



800-843-7348 - [SOUSA.COM](http://SOUSA.COM) - 877-843-8443

## **Community Engagement Panel Public Meeting**

### **Transcript of Proceedings**

**Date: 03/25/2014**

**Job #: 592042**

Court Reporting – Videoconferencing – Trial Presentation – Nationwide Networking

**Calabasas - Hermosa Beach - Santa Ana - Riverside - San Diego - Las Vegas**

SAN ONOFRE DECOMMISSIONING  
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PANEL MEETING  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
SAN CLEMENTE, CALIFORNIA  
TUESDAY, MARCH 25, 2014

Reported by:  
CARLOS R. HICHO  
CSR No. 13111  
Job No. 592042

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

SAN ONOFRE DECOMMISSIONING  
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PANEL MEETING  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE

Transcript of proceedings, taken at  
100 North Calle Seville, San Clemente,  
California 92672, commencing at the hour of  
6:01 P.M., TUESDAY, MARCH 25, 2014, before  
CARLOS R. HICHO, CSR No. 13111, pursuant to  
Notice of Taking Deposition.

1 PANEL APPEARANCES :

2 DAVID G. VICTOR  
3 CHAIRMAN

4 CEP MEMBERS :

5 EDWARD "TED" QUINN  
6 AMERICAN NUCLEAR SOCIETY, SAN DIEGO  
7 CHAPTER

8 RICH HAYDON  
9 CALIFORNIA STATE PARKS

10 PRESIDENT JOHN ALPAY  
11 CAPISTRANO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD  
12 OF TRUSTEES

13 LARRY RANNALS  
14 CAMP PENDLETON

15 MAYOR LISA BARTLETT  
16 DANA POINT

17 VALENTINE "VAL" MACEDO  
18 LABORERS INTERNATIONAL UNION OF NORTH  
19 AMERICA LOCAL 89

20 DAN STETSON  
21 OCEAN INSTITUTE

22 JEROME M. "JERRY" KERN  
23 OCEANSIDE CITI COUNCILMEMBER

24 GARRY BROWN  
25 ORANGE COUNTY COASTKEEPER

DONNA BOSTON  
ORANGE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

SUPERVISOR PAT BATES  
ORANGE COUNTY

(Continued.)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

APPEARANCES :

CEP MEMBERS

GENE STONE  
RESIDENTS ORGANIZED FOR A SAFE  
ENVIRONMENT

MAYOR TIM BROWN  
SAN CLEMENTE

SUPERVISOR BILL HORN  
SAN DIEGO COUNTY

MAYOR SAM ALLEVATO  
SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO

JIM LEACH  
SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY ECONOMIC COALITION

DR. WILLIAM PARKER  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE

1 TUESDAY, MARCH 25, 2014, SAN CLEMENTE, CALIFORNIA

2 6:01

3 \* \* \*

4

5 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Let me bring the -- this first  
6 meeting of the Community Engagement Panel to -- to  
7 order. My name is David Victor. I'm chairman of the  
8 panel. I'm a professor at University of California San  
9 Diego and I made a career studying highly regulated  
10 industries, in the energy industry in particular, and  
11 much of that work has involved bringing different  
12 stakeholders together around the research and  
13 development agenda for the energy -- the energy  
14 industries.

15 My family, wife, two kids, myself, live in  
16 San Diego County. We are part of the broader  
17 communities that are affected by -- by this -- by this  
18 plant.

19 I'm really pleased to be here. Let me just  
20 say that this Community Engagement Panel exists and it  
21 was convened by the owners -- co-owners of the  
22 San Onofre nuclear generating station as a way to open  
23 a conduit between the communities and the co-owners.

24 And as you're going to hear already tonight,  
25 there's a whole series of decisions that have to get

1 made in the coming months, years, even decades, and  
2 those decisions are going to benefit enormously from  
3 the participation of the community.

4 And I know a lot of people, witnessed by the  
5 large number of folks out tonight, a lot of people are  
6 interested in what's going on at the plant. This is a  
7 huge engineering project. It seems to be as difficult  
8 to dismantle a plant as it is to build one in the first  
9 place.

10 Let me just -- before we get into the agenda,  
11 let me just point out that the exits for this room --  
12 I'm not inviting you all to leave right now, I'm just  
13 pointing out that the exits are marked with the sign  
14 "Exit," the restrooms are out that door; you will see,  
15 as you came in, on a table a sign-up sheet for people  
16 to make comments during "the public comment" period.

17 There is an hour allotted for public comments  
18 of three minutes each later in our agenda tonight. You  
19 can sign up there. And if you didn't sign up, you can  
20 still make a comment, you would just have to line up  
21 once we get to that stage in -- in the meeting.

22 We have two uniformed officers here tonight.  
23 This is a public facility. They're here for everyone's  
24 safety and as is the normal -- the normal practice.

25 I want to briefly introduce the 18 members of

1 the Community Engagement Panel. This is an  
2 extraordinary panel. We have just an incredible  
3 representation from the different communities who are  
4 affected in different ways by -- by the plant.

5 And I'm just going to read folks' names off  
6 and their affiliations as they're listed on the  
7 website. We are ordered tonight by alphabetical order.  
8 As somebody who the last name begins with the letter V,  
9 I'm often at the back end of that alphabetical order,  
10 so maybe one day we'll order everybody alphabetically  
11 in the opposite direction just to kind of make sure  
12 everybody is awake.

13 But tonight we're in alphabetical order by  
14 last name on the list here. My name is David Victor.  
15 I've already introduced myself. We have a member from  
16 the American Nuclear Society of San Diego Chapter, Ted  
17 Quinn. He is unable to be with us tonight. He's  
18 overseeing on a previous engagement that was  
19 unbreakable, but he will be here at future meetings.  
20 This panel will meet at least on a quarterly basis, if  
21 not more often. And I know Ted is very keen to  
22 participate.

23 We have from California State Parks, Rich --  
24 Rich Haydon. We have from Capistrano Unified School  
25 District Board of Trustees, President John Alpay.

1           We have from Camp Pendleton, Larry Rannals;  
2           from Dana Point, Mayor Lisa Bartlett; from the Laborers  
3           International Union of North America Local 89, then he  
4           works at the plant, Val Macedo; from the Ocean  
5           Institute, Dan Stetson; from Oceanside City  
6           Councilmember, Jerry Kern;

7           From Orange County Coastkeeper, Garry Brown;  
8           from the Orange County Sheriff's Department, Donna  
9           Boston; from Orange County, Supervisor Pat Bates; from  
10          Residents Organized for a Safe Environment, Gene Stone;  
11          and Gene has already indicated that in his -- in cases  
12          where he may be absent, he's not nominated an  
13          alternate, Glen Pascal, here from the Sierra Club.

14          And we welcome Glen, who is sitting with us in  
15          the audience tonight.

16          From San Clemente, we have Mayor Tim Brown;  
17          from San Diego County, Supervisor Bill Horn; San Juan  
18          Capistrano, Mayor Sam Allevato; South Orange County  
19          Economic Coalition, Jim Leach; and from the University  
20          of California at Irvine, Dr. William Parker.

21          It's an incredible panel and I'm really  
22          honored to serve with these distinguished members of  
23          the community. All of us are volunteers, all of us are  
24          here because we think this process really matters.

25          We think it matters, not only because we want

1 the process of decommissioning of San Onofre to work  
2 efficiently, but also I think one of the -- um, one of  
3 the goals here would be to demonstrate a process by  
4 which decommissioning can happen effectively, with  
5 proper community engagement and lots of other plans,  
6 because we're going to see this happen in other parts  
7 of the country in the coming years as other plants are  
8 decommissioned.

9 I see a sign, indicating that there is no Web  
10 service, and so I will ask the technical folks to --  
11 um, to look into that.

12 Let me also recognize in the audience tonight  
13 Greg Warnick from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
14 He's a senior resident inspector from the NRC for the  
15 San Onofre plant. He's not here to answer questions on  
16 behalf of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, but I  
17 wanted to recognize his presence here with us tonight.

18 We have a full agenda tonight and we -- the  
19 first half hour will be devoted to getting this process  
20 started and to some initial comments from different  
21 members of the Community Engagement Panel should they  
22 want to make comments.

23 Then we have an hour on the decommissioning  
24 process itself. You will see very quickly that there  
25 is a lot going on very quickly and this process needs

1 in critical areas the input from the community and I  
2 think the community will benefit enormously from --  
3 from learning more about that process.

4 We have, then, a final half hour where the  
5 panel will make some comments on what we heard tonight,  
6 including comments that are going to lead us to the  
7 agenda for future meetings and for workshops that might  
8 be useful for us to hold in the community to explore a  
9 wide variety of technical and nontechnical topics that  
10 are important for this.

11 Tonight we have live streaming. It sounds  
12 like we don't have the Web, but we'll be working on the  
13 Web. We have live streaming. We have recording of the  
14 entire meeting tonight, as well as a transcription of  
15 the entire meeting tonight.

16 Please, when you have the microphone, please  
17 speak clearly so that the transcriber in particular can  
18 hear what you're saying and get that into the -- into  
19 the record.

20 The tone of this process is complete  
21 transparency, so information about all the panel  
22 members is up on [songscommunity.com](http://songscommunity.com). The -- the  
23 co-owners have put together for us a briefing book  
24 with, frankly, more technical material than I thought  
25 could exist in one binder all -- in the form of all

1 public documents.

2 Those public documents are all available, most  
3 of them are actually already on songscommunity.com.  
4 And in the coming few days, we will make sure that the  
5 entire contents of that briefing book are available  
6 there. The idea here is to make widely available the  
7 information that all of us are looking at and -- and  
8 talking about.

9 Before I stop talking, as part of this opening  
10 session, I just want to say three things very briefly  
11 about the process that is in front of us:

12 This is moving very, very quickly. We're not  
13 yet at the one-year anniversary of the decision to shut  
14 the plant and the defueling of the plant. The  
15 Community Engagement Panel itself, all of us up here,  
16 was announced only last month.

17 Here we are having our first public meeting  
18 today. We are trying to get on this process as quickly  
19 as possible and open that conduit between the co-owners  
20 and the communities.

21 At the same time this is a long and  
22 complicated engineering project. This is a 20-year,  
23 plus or minus, project costing 4 billion dollars or so,  
24 and so all of us are going to be dealing with each  
25 other in this process as we have been during the

1 initial construction and operation of the plant.

2 And so I'm hoping very much that whatever  
3 different views we may have had about the wisdom of the  
4 plant in the first place, about a whole variety of  
5 decisions, we have to focus on the practical process  
6 and the civility that's going to be needed to -- to  
7 handle the decommissioning process in a transparent and  
8 effective way.

9 The second thing of the three things I'd like  
10 to say very briefly is, we need your help on the  
11 agenda. The agenda for the future meetings of the  
12 Community Engagement Panel, the agenda for workshops,  
13 things you want to know more about, things you think  
14 the community should know more about.

