

Dear Ava Community Energy Board members,

We are writing as clean energy advocates to urge you to support the inclusion of Diablo Canyon's GHG-free electricity in your planning procurement portfolio and power content label. The customers of Ava Community Energy have an opportunity for lower electricity bills and higher GHG-free electricity in their service plans if this nuclear generation allocation is accepted. The CCA's mission is to transition to a cleaner, more efficient energy supply, and accepting Diablo Canyon's low-carbon energy supports this goal and will allow for more clean energy to be developed.

This decision will signal to customers and other CCAs your commitment to reducing GHG emissions. Ava has the ability to cast off its dirty unspecified power mix which comes from mainly natural gas. In taking the carbon-free allocation credit, Ava could achieve a 100 percent carbon-free generation portfolio five years earlier than planned, while achieving financial [savings in the tens of millions of dollars](#), as projected by the objective analysis from Ava staff. With Diablo Canyon's power, you will have more clean energy and more money to invest in local community programs, grants, scholarships, electrification efforts, clean power projects, or spot windfall savings back to customers. It's a win-win and would be a monumental victory for customers.

Opposition to this decision has repeatedly referenced the SB100 policy, stating that it calls for 100% renewables, disqualifying nuclear energy - but this is incorrect. The bill text [states](#) that "it is the policy of the state that eligible renewable energy resources AND zero-carbon resources supply 100% of retail sales of electricity to California end-use customers and 100% of electricity procured to serve all state agencies by December 31, 2045." And according to bill [SB846](#) nuclear energy is a zero-carbon electricity source that "currently supplies approximately 17 percent of California's zero-carbon electricity supply and 8.6 percent of California's total electricity supply."

In a state recovering from an energy crisis, plagued with the [second-highest](#) electricity prices in the nation, and [not on track](#) to meet its climate mandates, we have the duty to deliver clean affordable energy.

Ava commits itself under its [Joint Powers Formation Agreement](#) to pursuing a lower total amount of greenhouse gas emissions for its power portfolio than comparable service from PG&E, calling for 10% greater zero-carbon resources than PG&E in its CPUC-filed implementation plan. Though, ironically, by not accepting nuclear in its portfolio, Ava has fallen behind PG&E in this pursuit. In fact this year, PG&E announced in its [10-K filing](#) with the United States Securities and Exchange Commission that it has reached a zero carbon power content label for 2023.

With the inclusion of electricity procurement from Diablo Canyon, Ava can maintain a competitive advantage of price and clean energy portfolio; without it, your portfolio's fossil fuel portion will be higher.

Despite statements claiming low support for Diablo Canyon and nuclear energy, [recent polling](#) suggests otherwise, finding that:

- Support for Diablo Canyon is highest in the Bay Area at **66%**
- Nearly ¾ citizens support the continued operation and in SLO County **76%** support
- California voters have become more comfortable with nuclear energy over time, with solid majorities saying they approve of the use of nuclear energy to generate electricity and that its benefits outweigh its risks.

The local YTT Northern Chumash tribe, whose land the plant lies on, is also [supportive](#) of the continued operation of Diablo Canyon. But your acceptance of this power does not necessarily mean you support the extension of Diablo but demonstrates an understanding that for the next five years, communities can benefit from its clean and affordable electricity.

As California does its part alongside the United States and the rest of the world to continue the energy transition, there is consensus among the top energy and climate organizations that nuclear does and will continue to play a major role in decarbonization.

- In the latest [IPCC WG3 Climate Report](#), it states that a doubling of nuclear capacity is needed by 2050 to limit the warming to 1.5 degrees.
- According to the [UN Economic Commission for Europe](#), “nuclear energy is demonstrably a source of low carbon energy and a vital tool for successfully helping the world mitigate the effects of climate change.”
- In a report by the [International Atomic Energy Agency](#), they found that nuclear energy has made significant contributions to carbon avoidance in the past, and in order “to

support the Paris Agreement 2°C goal, nuclear capacity must more than double the current level worldwide.”

- In a summary by the [World Economic Forum](#), they conclude, “Nuclear technology could sustain the deployment of renewables, provide a stable and secure baseload, and allow the planet to meet the necessary carbon-free targets set by the Paris Agreement.”
- In 2021, the European Commission’s research center, the JRC, conducted a report and found [no scientific evidence](#) that nuclear power harms people and nature more than other energy sources - including wind and solar power.

On May 15th, Ava can secure savings benefits and accelerate its carbon-free generation and emissions reductions to its customers by accepting the carbon-free allocation from nuclear generation. We urge you to demonstrate thought leadership and financial rigor towards this decision and vote **in favor** of Scenario 1 (*Accept Nuclear*) or Scenario 2 (*Accept Nuclear + Further Reduce Carbon Intensity w/Additional Large Hydro or Nuclear*).

Sincerely,



1. Paris Ortiz-Wines - Albany 94706
2. Kevin Pannell - Albany 94706
3. Brendan Pittman - Berkeley 94704
4. Ryan Pickering - Berkeley 94709
5. James Hopf - Tracy 95376
6. Francisco Porcel Rodriguez - Dublin 94568
7. Hannah Doan - Dublin 94568

8. Dinara Ermakova - Alameda 94501
9. Carlos Noreña - Berkeley 94704
10. Brenna Marcoux - Oakland 94610
11. Karis Russell - Oakland 94619
12. Jennifer Klay - San Luis Obispo 93401
13. Wesley Schon - Oakland 94610
14. Casey Tompkins - Alameda, 94501
15. Daeseong Kim - Oakland 94607
16. Emil Mejares - Oakland 94612
17. Grant Mills - Berkeley 94709
18. Sam Nathanson - Oakland 94610
19. Taylor Jaszewski - Oakland 94610
20. Rohan Reddy - Berkeley 94720
21. Karen Haga - Pleasanton 94566
22. Mount - 95117
23. Lucas Beveridge - Commerce City, 80640
24. Stephanie Wise - Livermore, 94551
25. Kurt Cabrera - Livermore, 94551