estimate of 65%-75%. Average or poor performance of the plant would drastically reduce its ability to displace oil even disregarding the "take or pay" contracts.

Savings. The "take or pay" contracts for foreign oil drastically reduce any possible savings over burning oil. PG&E is obligated to pay for the oil whether it takes it or not. Also, the 1981 CEC report: "Electricity Tomorrow" states that *"conservation remains the most accessible, least expensive energy source. It reduces the need for alternative supplies and directly reduces the amount of fuel burned in power plants." "—it immediately and economically decreases our vulnerability to oil price rises and (foreign) oil supply disruptions—".* Additionally, poor performance of the Diablo plant would make its electricity cost more. PG&E calculated the possible savings at a level of electricity output that will be very difficult to achieve. Finally, many Public Utilities Commission and CEC economists estimate the cost of electricity from Diablo will be equal to that of PG&E's most efficient oil-fired plants, thus making the advertised savings non-existent even without the other factors.

Finding a Solution

Two things can be agreed upon. PG&E has a large financial investment and a large nuclear plant located 2½ miles from a large earthquake fault. For PG&E the real issue is their financial investment. For others the real issue is safety. Clearly Diablo Canyon is an obsolete energy answer to a time which is past. It is an expensive mistake. *The only more expensive mistake is to allow it to operate.*

For further information please contact:
The Abalone Alliance Diablo Project Office
805 543-6614
452 Higuera Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401