15 And when we get to the public comment period,  
16 we, in the panel in particular, would like to hear your  
17 views. It's not really a question-and-answer period,  
18 it's a comment period. We would like to hear your  
19 views about what you think we should be working on and  
20 what is important.

21 And the third and last thing I'll say is, I  
22 think it's very important that we be realistic in  
23 this -- in this process. We're going to learn shortly  
24 about the decommissioning process and the timeline and  
25 many, many different regulatory issues.

1           There are some areas where involvement of the  
2 Community Engagement Panel and information we can  
3 provide is going to be critical to what the co-owners  
4 do, what they -- what they decide, how they go about  
5 decommissioning and so on.

6           And there are going to be some areas where  
7 the -- where the owners/operators of the plant are  
8 highly regulated and we don't have a lot of practical  
9 input, and so I think we need to be very, very  
10 pragmatic as to where we can be most helpful and how  
11 and where, as a practical matter, we -- we are going to  
12 have less -- less influence.

13           We now -- next in the -- in the agenda, I'd  
14 like to turn the floor over to Chris Thompson; he is  
15 vice-president for nuclear decommissioning at Southern  
16 California Edison. He's going to talk with us a little  
17 bit about the decommissioning core principles and  
18 values and the role of the Community Engagement Panel  
19 and public engagement and education.

20           Chris Thompson, the floor is yours.

21           MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Dr. Victor. Can  
22 everybody hear me okay? Good evening. My name is  
23 Chris Thompson. As Dr. Victor said, I'm the  
24 vice-president for decommissioning of Southern  
25 California Edison.

1           And my role: I'm responsible for overseeing  
2 the various elements of decommissioning, regulatory  
3 issues, legal issues, financial issues, as well as  
4 external issues, like the panel here tonight.

5           The -- the owners of the San Onofre facility,  
6 including Southern California Edison, took the  
7 initiative to form the Community Engagement Panel in  
8 part because we greatly value public dialogue.

9           I've had the opportunity to talk to a number  
10 of the panel members in advance of this meeting and  
11 have been encouraged by the feedback I've gotten. I've  
12 heard from them that they're impressed with the  
13 diversity of views that are represented on the panel  
14 and they're -- they're ready to do this work with us.

15           As Dr. -- as Dr. Victor mentioned, one of the  
16 vital elements of the panel's function -- one of the  
17 vital functions of the panel in decommissioning is that  
18 it's a two-way channel of communication. It's a  
19 mechanism for the community to have input to the panel  
20 and to us.

21           We're going to take the input from the panel  
22 very seriously. It's important to bear in mind the  
23 input from the panel are one input into this long  
24 process. We will also be getting input from Nuclear  
25 Regulatory Commission and the Public Utilities

1 Commission, who are regulators, and they will have a  
2 lot to say about the decommissioning of this facility.

3 There are also a number of other local, state,  
4 and federal agencies that have a role in the  
5 decommissioning process.

6 A couple of words about the principles that'll  
7 guide us in this process, the co-owners of the facility  
8 have issued a set of principles to guide  
9 decommissioning and there is three of them: Safety,  
10 stewardship and engagement.

11 Safety has to be foremost in this process.  
12 And to me, safety means three things: It's the safety  
13 of the personnel who are performing the work at the  
14 facility, the safety of the residents of the  
15 communities that surround the facility, and the safety  
16 the natural environment.

17 Stewardship is another guiding principle for  
18 us in this process. Roughly 30 years ago we  
19 established a trust fund to contain money to fund the  
20 decommission of this facility. Our customers have paid  
21 into those trust funds for 30 years.

22 We have a duty to our customers to spend those  
23 funds wisely. At the end of this process any balances  
24 that remain in the trust fund will be refunded to our  
25 customers.

1           The third guiding principle is engagement and  
2 this panel is one element of that engagement. We will  
3 listen to the feedback we get from the panel, we'll  
4 also continue to do direct communication with the  
5 public as we have throughout the operation of  
6 San Onofre.

7           For example, in the last couple of years,  
8 we've conducted hundreds of briefings and presentations  
9 to community groups and local governments and we'll  
10 continue to do that and to communicate directly with  
11 the public.

12           So the only other thing I wanted to say was  
13 thank you to all of you for willing to serve in this  
14 capacity and thank you for being here, your presence  
15 and your presence are vital to engagement.

16           And when I think of "engagement," what I think  
17 of is two things: Learning and participation. And  
18 through this process we will do all we can to  
19 facilitate learning on the part of the public, learning  
20 on the part the panel, and we will listen and learn  
21 through this process, as well.

22           So with that, I'm going to turn it over to Tom  
23 Palmisano.

24           PANEL MEMBER: No, back to David.

25           MR. THOMPSON: No? Back to David.

1           CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much. Thank you,  
2 Chris. Um, let me also recognize in the audience two  
3 San Clemente City councilmembers, councilmember Bob  
4 Baker, councilmember Lori Donchack. Let me also thank  
5 San Clemente, in particular, for hosting the meeting  
6 that we have here tonight.

7           Can I ask if any members of the CEP would like  
8 to make any initial comments? We have three minutes  
9 per member, if members want to make any initial  
10 comments at this -- at this stage.

11           And maybe since this is a long table, and my  
12 eyes are not as good as they were 20 years ago, if you  
13 want to get the floor or my attention, at least, maybe  
14 put your flag like this (indicating) and I'll see it  
15 and then put it back down. Jerry?

16           MR. KERN: I understand this is a regional issue  
17 and I'm sure the chairman and somebody is going to  
18 mention it later in that venue, we're going to be  
19 moving these meetings around throughout the region.

20           One of the requests I made, and the chairman  
21 agreed to, is to have at least one meeting in San Diego  
22 County a -- a year. And I think it's a wide regional  
23 interest, so we're going to be moving back and forth  
24 between -- throughout the region, so it'd make it  
25 convenient for everybody that wants to say something

1 can say something.

2 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very much, Jerry  
3 Kern. Let me recognize, Gene Stone. Gene, would you  
4 like to -- to take the floor for a few minutes?

5 MR. STONE: Thank you. I'd like to thank  
6 California Edison for selecting me to be on this panel  
7 as a anti-nuclear environmentalist and on the Community  
8 Engagement Panel, so thank you very much.

9 And I would like to assure California Edison  
10 and the public that I will do all I can do to help you,  
11 California Edison, live up to your excellent statement  
12 and core principles and values for decommissioning of  
13 San Onofre for the safest, leading edge decommissioning  
14 of San Onofre as possible.

15 While cost is a -- cost of decommissioning is  
16 a very important topic, safety will always outweigh  
17 every other concern, in my mind. As I'm a member of  
18 the coalition to decommission San Onofre, I will be  
19 speaking for Residents Organized for a Safe Environment  
20 because I can not speak for all the individuals in the  
21 different groups that make up the coalition as a whole.

22 I'd like to thank Glen Pascal for being my  
23 alternate. There will be many important things to  
24 watch during the decommissioning of San Onofre.

25 Here are just a few of the items that I think

1 that we need to be really aware of and start thinking  
2 seriously about the very best solutions:

3 One, can all high burn-up fuel and ex -- and  
4 extra protection because of the damaged fuel rods and  
5 the cladding -- canning is putting broken fuel rods  
6 into an extra stainless steel canister before they go  
7 into the dry cask.

8 Two, storage of all nuclear waste on site with  
9 high burn-up -- of all high burn-up fuels with berm  
10 upgrades and a higher tsunami wall and this will also  
11 make the waste a little safer in case of a possible  
12 terrorist attack by sea or air. A safer -- a safer  
13 storage is a safer California.

14 Number three, as a PEC member -- member I'd  
15 like to see California Edison's plans in case of an  
16 accident with any of the nuclear fuel and dry cask,  
17 including the more highly radioactive high burn-up  
18 fuel. A possible solution is a new fuel pool next to  
19 the dry cask area.

20 Four, will the sub -- will SCE -- SCE  
21 subcontract all or part of the decommissioning on site  
22 or will SCE be handling the decommissioning itself? If  
23 so, what experience does the California Edison have in  
24 this area, and is it true that the decommissioning of  
25 Unit 1 is still incomplete?

1           Five, the California -- the CEP should  
2 consider our first workshop ASAP to be a dual purpose  
3 one: Part one, with members of other communities that  
4 are ahead of us in the decommissioning process to help  
5 us find the pitfalls that may be ahead of us; Two, on  
6 high burn-up fuel, with independent nuclear experts and  
7 California Edison and NRC experts.

8           And last, I'd like to say the spirit of my  
9 relatives, Sitting Bull, let us put our minds together  
10 and work to see what we can do to make a better life  
11 for our children.

12           CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much.

13           MR. STONE: Thank you.

14           CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you, Gene. Next I'd like  
15 to recognize Tim Brown. Please.

16           MR. BROWN: Thank you, Dr. Victor. On behalf of  
17 the city council and residents of San Clemente, I'd  
18 like to extend a warm welcome to all those that are  
19 visiting us, particular members of the panel,  
20 distinguished members of the panel, I would like to  
21 recognize and commend SCE for putting this panel  
22 together.

23           And I think it shows some foresight and,  
24 frankly, a strong understanding of how important the  
25 community is in this effort. And I will just, if I

1     could just -- there was -- there was a charter for the  
2     CEP, for the Community Engagement Panel, that was  
3     provided and there were two items in this that really  
4     spoke to me.

5             And the first is, if this panel is intended to  
6     serve as a conduit for public information, encourage  
7     community involvement, communication with the SONGS  
8     co-owners; and another item that is of critical  
9     importance is that we will focus on public education,  
10    understanding matters of interest to area communities  
11    related to the shutdown and decommissioning of SONGS.

12            To that same vain, I understand, as a member  
13    of this panel, I'm sure as we all do, that our primary  
14    purpose is to educate members of the public of the  
15    information that we receive, but also serve as a  
16    conduit for their concerns, their questions, their  
17    doubts, and feedback that they have.

18            And to that same vain, for residents who are  
19    here, the city will be updating our Web page and  
20    provide a forum for you to submit questions, concerns,  
21    or any other items that you may -- that you may walk  
22    away from this tonight.

23            And so we will be supporting this effort by  
24    trying to extend into the community more and bring some  
25    awareness as to exactly what is going on here. And so,

1 again, I'm grateful that we have this opportunity to do  
2 it.

3 Frankly, I think if we are able to do what we  
4 need to do and do it well, that we will be able to  
5 really coalesce around the issues that really matter  
6 and find a common understanding that at the end of the  
7 day we'll make the decommissioning will be something  
8 that we -- instead of something that always has a  
9 pejorative or a negative implication, it'll be  
10 something to be very positive that we can look to  
11 and -- and establish a standard frankly for the rest of  
12 the nation, so I'm grateful for the opportunity.

13 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Mayor Brown, thank you very, very  
14 much.

15 Any other members of the panel who would like  
16 to make initial comments?

17 (Brief pause in the proceedings.)

