11-\$0.14/kWhr. The bill notes that our "generation" charge is \$0.07-0.11/kWhr, and the delivery charge is \$0.006. We also pay \$0.20/kWhr for "on-peak demand", "summer non-coincident demand", and "summer generation demand". Yes we work during the day, yes we work summer, fall, winter, and spring. Further, we have been notified that our bill will increase "6-8%" shortly.

In summary, it is not only the local surfers and bussed-in (hysterical) environmentalists that are concerned about the shutdown of San Onofre.

It is also many many others that are affected in other ways.

Hope this helps you with additional perspective,

Michael

Michael J Snow, Ph.D.  
President, SnowPure Water Technologies  
[www.snowpure.com](http://www.snowpure.com)  
+1.858.692.0664 (World mobile)  
+1.949.240.2188 (US office)  
+86.138.1698.1043 (China mobile)

 Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.