18 Okay. I think we'll go on to the next segment  
19 of the meeting, which really begins the serious work  
20 that we have to do here. We have from Southern  
21 California Edison, Tom Palmisano. He has several  
22 titles with the company, the most important of those is  
23 he's the chief nuclear officer.

24 And I can add that prior to joining Edison  
25 three years ago, he was at other utilities that have

1     been -- that have decommission plants and has extensive  
2     experience in this area.

3             Tom is going to give us an overview of the  
4     decommissioning process. Let me just make a couple of  
5     procedural points: The slides he's using tonight will  
6     be posted, I believe, this evening on  
7     songscommunity.com, and his presentation is slated on  
8     the agenda to run for half an hour, but let me  
9     encourage the members of the panel if you have factual  
10    questions along the way, important factual questions,  
11    please interrupt and we'll get those clarified.

12            And if the meaning of the word "fact" changes  
13    along the way, we'll put a pause on that and let Tom  
14    finish his presentation before we, as a panel, have a  
15    larger discussion about this.

16            Tom Palmisano, the floor is yours.

17            MR. PALMISANO: Okay. Well, thank you very much.  
18    And let me just add my thanks to the panel for  
19    volunteering your time to be part of this important  
20    function and thank you to the members of the public for  
21    turning out tonight to really hear the start of this  
22    dialogue about decommissioning.

23            I think, as Chairman Victor and Chris Thompson  
24    have said and some of the other panel members, this is  
25    the start of an important process and it's a lengthy

1 process and it's a complicated process. There is some  
2 precedent, but it's an important process for us. It's  
3 obviously very local.

4 And we're talking about decommissioning  
5 San Onofre and this engagement tonight, the  
6 transparency this will start it's very important to all  
7 of the owners, to all the residents of the community,  
8 and all the various stakeholders, so we really thank  
9 for your time.

10 As Chairman Victor said, I am going to give an  
11 overview. We actually have blocked out, I think, 30  
12 minutes of presentation and 30 minutes for panel  
13 questions, so we have about an hour. So, as I go  
14 through, I have always found it best for you just ask  
15 questions as I go; don't wait for 30 minutes and think  
16 of your questions at that point. I think it'll  
17 facilitate a better dialogue between us.

18 And the other thing I would offer, we've  
19 provided you, as Chairman Victor pointed out, a fairly  
20 impressive book of material. We won't sure get a show  
21 of hands to see who's read it all, but I'll be glad to  
22 answer questions about what's in the book and help  
23 clarify that as part of the presentation. So with  
24 that --

25 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Let me just, again, clarify for

1 members of the community, the book contains public  
2 record documents about the decommissioning process,  
3 most of which are already on songscommunity.com and the  
4 rest we'll make sure we have hyperlinks or some other  
5 magic there so you can see everything that we see.

6 MR. PALMISANO: Okay. Just to reiterate our  
7 decommissioning principles, with the co-owners,  
8 Southern California is committed to safety, in a couple  
9 of bullets, we're going to safely decommission  
10 San Onofre, safely move the power plants spent fuel  
11 into dry cask storage until the government approve  
12 long-term storage options are available.

13 None of us are happy with the situation of  
14 having to store fuel of various reactor sites. I've  
15 managed four sites in the Midwest and I've dealt with  
16 dry cask storage before and I think this is one thing,  
17 with the panel's help, will align behind is the need to  
18 work for a longer term resolution. Yes?

19 MS. BATES: I hate to stop you so soon, but that  
20 caught my eye in doing the review that we have this  
21 issue with the federal government honoring that promise  
22 many years ago, so on what front are we engaged in  
23 pushing down into commitment and doing something?

24 MR. PALMISANO: All right. Let me just give you a  
25 brief comment because I think this is something, as a

1 panel, we need to talk to you, the panel, about it  
2 about the help we need.

3 From an industry perspective, utilities  
4 individually and the utilities through any eye have  
5 been urging the federal government, particularly  
6 Department of Energy and Congress, to take action.

7 Likewise, we've been involved in lawsuits with  
8 the Department of Energy and department of justice to  
9 recover on behalf of our ratepayers for the money we're  
10 all having to pay for this situation.

11 So there has been some significant effort over  
12 the last 10 to 20 years. We don't have time to get  
13 into all the politics of Yucca Mountain and the waste  
14 conference decision making in that, but I think that's  
15 something as we deal with San Onofre and what to do  
16 with the fuel in the short and intermediate term, we  
17 need to stay focused on the long term, as well as what  
18 we all want and that's fuel off this site eventually  
19 down the road.

20 Okay. Stewardship: This is very important.  
21 No. 1, leaving the community better off for San Onofre  
22 having been here for many years, not only as a power  
23 producer and contributing to the economy, the various  
24 interaction we've had with the community, what we've  
25 provided to local communities in terms of support, what

1 our valuable employees over the years have given back  
2 to the community in terms of their involvement and  
3 service.

4 We're proud of that. We're proud of our  
5 history and we're looking forward that when we're done  
6 to leaving the community better off for San Onofre  
7 having been here for so many years.

8 Spending the nuclear trust fund wisely, as  
9 Chris pointed out, our ratepayers have contributed to  
10 that fund. We've managed it wisely from an investment  
11 growth, but we're stewards of the fund; that really  
12 belongs to ratepayers and we're very sensitive to that  
13 as we make decisions.

14 It will always be "safety first," that's why  
15 it's the first principle, but we are sensitive that  
16 we're stewards of money that other people have  
17 attributed.

18 The last item is Engagement: This is an  
19 opportunity to engage. This is the start of a process  
20 and a process we are very confident in that will lead  
21 to a better decommissioning of San Onofre, a more  
22 understandable decommissioning of San Onofre for the  
23 public, and a better informed decommissioning of  
24 San Onofre as we listen to the public and other  
25 stakeholders, so engagement is very -- a very important

1 part of our principles.

2 MR. THOMPSON: Tom, quick question.

3 MR. PALMISANO: Yes, sir.

4 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: You need to make sure -- approach  
5 the microphone a little.

6 MR. THOMPSON: What's the -- what's the current  
7 balance in the trust fund?

8 MR. PALMISANO: The current balance in the trust  
9 fund is about 3.9 billion, that's the 100 percent value  
10 amongst the four co-owners. Does that answer your  
11 question?

12 MR. THOMPSON: It does.

13 MR. PALMISANO: Okay. Okay. Just to recap a  
14 little bit, and I didn't put it at the top of the  
15 slide: Neither reactor has operated since  
16 January 31st, 2012. Unit 2 was shut down around  
17 January 9th for a refueling outage and Unit 3 because  
18 of the events with the steam generator tube leak, so  
19 neither reactor has operated for over two years now.

20 June 7 of 2013, we announced the decision to  
21 permanently close the plant or shut the plant. June  
22 12, we certified that with a formal letter to the NRC,  
23 certifying we would no longer operate the plant.

24 And we had already defueled Unit 3. In the  
25 summer of 2013, we defueled Unit 2, and we certified in

1 a writing to the NRC that the reactors were permanently  
2 defueled. That's an important point because at this  
3 point that modified our operating license.

4 We're licensed by the federal government over  
5 the years to operate, maintain the plant, process, and  
6 use nuclear fuel. After July 22nd, 2013, we're no  
7 longer authorized to operate the plant or place fuel in  
8 the reactor. We're authorized only to possess the  
9 material and protect the material, so that's a  
10 significant change in our authorization. The --  
11 sometimes it turn to possession-only license at this  
12 point.

13 The other thing, it's been a challenging year  
14 for the staff at San Onofre. In June 2013, we had  
15 1,500 employees permanently on site, today we have less  
16 than 500, so we have reduced the staffing safely to do  
17 the right work, to keep the fuel safe and manage the  
18 activities.

19 The part of being stewards of the funds is to  
20 make sure we're spending the money wisely and the staff  
21 reductions are part of that.

22 Okay. The next slide, this is a slide -- and  
23 it's really based for the panel members in the book and  
24 for the public when you get access to the information.  
25 There's an NRC Req Guide that gives a pretty good

1 description of the decommissioning process, it is Reg  
2 Guide 1.184.

3 And what we've done here is simplified it. It  
4 describes decommissioning the process in three phases:

5 The first to thing to know is, by regulation,  
6 we would have up to 60 years to decommission San Onofre  
7 and terminate the remaining license and relink -- and  
8 release the site for unrestricted use or some  
9 combination of restricted/unrestricted use.

10 We don't intend to take 60 years; that's not  
11 consistent with our values and our principles. The way  
12 the NRC breaks the process, the first two years or so  
13 are decommissioning planning, so from January 2013, we  
14 have until January 2015 to submit some key documents,  
15 and on the next slide I'll talk about those in a  
16 minute.

17 So during those first two years, we cease  
18 operation, notify the NRC, defuel the units; what we've  
19 already done. The second black and red, if you can see  
20 it, we submit what's called "the post-shutdown  
21 decommissioning activities reports." This is one of --  
22 ah, that's not going to show up very well.

23 That's one of three keys submittals. And this  
24 really is about a 50-page document that gives a  
25 high-level overview of the plan to decommission

1 San Onofre: The expected cost, the environmental  
2 impact, and the summary of the plan to manage spent  
3 fuel. So this is a summary level document.

4 The NRC then reviews that document. We submit  
5 it to them. There's a 90-day period where the NRC  
6 reviews it, ask us questions, it's posted for public  
7 comment, and the NRC holds a public meeting to discuss  
8 the decommissioning plan.

9 We're not allowed to do major decommissioning  
10 activities, which would be dismantling the plant, until  
11 that document has been submitted and the 90-day review  
12 period is completed. Then we have until June 2015 to  
13 submit that. We intend to submit that later this year.

14 The "Major Decommissioning Activities." So  
15 now once we're -- and I'm going to show you a timeline  
16 in a minute that'll hopefully bring all this in a  
17 little bit better focus.

18 Once the initial planning phase is done, we  
19 move into "the major decommissioning activities" phase.  
20 This is the actual dismantlement of the plant. The  
21 off-load of the spent fuel into spent fuel pools -- or  
22 into dry cask storage -- I'm sorry -- from the pools  
23 into dry cask storage.

24 The actually dismantlement of the plant: This  
25 period, you know, it's envisioned to take on the order

1 of 10-plus years because it's a lot of work, it's a  
2 complex site, there's a lot of equipment, so that's the  
3 major decommissioning activity phase.

4 And on the -- and you can see in the blue box,  
5 if you can read them, we initiate cleanup activities or  
6 dismantlement activities, the NRC conducts periodic  
7 inspections and, in fact, they already are conducting  
8 decommissioning inspections.

9 We submit what's called a "license termination  
10 plan," and I'll talk about that in a minute. We  
11 complete the cleanup activities and the NRC performs  
12 technical environmental reviews of the license  
13 termination plant.

14 So, what's "the license termination plan"? So  
15 the near the end of the dismantlement phase, we have to  
16 submit a license termination plan. By regulation, it's  
17 required at least two years before the end of the 60  
18 year-period.

19 Obviously, In our case, we'll submit that much  
20 sooner. But that really outlines and -- and proposes  
21 what has been done to decommission the plant, what has  
22 been done to survey all the radiological conditions,  
23 demonstrate the logi -- radiological conditions have  
24 been remediated or cleaned up so the site is -- is  
25 remediated below NRC required standards for radiation

1 exposure to a targeted member of the public or a public  
2 population. So that's the standard process and that's  
3 the part in green.

4 So under -- once the NRC approves the license  
5 termination plan, and they have to approve it, we then  
6 conduct the final surveys, any final remediation  
7 activities, the NRC comes in and inspects again and  
8 possibly even independently samples.

9 Now, at the end of that -- and that's  
10 important from a transparency and a clarity standpoint.  
11 With the waste storage situation today in this country,  
12 at the end of this period, San Onofre will be  
13 decommissioned, the physical plant will be removed,  
14 but -- and the license will be terminated, but it will  
15 be reduced and there will be a dry fuel storage  
16 installation remaining covered by the reduced NRC part  
17 50 License.

18 So at the end of that period, that's what the  
19 end-state looks like for the foreseeable future until  
20 we deal with the issue of where waste can move off the  
21 San Onofre site.

22 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: And can I just clarify? That's  
23 life, there is no room for varying that?

24 MR. PALMISANO: Well, that's the situation we're  
25 faced with today. And, you know, the suggestion

1 earlier discussion, there will be more panel meetings  
2 and potentially workshops.

3 I think as we get to delve into the whole  
4 important question of spent fuel: "What is done with  
5 spent fuel and what is its ultimate disposition?"  
6 that's a topic we need to get into is, what's the  
7 situation today?

8 The reality today is it cannot be shipped off  
9 site, there is nowhere to ship it to. That doesn't  
10 mean it has to be the reality a 100 years from now.  
11 We -- this is one thing we, in this county, need to  
12 work on, it's taking action to find a way to deal with  
13 this and move this off site.

14 But as we complete a 20 year or so of  
15 decommissioning, that will be the end-state for dry  
16 fuel storage installation. I want to make sure we're  
17 clear that that's what the option is ahead us right  
18 now. Yes?

19 MR. BROWN: A question: It feels as if there is a  
20 tremendous amount of infrastructure that is in place at  
21 that site, power lines in both ways, and that at some  
22 point SCE may contemplate repurposing the site for some  
23 type of other power plant.

24 Again, I have -- I'm just asking the question:  
25 At what point during the decommission process would

1 that be allowed, or is there a point where that would  
2 be where if that was a decision to be made, we would be  
3 notified of that, of a repurpose use for the site and  
4 of -- of what the process would be going forward, and  
5 can that coexist with a dry fuel storage facility?

6 MR. PALMISANO: Well, let me answer first in  
7 general terms, in the NRC -- and I should -- should  
8 mention, the staff at San Onofre over the last eight  
9 months, we have benchmarked every currently active  
10 power reactor decommissioning site in this country,  
11 including Humboldt Bay in Northern California, Scion,  
12 North of Chicago, and number of ones that have been  
13 completed in the last decade.

14 Most sites, generally clean up to a release  
15 criteria and don't repurpose the site. Humboldt Bay  
16 has repurposed the site already and built fossil  
17 generation on the same site where they're  
18 decommissioning the nuclear plant.

19 If a licensee, in general, wanted to repurpose  
20 the site, we would need to describe that end-state  
21 differently than, say, release for unrestricted use and  
22 know what the use would be, so that's a general term.

23 So, right now certainly for Southern  
24 California Edison and the owners, the intent is to --  
25 to decommission, remediate the site and not repurpose

1 the site itself.

2           Okay. Should that change, we certainly would  
3 be very upfront on that, but right now that's not in  
4 our plans. The switchyard itself is a different  
5 question. The switchyard is a major interconnection  
6 point for our system in San Diego gas and electric;  
7 there may be a need for that switchyard or a relocated  
8 switchyard potentially again early in the decision  
9 making on something like that, but again, it's  
10 something we would share. So we need --

11           CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Larry, do you want to --

12           MR. PALMISANO: -- to separate to some extent,  
13 probably, the switchyard from the power plant itself.

14           MR. BROWN: I understand.

15           CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Larry and then William Parker.

16           MR. RANNALS: Good evening, everyone. My name is  
17 Larry Rannals. I'm here representing my boss tonight  
18 who is the Commanding General of Camp Pendleton,  
19 General John Bullard.

20                    Just to kind of tag onto Mr. Palmisano's  
21 comment and in response to the Mayor's question, once  
22 SONGS has decommissioned any reuse of that land that's  
23 currently there now where SONGS occupies, that's going  
24 to be a Department of the Navy decision.

25                    There's no guarantee there'll be another plant

1       there, there's no guarantee as to what may be there or  
2       how it may be reused, but it will strictly be a  
3       Department of Navy decision because the Department of  
4       the Navy owns that property.

5               As I think many of you probably are already  
6       aware, SONGS is there under an easement and a lease  
7       agreement and so forth. So as to what might be the  
8       future reuse of that site once decommissioning is  
9       completely done, who knows at this point. But the  
10      Department of the Navy will certainly have a say in it.

11      MR. PALMISANO: Thank you.

12      MR. THOMPSON: Thank you very much.

13      MR. PALMISANO: I've got slides at the end that  
14      talk about the lease and the easement to make that  
15      point, but thanks for bringing that up at this point.

16      CHAIRMAN VICTOR: I'm going to ask Bill Parker and  
17      then Gene Stone. And let me just remind panel -- not  
18      remind, ask panel members, for the benefit of our  
19      online audience, there are apparently millions and  
20      millions of people listening online, my Facebook page  
21      is a buzz. For the benefit of them, would you please  
22      introduce, you just mention your name before you speak.

23               Bill Parker and then Gene.

24      DR. PARKER: My question was answered.

25      CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Okay. Gene Stone.

1 MR. STONE: I have a couple of questions for Larry.  
2 Can you tell the public what the end radiation level by  
3 your contract with Southern California Edison will be?  
4 Have you made that clear? Are you to greenfield  
5 status?

6 MR. PARKER: Sir, I think the answer to that  
7 question is one that the NRC needs to address. That's  
8 completely out of my lane as to what the expected end  
9 radiation level would be. But I think --

10 MR. STONE: Because I think maybe -- Tom, is there  
11 an answer to that question? Did you tell me the other  
12 day that you have greenfield status in your contract?

13 MR. PALMISANO: No, no. We didn't discuss any  
14 language in the contract other than it's an easement  
15 dated from the 1960s. What the easement in general  
16 terms requires, and you'll see this on probably the  
17 second to last slide is, we are to remediate and return  
18 the site to a condition as specified by the Department  
19 of the Navy.

20 MR. STONE: Okay. So --

21 MR. PALMISANO: There's language in there about,  
22 you know, we're expected to remove any improvements  
23 unless otherwise directed by the Department of the  
24 Navy.

25 MR. STONE: So my other follow-up question on that

1 is, will -- will California Edison clean up to the  
2 degree that the Navy requires or the State of  
3 California?

4 MR. PALMISANO: We're going to clean up to the  
5 degree that the NRC decommissioning rule requires,  
6 which is, as you're well aware, 25 millirem exposure to  
7 the public, that'll be the starting point for the  
8 remed -- for the decommissioning planning.

9 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: We should probably let you  
10 continue on. Clearly, the questions surrounding what  
11 the site might look like at the end of this, although  
12 somewhere down the road, those questions are probably  
13 something that this panel wants to come back to at a --  
14 at a future meeting, as well.

15 Tom, do you want to continue?

16 MR. PALMISANO: Yes. And, please.

17 MR. ALPAY: If I may, I have one question. Can you  
18 hear me?

19 MR. PALMISANO: Yes.

20 MR. ALPAY: You mentioned something about --

21 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: And just --

22 MR. ALPAY: I'm sorry. John Alpay from Capistrano  
23 Unified. There was -- you mentioned briefly about the  
24 switching stations, so it's not clear to me as the  
25 access to the grid and the high-power transmission

1 lines, is that part of the decommissioning process or  
2 is that a tangential or something that's going to be set  
3 aside?

4 MR. THOMPSON: It's -- it's initially part of the  
5 process. We what to decide and propose what to do with  
6 it. And I'll show you a slide in a minute that shows  
7 you what we call the part-50 license area, which  
8 includes a switchyard.

9 So we need to include that in the  
10 decommissioning plan, whether it's remove, whether it  
11 stays as part of the planning process, and that's not  
12 an immediate decision. That realistically is probably  
13 driven by more of what the needs of the grids are --  
14 grid is in Southern California, different plants have  
15 done it different ways in the decommissioning  
16 scenarios.

17 MR. ALPAY: Okay. Thank you very much.

18 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you.

19 MR. PALMISANO: And it's no part of the nuclear  
20 part of the plant where there's any radiological issue  
21 to remediate.

22 MR. ALPAY: Correct.

23 MR. PALMISANO: So let me move on. So I've  
24 outlined the three phases in the NRC process. And, by  
25 the way, in the notebook we provided you and the

1 materials the public will have access to we have some  
2 photographs of some sites, such as Maine Yankee, Big  
3 Rock Point where I have some direct experience from my  
4 years back there, in terms of what some site have been  
5 remediated, including Rancho Seco, which did not  
6 remediate to a greenfield status compared to some other  
7 sites. So, they're useful pictures to look at for  
8 future points of discussion, I think.

9           Okay. Let me talk about a couple of documents  
10 here. I don't want to get too deep in a technical  
11 discussion tonight because there's going to be a lot  
12 more discussion overtime.

13           I've mentioned, though, the first one, the  
14 post-shutdown decommissioning activities report  
15 required to be filed within two years, about a 50-page  
16 document that outlines the plan for decommissioning,  
17 the cost, the environmental impact, spend fuel  
18 management.

19           We can make available some publicly filed  
20 documents by other utilities recently to show the panel  
21 examples; we may have provided some already.

22           The next important decommissioning document,  
23 and the first three are all decommissioning related.

24           Irradiated fuel management plan: For an  
25 operating plan, five years before your operating

1 license ends, you need to file a radiated fuel  
2 management plan. In our case, we now file it after  
3 we've ceased operating, since our decision was somewhat  
4 unexpected.

5 This is a plan that describes how spent fuel  
6 would be managed and funded over the life of its time  
7 on the site, so this has to be a specific document that  
8 the NRC actually reviews and writes a safety valuation  
9 on that will extend beyond the initial decommissioning  
10 and the initial removal of the plant to describe how  
11 spent fuel will be safely stored, managed until it's  
12 removed from the site by the Department of Energy.

13 MR. STONE: Tom, is there a plan that Edison has  
14 developed for mitigating problem with the dry cask, if  
15 there is an accident?

16 MR. THOMPSON: I think -- we're early in your  
17 planning process at this point and I think that's a  
18 question probably for a more detailed workshop to  
19 discuss how dry fuel is handled specially --

20 MR. STONE: So right now we don't?

21 MR. THOMPSON: We -- we complied with all the  
22 requirements for the current dry fuel storage system,  
23 and which includes the ability to take a cask in and  
24 unload it. Okay. "Decommissioning cost estimate," the  
25 third document, this is also required in the first two

1 years.

2 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Go ahead.

3 MR. BROWN: As you go through this, would you give  
4 us an idea of the -- of the time frame on these?

5 MR. PALMISANO: Sure. I've got a table that's  
6 going to tell you that, but just hold a second, let me  
7 get through the definition.

8 Decommissioning Cost Estimate:

9 So this now will be what's called a "site  
10 specific decommissioning cost estimate. To date, we do  
11 decommissioning cost estimate and every three years we  
12 file these with the state and they're designed for  
13 what's called funding assurance or funding adequacy, to  
14 make sure we're collecting enough money, the investment  
15 trust is growing so there is enough money to  
16 decommission when the time comes.

17 This cost estimate is much more detailed, much  
18 more specific and it's an actually more specific number  
19 of what is going to take for the actual decommissioning  
20 plan for San Onofre.

21 So these three documents are required in the  
22 first two years, so you'll see in a table when we  
23 intend to file them and we have until June of 2015.

24 These three documents are needed before we  
25 proceed from that first planning phase to the second

1 phase, so we cannot commence any major decommissioning  
2 activity, that means building, removal, or remediation  
3 until these three documents are complete and submitted  
4 to the NRC. They also restrict access to the funding  
5 by the NRC and, to some degree, we have to also file in  
6 a parallel path with the Public utilities Commission.

7 The next two documents are related to  
8 decommissioning, but they're not decommissioning  
9 documents specifically out of the decommissioning Req  
10 Guide.

11 The Defueled Emergency Plan: We have  
12 emergency plan for many years. What the NRC's guidance  
13 tells us is, now that the plants are defueled, there  
14 are many of the accidents that occur with fuel and the  
15 reactor, the reactor of power, that are no longer  
16 possible because we cannot fuel or operate the  
17 reactors, so we revised the emergency plan to recognize  
18 that accident scenario and recognize the responses that  
19 would be required. It's basically built around the  
20 response to spent fuel pool issues, dry fuel storage  
21 issues.

22 And the last one is a Defueled Technical  
23 Specifications: These are attached to our operating  
24 license. These -- we had this in place for many years  
25 for tech specs. We call them "technical

1 specifications." They provide the rules for what  
2 equipment has to be in service, what equipment has to  
3 be there to be redundant, how we have to test and  
4 maintain equipment.

5           Again, with the reactors defueled, most of the  
6 equipment on site has no purpose anymore, so we revised  
7 this and the NRC gives us guidance on how to revise  
8 this, including some draft guidelines to follow on how  
9 to write these. So those are related to  
10 decommissioning, but they're not three decommissioning  
11 specific documents.

12           So the question about time frame, as I told  
13 you, the first three we have until June of 2015. We're  
14 certainly not going to take that long. So what I've  
15 done on this table, the first three are these three  
16 decommissioning specific documents.

17           Our target date to complete and submit them to  
18 the NRC is third quarter of 2014. And what I've put on  
19 the last column it's important that the Community  
20 Engagement Panel provide us feedback on these, so as  
21 the drafts are ready, we'll work with Chairman Victor  
22 on the appropriate way to get them to the panel to get  
23 panel input, to come explain them to you, whether it's  
24 a workshop or a meeting, but this is an important part  
25 of the transparency.

1           CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Let me just add that some members  
2 of the panel spent a lot of time focusing on these  
3 regulatory issues, so if all these acronyms are dancing  
4 in your head during your dreams, most of us don't, and  
5 I know this stuff can be complicated, I have committed  
6 to working with the co-owners as these drafts are put  
7 together to generating cover memos or other mechanisms  
8 so we can cut through the complicated parts of this and  
9 really focus the panel in on the parts where feedback  
10 would be really, really helpful because I think some of  
11 these documents, even the briefer ones, can be kind of  
12 daunting, and it's crucial that we'd be able to focus  
13 on what really matters here.

14           MR. PARKER: If I read this schedule right, you've  
15 got to submit these documents or anticipate submitting  
16 these documents in six months.

17           MR. PALMISANO: That's correct.

18           MR. PARKER: And to get meaningful feedback from  
19 the community, from this panel, in a six-month period  
20 on some rather technical admittedly high-level planning  
21 documents, you've got to have a pretty aggressive  
22 schedule meetings and opportunities to comment and so  
23 on.

24                     If you wait three or four months to show us  
25 the first draft is too late for meaningful feedback, so

1 I would hope you would have something approaching a  
2 final document within a month or two.

3 MR. PALMISANO: In most cases, we will. Okay? But  
4 let me, first of all, say, you know, this is the first  
5 panel meeting. We're committed to transparency and  
6 we're committed to listening, so we want to make sure  
7 we understand.

8 These are target dates that I drive my staff  
9 to internally. We'll meet the June 15 date, we'll meet  
10 that with some margin -- what's important, it's taking  
11 the time with the panel. So it's not going to go out  
12 the door until we're satisfied that we've had the right  
13 feedback.

14 MR. PARKER: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: And I think, if we as a panel see  
16 some things where we think there's something very  
17 important material that we want to help with, then we  
18 ought to work with the co-owners to slow down that  
19 particular document, you know, within reason.

20 And we can't slow everything down because that  
21 means that there is less money left over to go back to  
22 ratepayers and other consequences for the community,  
23 but we have to figure out what timetables are  
24 reasonable.

25 MR. PALMISANO: And I appreciate that. The last

1 two documents you'll see the first quarter of 2014,  
2 both of these require prior review and approval by the  
3 NRC before we implement them and that starts a 12-month  
4 review process, which includes public comment periods,  
5 opportunities for hearing.

6 They are licensed amendments. Some of you are  
7 familiar with that process. That's a very well defined  
8 with designed public comment, public notice periods.

9 So the bottom one I've already approved and  
10 sent in because that starts the 12-month process.  
11 We'll provide that to the panel. This is a pretty  
12 straightforward document with pretty clear guidance  
13 from the NRC, and it's not decommissioning specific,  
14 per se, so that's what I'm providing for awareness as  
15 opposed to feedback.

16 I'll certainly take any feedback because we  
17 have plenty of time. The NRC will ask us questions and  
18 we'll modify our submittal over the next 12 months. So  
19 if there are pertinent comments, there's an  
20 opportunity.

21 The same thing with the defueling emergency  
22 plan, it starts a 12-month period for review and  
23 approval by the NRC, including public comment and  
24 opportunities to request hearings.

25 So again, I'm probably within a week of

1 approving and sending that in to start the 12-month  
2 process and, again, provided for awareness. If there  
3 is any comments, we'll be glad to discuss them and  
4 listen to them, but I need to get that process started  
5 with the NRC.

6 So let me move on. So let me show you what a  
7 roughly a 20-year or less timelines looks like. It may  
8 be a bit hard to see. Again, you'll get to see this  
9 online. Since my pointer is not very good, I'm going  
10 to try to narrate. Those of you on the panel have this  
11 in front of you.

12 The time scale is a little funny. If you see  
13 the big bold line of January 2016, think of that  
14 roughly as the end of that first two, two and a half  
15 year planning period. It's a little longer than  
16 January 2015, but all the activities in the front-end  
17 of this, the two year, the physical plan changes.

18 I'm not talking dry fuel storage on this line,  
19 we're talking about the activities to finish draining  
20 systems depressurizing systems, all the things we need  
21 to do now that the plant will never operate again.

22 We drain acid and caustic things, things we  
23 needed while the plant was in service. Our decision,  
24 from a safety standpoint is, get that material off, so  
25 we're well along in draining those types of systems,

1 reducing the hazards, we've drained oil out of  
2 equipment, so there's no fire hazard, so that's what  
3 the implement physical plan changes it.

4 That also will include by January 2016,  
5 there's a term in the industry that EPRI, the Electric  
6 Power Research Institute, uses is called "cold and  
7 dark." So those of you who have seen the plant,  
8 picture that big plant empty, drained, depressurized,  
9 the power is off, except for the spent fuel pool, which  
10 is protected separately, and the plant is ready for the  
11 start of the major deco -- dismantling phase.

12 So that's at the end of that two-year period.  
13 You just see it roughly ending the second quarter of  
14 2015. My goal for the staff by 2016 we'll be there and  
15 ready for the start of the next phase.

16 The licensing submittals, those are the defuel  
17 tech specs and defuel emergency plan. I'm obligated to  
18 continue to change my licensing basis as I shut the  
19 plant down and drain the plant and take equipment out  
20 of service, I've got to keep what's called the  
21 licensing basis up to date, so submittal is a part of  
22 that, reflecting our permanently defueled status never  
23 to operate again. So that's what "licensing  
24 submittals" are.

25 The next thing you see, and that's -- those

1 both take 12 months review and approval by the NRC  
2 before I can implement. Then you see the three  
3 decommissioning submittals that are needed before we're  
4 authorized to access the decommissioning fund and  
5 authorize the start the major decommissioning  
6 activities.

7 The next section is one that I think it's  
8 going to be very important to the panel and the public,  
9 not that the rest isn't, but this is probably one of  
10 the keys in the near term, is dry fuel storage.

11 I'm going to show you a slide in a minute that  
12 explains how much fuel we have and where the fuel it's  
13 stored. We need to expand our dry fuel storage. As we  
14 look at the -- as we look at the next 20 years or so,  
15 the fuel is not going to be able to be moved off site,  
16 so we need to make sure we're storing it safely, we're  
17 monitoring it safely, and at this point we're planning  
18 to move it out of the fuel pools and into dry fuel  
19 storage.

20 So what that series of activities is, it's  
21 expanding the dry fuel storage capability, purchasing  
22 additional canisters and then ultimately offloading the  
23 pool. If I started roughly in mid-2014, it would be  
24 about -- at the end of 2019 before I have all the fuel  
25 out of the pools and into dry cask storage, give you a

1 feel for the kind of timeline we're talking about here.

2 So this is one, I think, for an early  
3 discussing in a workshop is to what the fuel situation  
4 is.

5 MR. STONE: Does that include the high burn-up  
6 fuel?

7 MR. PALMISANO: That includes the high burn-up  
8 fuel, you'll see that on a slide in a minute. So,  
9 then, if you run forward to January 2016, so roughly  
10 two years from now, we've completed all that.

11 We've reconfigured the plan, we've changed our  
12 licensing basis, we submitted all our decommissioning  
13 submittals, we have NRC approval, we have PUC access to  
14 the funds were poised for the start of the major  
15 dismantlement phase.

16 Now, there's a lot of other reviews we aren't  
17 talking about tonight, cost of commission, other state  
18 California permitting. We know we have to do all that.  
19 That is early in the second phase the more detail  
20 planning really takes place.

21 About a 10-year period to actually dismantle  
22 the plant, so it's 10 years a long time to take apart  
23 San Onofre a big two-unit plant? Well, here's what  
24 other benchmarks are showing us: Maine Yankee is  
25 probably the closest that is completed.

1           It's a moderately sized, single unit PWR.  
2       We're a dual unit, PWR, pressurized water reactor.  
3       We're about 1000 megawatts each. They have one unit  
4       about 850 to 900 megawatts, overall it took them about  
5       seven to eight years for the actually dismantlement,  
6       the middle phase, and they did it fairly aggressively  
7       and they did it probably as well as anybody in the  
8       industry and they completed about five or six years  
9       ago.

10           So a 10-year for a two-unit plan. We're  
11       larger, we're later designed, we're more complex, we  
12       have more equipment, that looks to be a reasonable time  
13       frame for us to achieve safely, as quickly as  
14       reasonably possible being good stewards of the trust  
15       fund.

16           Then towards the end of that, you'll see the  
17       start of the license termination phase, so two years  
18       before we're done, we file the formal plan with the NRC  
19       and this plan is being built overtime, which  
20       characterizes the radioactivity, characterizes what  
21       we've remediated, those are the final measurements we  
22       cleaned up to. The NRC formally reviews and approves  
23       that plan before we're done.

24           So at the completion of that, we complete the  
25       radiological decommissioning, we complete any

1 non-radiological decommissioning, warehouses that the  
2 NRC is not interested in, the switchyard, for example,  
3 et cetera.

4           And at the very end of that, again, we want to  
5 be clear, we want to be transparent. At the end of  
6 that our license goes through a termination process,  
7 but it's reduced and it will apply to a dry fuel  
8 storage facility. So at the end of that nominal  
9 20-year period is a dry fuel storage facility with the  
10 rest of the plant gone.

11           CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Can I just -- Tom, clearly the  
12 plan is going to be interested in looking at issues  
13 surrounding dry fuel storage, the options there, and so  
14 on, how big is this total facility going to be and so  
15 on, and that's important.

16           It seems to me that at some point we, as a  
17 panel, also ought to look closely at the  
18 decontamination and dismantlement process. How quickly  
19 could that be accelerated? What would that cost, maybe  
20 it would actually cost less? What are the issues for  
21 the local community surrounding noise, dust,  
22 transporting the materials?

23           And so I'm not proposing we have a detailed  
24 discussion about that right now, but I am concerned  
25 that we not get so focused on the -- the kind of sexy

1 parts of this, if that term makes any sense, that we'd  
2 lose sight of the kind of more mundane, but in some  
3 sense, the work that's going to be visible and audible  
4 in the community to some degree for a long time.

5 MR. PALMISANO: And we would welcome that, because  
6 as we balance safety first, but stewardship, the length  
7 of time, the pace we go, it relates very much to  
8 stewardship as well as safety.

9 What our benchmarking is showing us, the  
10 longer you take to do this, the more money it cost.  
11 And, you know, I don't -- I'm not an economist, but I  
12 don't need to be one to conclude that from our  
13 benchmark.

14 Other questions on this slide. This is really  
15 the first view we're giving you of what the overall  
16 schedule that our initial planning is showing us is  
17 feasible for San Onofre, so I want to make sure if the  
18 panel has questions. Yes, ma'am.

19 MS. BARTLETT: Hi. Lisa Bartlett, Mayor of Dana  
20 Point. A couple of questions: I know that you've got  
21 the spent fuel that will be put in a dry cask storage  
22 until it can be moved long term on a permanent basis,  
23 how long can it stay in a dry cask storage? Can it be  
24 indefinite before it becomes an issue?

25 MR. PALMISANO: This is a issue of current industry

1 discussion about how long. The dry cask storage  
2 systems that we use are licensed by the vendors and  
3 then we use it as part of our part-50 license.

4 They're initially licensed for 20 years. Our  
5 current system, the first round of renewals come up in  
6 2023; other sites in the county have already renewed  
7 their licenses through the work of their vendor.

8 So it's anticipated much like the reactors  
9 were originally licensed for 40 years, many places  
10 across the country have added an additional 20 years to  
11 that. It's anticipated we're going to go through  
12 several rounds of re-licensing the casks.

13 We'll put in place some maintenance programs,  
14 some inspection programs to allow to do that, there's  
15 also some research that has been done and will continue  
16 to assure the cask function safety, so we will face  
17 that re-licensing question.

18 So far there has been no significant issues  
19 re-licensing the cask themselves.

20 MS. BARTLETT: Okay.

21 MR. STONE: Tom, again, this is Gene Stone. Just  
22 to be clear on this point, the high burn-up fuel has  
23 not been licensed to be restored again. I think one of  
24 the companies it's coming up to 20 years and has asked  
25 for re-license, but the NRC is waiting for the DOD

1 study that's being done about storage of high burn-up  
2 fuels, so this is a big issue and still a question in  
3 the industry at this point.

4 MR. THOMPSON: Tell you what, Gene. I think in a  
5 workshop or in some other session we'll get some more  
6 facts, particularly out of the dry cask storage vendors  
7 and you'll get the full story on that.

8 MR. STONE: Okay.

9 MS. BARTLETT: And then, second question: You  
10 know, we're in earthquake country here.

11 MR. PALMISANO: Yes.

12 MS. BARTLETT: To what level can the dry cask  
13 storage withstand seismic activity before it becomes a  
14 public safety issue?

15 MR. PALMISANO: Oh, this dry cask system is  
16 designed and licensed to exceed the earthquake  
17 capability of the plant. So when we cited dry cask  
18 system, the vendor designs the dry cask system licenses  
19 before we can use it. The pad we build has to be  
20 suited for the local environment for San Onofre,  
21 including our earthquake spectrum, and the cask system  
22 has to be licensed to be capable of that or more, so  
23 these casks are designed to withstand earthquakes in  
24 this area as the power plant is.

25 MS. BARTLETT: Okay. And that withstand an 8.0

1 earthquake or can you elaborate on that?

2 MR. PALMISANO: I don't have a ready Richter  
3 reference to the G-acceleration fact, but we can get  
4 that to you as part of a panel question.

5 MS. BARTLETT: Okay. I think the community would  
6 like that information. Thank you.

7 MR. PALMISANO: We'll be glad to provide that.

8 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much.

9 Was there another questions down here?

10 MR. PARKER: The use for the design specifications,  
11 the accel -- ground level of accelerations to which  
12 these casks are designed, even saying that it's  
13 designed for an 8.0 Richter earthquake means nothing,  
14 it's how far away.

15 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

16 MR. PARKER: What you need is, what are the design  
17 specifications for on-site ground accelerations?

18 MR. PALMISANO: We have all that. We'll be glad to  
19 provide it as an answer to the panel, that can be made  
20 public.

21 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: And for the benefit of the  
22 transcription, that was Bill Parker. Let me -- who I  
23 will deputize to once we get the accelerations to help  
24 it turn those numbers into something that the rest of  
25 us can understand, distance from different kinds of

1 quakes, and ground movements and so on.

2 MR. PARKER: I'll be more careful what questions I  
3 ask in the future.

4 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: That was not a threat, that was  
5 just -- my high school physics is rusty.

6 MR. PALMISANO: Thank you. And we'll be glad to  
7 answer that.

8 MR. BROWN: I do -- I do have one question. Tim  
9 Brown, Mayor of San Clemente. You know, most  
10 construction projects that I'm involved are large scale  
11 infrastructure project aggressive timelines are always  
12 pushed out, it's almost inevitable in seeing  
13 complications, although this seems extremely well  
14 thought out.

15 As these timelines do push, if -- if, again,  
16 an unforeseen consequences occur, these timelines do  
17 push, is there any of these items as they're pushing  
18 back that you start pushing up against certain  
19 restrictions, deadlines, things where you can't push  
20 beyond, you'll be hurried in any safe phase?

21 And I just want to ensure that the whole  
22 process isn't -- you know, as we're looking to it that  
23 they'll never be a sense of emergency, what the safety  
24 would require, you know.

25 MR. PALMISANO: I would tell you from the benchmark

1 we've done and there's a small nuclear plant in  
2 Northern Michigan, Big Rock Point, which was  
3 decommissioned from '97 to 2007, I worked for that  
4 company for the first five years, and I was not  
5 stationed, but I was on their oversight board, so I'm  
6 very familiar with the early planning and start of  
7 something like that.

8           Typically, in this 20-year timeline there is  
9 not something specific that we would push up against.  
10 We're not a plan going into 30 years of safe store,  
11 which -- you know, which we with plants, like Kuwani  
12 and Crystal River are likely to do, that would maybe  
13 push the back end of the timeline.

14           But right now with what we see ahead of us,  
15 we'll pay attention to the schedule, but there is  
16 nothing that I would tell you "We've got to do this by  
17 then" or "If we don't comply with something, we're in  
18 trouble."

19           Now, we're early in the planning stages, so  
20 there will be much more detail planning. And just so  
21 we're not naive, this initial planning with the NRC is,  
22 you know, somewhat of a high level to get approval to  
23 start the more detail planning is done towards the end  
24 of this first two years as we select a decommissioning  
25 contractor potentially and really start doing the more

1 detailed deconstruction planning.

2 So we'll be asking that questions regularly.

3 And, again, back to our principles, and this where

4 they're important is, we look at safety, stewardship,

5 and engagement. We need to be continually talking to

6 you about where we are, what it means in terms of

7 progress, cost, safety, deadlines.

8 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: And I think, Tom, the larger  
9 point here from Mayor Brown's question is, we really  
10 ought to, as a panel, understand where the timelines  
11 stretch out and where they could be compressed --

12 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

13 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: -- without compromising safety  
14 because it seems to me that basically the cost of doing  
15 big engineering projects is rising more rapidly than  
16 the value of the money in the trust fund.

17 And so all else equal, getting things done  
18 faster but still done safely would seem to be better  
19 than getting things done slowly, and maybe there are  
20 decisions that we'll give you advise on that could have  
21 a big impact on slowing or speeding up the -- the  
22 timetable. I think for us to understand that, how  
23 those decisions can affect the lines on this chart here  
24 would be very helpful.

25 MR. THOMPSON: Very good. And we look forward to

1 that discussion.

2 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Jim Leach.

3 MR. LEACH: Yes, just clarify for me, the duration  
4 of a facility holding a fuel -- a spent fuel storage  
5 facility on this site entirely dependant upon the  
6 politics of finding a disposal site elsewhere.

7 MR. PALMISANO: Yes, it is.

8 MR. LEACH: Okay.

9 MR. PALMISANO: Okay. I'm going to move on.

10 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Do you want to ask --

11 MR. PALMISANO: Please.

12 MR. HORN: Supervisor Horn, from San Diego. I'm  
13 also the chairman of the North County Transit District.  
14 My trains pass in front of your plant. Where do you  
15 plan to expand this dry fuel storage? Where -- where  
16 to look at -- I'm more specifically concerned about  
17 location to my tracks.

18 MR. PALMISANO: Right. I understand. And I'll  
19 touch on that a little bit tonight, but we haven't made  
20 any final decisions there. One of the things we would  
21 like to talk to the panel on is what the options are in  
22 terms of where we expand. Do we expand the existing  
23 facility or do something different?

24 If you hold your question, I do have a site  
25 picture. It's not going to be clear enough probably,

1 but I'll be glad to show you afterwards where the  
2 current path is in relation to your tracks.

3 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Okay. We'll let you go on so we  
4 don't run out of time.

5 MR. PALMISANO: Okay. So, spent fuel storage,  
6 again, we want to be really clear on where we stand.  
7 The top left block or the left side is Current Status.

8 So, currently, we have two spent fuel pools,  
9 unit 2 and 3, total we have 2668 fuel assemblies in  
10 those two spent fuel pools, so that's what we have  
11 today. And there are some high -burn up assemblies.

12 Out of those 2668, approximately one-thousand  
13 -- not approximately, 1115 are, in fact, high burn-up  
14 assemblies. On the lower box, on the left, you see  
15 Existing Dry Fuel Storage Pad. So we have an existing  
16 pad, we have 50 canisters loaded with fuel, the unit 1  
17 fuel and some fuel for unit 2 and 3, so we have 1187  
18 fuel assemblies currently in dry fuel storage, and out  
19 of those, 8 are a high burn-up fuel assemblies. So  
20 that's the current situation; what's in the pool,  
21 what's in the dry fuel storage.

22 The center is the Future State, it's moving --  
23 emptying the spent fuel pools and putting those 2668  
24 assemblies in a dry fuel storage cask. It's  
25 approximately 100 canisters, based on if we had used,

1 say, a 32-assembly canister, 32 fuel assemblies in a  
2 canister, it would be approximately 100, in addition to  
3 the 100 -- to the 50 that are already in place.

4 So that would give us 150 loaded canisters  
5 when the pools are completely empty. So that's what  
6 the magnitude of the dry fuel storage facility would be  
7 in terms of number of canisters.

8 MR. PARKER: Bill Parker. Could you at some point  
9 provide radiological measures to the panel to say  
10 there's 1,000 canisters, if there's 1,000 canisters of  
11 dry concrete represents no issues; if it's billions of  
12 curies represents an entirely different issue. So I  
13 think we ought to be provided data about the --

14 MR. PALMISANO: Sure.

15 MR. PARKER: -- fuel storage in units that relate  
16 to the direct safety issues, such as the radiological  
17 natures.

18 MR. PALMISANO: We will -- we'll be glad to do  
19 that, give you roughly, you know, the curing content of  
20 each canister is what you're asking --

21 MR. PARKER: Yes.

22 MR. PALMISANO: -- about, what the radiological  
23 hazards that would portray.

24 MR. PARKER: That's correct.

25 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: We should also, in that same

1 spirit, let's -- I don't know if anybody has a field of  
2 canisters that's large as this, it would then have to  
3 be, because every in the industry right now faces this  
4 problem that fuel is in pools and it's going to dry  
5 cask, but maybe we can also get some information about  
6 what the measurements are outside the cask just to help  
7 people understand.

8 MR. PALMISANO: In terms of radiation measurements?

9 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Yes.

10 MR. PALMISANO: Certainly we can do that. And what  
11 we can do, for the sites that have completed  
12 decommissioning, that are fully off-loaded, we can find  
13 out how many canisters.

14 And I realize, you know, to date we'll be the  
15 largest power reactor site to decommission, two large  
16 units, so we'll be on the larger side of that, but we  
17 can certainly get data on Maine Yankee, we can get the  
18 numbers out of Scion, which are two similar size units  
19 that operated almost as long as we did.

20 So the key thing in the Future State, with all  
21 the fuel on the pad, the current pad will not hold 150  
22 canisters, so either the current pad has to be enlarged  
23 on the order of two and a half to three times, or a  
24 second pad would have to be built.

25 We haven't made that decision yet and we're

1 evaluating the options and that's when we want to  
2 engage the panel on, talking about what the options  
3 are, what the trade-offs are, what the pros and cons  
4 are. So that is one that's on our list early on to  
5 engage the panel on and one reason I wanted to lay this  
6 out this clearly on the slide, so I appreciate the  
7 comments and we can easily answer the questions in  
8 terms of curing content, give you some relative  
9 radiation numbers and compare as to other decommission  
10 sites.

11           Okay. I just want to show you some pictures,  
12 specially many of you have never seen what we're  
13 talking about with spent fuel. I talked about 2,668  
14 assemblies in the pool. The picture on the left shows  
15 you one of those assemblies being withdrawn. And this  
16 is a picture of one of our spent fuel pools, so this is  
17 an assembly being lifted out of spent fuel storage RAC  
18 location. It's handled under water.

19           This assembly, in our current cask, holds 24  
20 fuel assemblies. The vendors today are building casks  
21 that hold 32 to 37 typically. But one of those  
22 assemblies is put into a steel canister, loaded, in our  
23 case, with 24 assemblies, a shield lid is put on, a  
24 structural lid is put on, and welded, it's evacuated,  
25 filled with helium.

1           And then what you see on the right is being  
2 moved out to the storage pad. You don't actually see  
3 the cask there, what you see is called "the transport  
4 cask. So the steel canister is inside of that; that  
5 gives it both physical protection and radiation  
6 shielding for our workers to move one canister out to  
7 the pad.

8           The next slide, these are pictures of  
9 San Onofre. On the left, we use a horizontal storage  
10 system. You see that transport canister being mated up  
11 to the concrete storage module; the concrete module  
12 provide protection, it provides radiation shielding, so  
13 when that is mated up, we use a ram to push the seal  
14 steel canister into the concrete module.

15           We drive that transport cask -- cask away,  
16 that transport cask away, and then we put a big  
17 concrete shield plug there and close up the module.  
18 And on the right you see the current 50 modules that  
19 have spent fuel stored in.

20           So that's what the physical -- and that's the  
21 actual pad in San Onofre today. You can see we have  
22 room to add some additional canisters, but no room to  
23 add 100 additional canisters.

24           Okay. I am going to move on. So now we've  
25 talked about spent fuel, we've had some great questions

1 and comments and clearly some things were talked about  
2 quite a bit in depth.

3 I'm going to shift a bit and talk about the  
4 decommissioning trust. We've had some questions over  
5 the last 60 months or so about the decommissioning  
6 trust in general.

7 So, a couple of key points: We've already  
8 talked about the value of the trust. No. 1, the  
9 decommissioning trust is overseen by a 5-member  
10 committee: Two internal to our company and three  
11 external nominated by management but confirmed by our  
12 board and approved by the Public Utility Commission.

13 So this -- his has some strong, independent  
14 oversight, responsible for really managing the trust,  
15 approving asset allocations, monitoring the performance  
16 of the investment manager, et cetera.

17 On the regulatory oversight, when it comes  
18 time to spend the money, so the Public Utility  
19 Commission and the NRC have monitored the growth of the  
20 fund and the contribution of the funds and we have to  
21 assure it's been managed and growing adequately.

22 So before we can withdraw from the fund, a  
23 couple of things have to happen: One, with the Public  
24 Utility Commission, we file a request for interim  
25 access. We filed that in November 2013. We provided

1 that to the panel. It's called an "advise letter."

2 And when we complete the site specific  
3 decommissioning cost estimate later this year, we will  
4 file that and that will start a proceeding with the  
5 Public Utility Commission for full -- full fund access.

6 Separately, the NRC regulates really two  
7 pieces of the fund: Officially, they regulate one,  
8 which is money they call for radiological  
9 decommissioning. So picture this 3.9 billion fund,  
10 there's three parts to it: One for radiological  
11 decommission and that's to dismantle and remediate the  
12 radiological portion of the plant.

13 The second piece is for ongoing spent fuel  
14 management, that's a radiated fuel management plan I  
15 talked about where we show funding assurance and that's  
16 part of the fund.

17 And the third piece would be, we would call  
18 non-radiological decommission: This is cleaning up the  
19 rest of the facility. This might be the switchyard,  
20 for example. Certainly, the warehouse is the office  
21 building.

22 Parts of the plant that are on the NRC license  
23 area, but not radiological and that is really under the  
24 purview of the Public Utilities Commission.

25 Now, the entire -- entire fund and access to

1 the fund is normally controlled by the Public Utility  
2 Commission and the NRC understands that. One the NRC  
3 is satisfied with their portions of the fund, they step  
4 back and the PUC manages the fund. We report to both  
5 entities however as we go through the process.

6 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Can I just clarify, this slide is  
7 basically to help us understand what's going on, but  
8 all of those committees are doing what they're doing.

9 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

10 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: And there is really nothing for  
11 us to do where we could be helpful is in particular on  
12 this cost estimate, which we're going to see a draft of  
13 soon. Because, it seems that there are important  
14 decisions that are then going to go into the cost  
15 estimate that relate to the speed at which the plant is  
16 decommissioned and a variety of other choices.

17 It seems like that's an area where the panel  
18 could be a particular value. Is that, more or less,  
19 the correct summary?

20 MR. PALMISANO: That is a good summary. We wanted  
21 to make sure we just baseline everybody on the fund,  
22 how the fund is managed and overseen and we haven't  
23 gotten into a lot of deal how we access it.

24 But really from the CEP standpoint, this is  
25 background information understand as we go forward and

1 we start to propose drawing from the fund, how some of  
2 the decisions we make and your influence may affect the  
3 fund.

4 MR. THOMPSON: Let me clarify one point.

5 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Chris Thompson.

6 MR. THOMPSON: There are multiple funds, Southern  
7 California Edison has funds established, SDTNE has its  
8 own funds, both of those are governed by the PUC and  
9 will be accessed through this advise letter process  
10 that Tom outlined. The cities Riverside and Anaheim,  
11 which were at one point -- one is an owner and one was,  
12 had their own funds that are not governed by the PUC,  
13 just for clarity's sake.

14 MR. PALMISANO: Yes. Thank you, Chris. I kind of  
15 kept the answer in a more general level, but, yeah,  
16 there is actually four owners that have decommissioning  
17 liability and responsibility.

18 Okay. We talked earlier a bit about we got  
19 into some of the end use of the land and the fact that  
20 San Onofre and its sporting facilities are, in fact, on  
21 Navy land.

22 So there is really two pieces to this: We  
23 have lease land and we have an easement. So, what I've  
24 shown on the slide here in blue, there are a number --  
25 they're five parcels that we actually lease from Navy

1 and the area in red is the easement and area in red is  
2 where the actual power plant and where the spent fuel  
3 is.

4 So on the east side of the highway there is an  
5 area we call "The Mesa." This is all not radiological,  
6 this is where our warehouse is, our training center,  
7 some of our auxiliary buildings, you know, that support  
8 the plant, but they're not associated with any  
9 radiological aspect of the plant.

10 So those parcels were working with the Navy to  
11 kind of define the terms in which we'll turn those back  
12 to the Navy and terminate that part of the lease. On  
13 the west side of the highway, the two blue parcels  
14 we're interested in continuing to use as part of our  
15 decommissioning.

16 This is a fairly small footprint for a site  
17 with major decommissioning. We're going to need space,  
18 so those parcels are somewhat ideally place to allow us  
19 to bring equipment in to stage material going out, so  
20 we're -- we know we need to discuss that with the Navy  
21 as we go forward in terms of those two parcels.

22 Now, the easement itself, this kind of the  
23 gets to some of the questions about end use of the land  
24 particularly, so the easement was established in the  
25 early 60s. There 85 acres. The terms of the easement

1 run through 2023, which is today the license life for  
2 the plant had it continued to operate. There is  
3 nothing magic about that, but that's -- that's where  
4 the easement would expire.

5 So we're discussing -- we're in early  
6 discussions with the Navy about both the leases and the  
7 land on the easement. Clearly, we're going to be on  
8 the land with the easement well beyond 2013. The Navy  
9 understands that.

10 The decommissioning process alone, as I laid  
11 out, is on the order of 20 years or less. It's going  
12 to take us well beyond that. So as part of that, we  
13 need to discuss that with the Navy, clarify that, and  
14 the terms of the easement would have us decommission  
15 the plan under the NRC rules, but to an end state  
16 determined ultimately by the Navy at this point under  
17 the terms of the easement.

18 So when you talk about new future use of the  
19 land, it'll start with the Navy, who owns the lands,  
20 who is our landlord, and then we'll go from there. So  
21 that's a situation with respect to the land and the  
22 easement.

23 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Supervisor Horn, do you have a  
24 question?

25 MR. HORN: Yeah, I have a number of questions.

1 supervisor Bill Horn for San Diego County. I sold off  
2 my trash system some many years ago and I had to put  
3 away a trust fund for 100 million dollars to cover  
4 any -- any liability later, which did surface later.

5 I think the concern I have, specially for the  
6 railroad and public safety, suppose this dry storage  
7 that you have here, and I'm assuming that it's safe, I  
8 don't know that it's safe because you currently have it  
9 in wet storage, has anybody ever dry stored this stuff  
10 before?

11 MR. PALMISANO: Oh, yes. In fact, we are dry  
12 storing fuel today.

13 MR. HORN: Okay. What is --

14 MR. PALMISANO: And we've it done for a number of  
15 years.

16 MR. HORN: -- the life of these containers?

17 MR. PALMISANO: As I said in the earlier question,  
18 currently they're licensed for 20 years. You know, we  
19 and the vendor, who licenses them, anticipate they'll  
20 be re-licensed probably several times for longer  
21 periods of time. That's already been done across the  
22 country for some license camps.

23 MR. HORN: Okay. Is there any deterioration to the  
24 concrete structure with this stuff in it?

25 MR. THOMPSON: Not -- not due to this stuff in it.

1 The concrete structure has to be monitored just for  
2 environmental effects, you know, certainly a salt water  
3 environment on the coast, that has to be monitored and  
4 that's part of our responsibility under the license, to  
5 continue to use the dry fuel storage systems.

6 MR. HORN: I'm going to -- I mean, I'd love to see  
7 you move this stuff to Searchlight, Nevada and give it  
8 back to Mr. Reid, but I'm concerned that it will never  
9 be moved.

10 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Very good. We'll let you do  
11 it.

12 MR. HORN: I'm really concerned what kind of life,  
13 you know, how permanent the structure is, because I  
14 think that's what you're going to have to build,  
15 because I just don't see it being moved out of here.

16 MR. PALMISANO: And I appreciate that concern. We  
17 appreciate that concern. That's one reason, I think,  
18 as we get into a deeper discussion of spent fuel and  
19 the current storage technology, capability, and what  
20 the future holds, we need to have a robust discussion  
21 with the panel.

22 MR. HORN: Okay. We --

23 MR. PALMISANO: So we know that's an issue.

24 MR. HORN: You have the conduit here of I-5, which  
25 is a huge, major connection for San Diego and for

1 Orange County and I have the railroad, which I'm  
2 concerned about specifically, but I want to make sure  
3 that this stuff is far enough away from the public and  
4 totally safe enough that it doesn't affect anybody  
5 40-50 years from now; that's my main concern.

6 MR. PALMISANO: I appreciate that.

7 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Mayor Brown, did you want the  
8 floor? Then Dan Stetson.

9 MR. BROWN: I did, I had a question. I'm Mayor  
10 Brown from City of San Clement. So you have a lease  
11 and an easement here and it sounds as if the terms of  
12 the easement extends to 2023 as to the terms of the  
13 lease.

14 I'm just curious because I know that these can  
15 be contentious negotiations. Is there not an extension  
16 that was built in for the decommissioning of the plan  
17 in case the license was not extended?

18 MR. THOMPSON: I'm not an expert in the real estate  
19 terms or the easement terms, I'm not aware of an  
20 extension, but let us take that and we'll answer that  
21 for you. Now, my understanding is, we have to  
22 negotiate the extension with the Navy. There's not an  
23 automatic extension built in that I'm aware of.

24 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: I think also, Tom, when the time  
25 comes, to help us understand how quickly the land east

1 to the 5 can revert back to the Navy would be helpful.

2 Dan Stetson?

3 MR. STETSON: Sure. At any of the other facilities  
4 across the country that are storing these units have  
5 there been any cases where they have problems with  
6 leakage at any of those?

7 MR. THOMPSON: I'm not aware of any cask -- loaded  
8 casks that have leaked.

9 MR. STETSON: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Gene Stone.

11 MR. STONE: Well, I have to points here: One, just  
12 for our Marine Corps here the Navy and the leaseholder  
13 here, it needs to be stated that while the NRC  
14 regulates the 25 service the clean up, the lessee or  
15 the state can actually make them clean up better than  
16 that, and in three states that has already been done  
17 all the way down to 10. So why you demand as a clean  
18 up will help all of our communities and not just Marine  
19 Corps Camp Pendleton and the Navy.

20 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Larry -- Larry Rannals, do you  
21 want to comment on that?

22 MR. RANNALS: Yes, Larry Rannals from Camp  
23 Pendleton. Actually, I think what the lease agreement  
24 calls for is it says that Southern California Edison  
25 will return the area to its original condition that it

1 was in prior to the plant being constructed.

2 Now, the NRC is going to determine whether or  
3 not it meets the radiological requirements, that's  
4 their call, not the department of the Navy.

5 MR. STONE: That's what I'm saying, though, it is  
6 your call. You, as the lessee, will be able to tell  
7 California Edison to clean up further than that because  
8 it has been done.

9 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Let me just jump in on this. It  
10 sounds to me that this panel should have a discussion,  
11 maybe it's a workshop, maybe it's part of a whole  
12 meeting, once we clear the immediate need to help the  
13 co-owners with these urgent regulatory filings.

14 We need to have a discussion about are  
15 feasible end-states, what things cost, what people  
16 want, you know, with our eyes open as to all the  
17 different options, I think an exchange would be helpful  
18 in that regard.

19 Mayor Brown?

20 MR. BROWN: Just so I can make sure the members of  
21 the public here understand and the clarify exactly  
22 where we stand, how long have we been using dry cask  
23 storage in San Onofre nuclear generating station?

24 MR. PALMISANO: Let me ask one of my longer terms  
25 staff. Jim, when did we start loading casks? '99?

1 Yeah, roughly 1999.

2 MR. BROWN: Have we had any incidents, leakage,  
3 challenges, anything that has come because of the dry  
4 cask storage?

5 MR. PALMISANO: We've had no leakage of the dry  
6 casks.

7 MR. BROWN: Okay. Thank you.

8 MR. STONE: And when did you first start storing  
9 high burn-up fuel in dry cask?

10 MR. PALMISANO: There is only eight assemblies  
11 stored and I don't have the specific dates, Gene, when  
12 those eight went in. We can provide that.

13 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Okay. We should let you continue  
14 with the -- I think we still have one more slide. Yes?  
15 Please. Val -- Val Macedo.

16 MR. MACEDO: I think it would be fruitful if we can  
17 get the specifications on, not only the concrete  
18 structures that hold these spent fuel rods, but also  
19 the stainless steel product that's inside of it.

20 MR. THOMPSON: We certainly can, the specifications  
21 for the canisters as well as the concrete over pack.

22 MR. MACEDO: I think that would be great.

23 MR. PALMISANO: I'll be glad to do that.

24 So I just want to close, you know, back to our  
25 principles, we're using these to guide what we do,

1 safety, stewardship, and engagement. We're at the  
2 start of the end of San Onofre, you know, the plant is  
3 no longer and operate again, those issues are behind  
4 us. Now we need to look forward.

5 As Chairman Victor's laid out about how we go  
6 forward with a safe decommissioning, timely  
7 decommissioning, a cost effective decommissioning, and  
8 managing spent fuel safely.

9 So that's what's building the staff for  
10 Southern California Edison and the other owners. I  
11 really appreciate the opportunity. We've fitted this  
12 for an our, we've done pretty well answering questions.

13 It was meant to be a high-level overview to  
14 get everybody baseline and get some of your initial  
15 questions answered. I know you have more detailed  
16 questions. We are looking forward in the right forum  
17 to discussing that further. So, thank you very much,  
18 Chairman.

19 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much. Let me just  
20 see if there are any other -- Tom, I think that was  
21 just exceptionally valuable. Thank you.

22 Are there any other urgent questions from  
23 the --

24 MR. HORN: I have one more question.

25 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Please go ahead.

1 MR. HORN: So do I understand and the partners --  
2 San Diego gas, electric, and Edison, they're on the  
3 hook until this land is returned back to its natural  
4 state, so as long as those concrete canisters are,  
5 they're responsible to pay for their maintenance or  
6 whatever that might be for that facility?

7 MR. PALMISANO: That's basically how the NRC rule  
8 works.

9 MR. HORN: All right. But if they don't move them  
10 out of here, it could be 100 years.

11 MR. PALMISANO: The owners -- the owners are  
12 responsible for the spent fuel storage until the  
13 Department of Energy takes title to the fuel.

14 MR. HORN: All right. So help you God.

15 MR. STONE: I have to state also that the NRC has  
16 made every nuclear power plant in America a nuclear  
17 waste dump for 299 years, so that is their latest  
18 output. I don't remember, just a few days ago, their  
19 latest statement on -- because there is no repository,  
20 so every nuclear power plant, including San Onofre, is  
21 a nuclear waste dump until this issue is resolved.

22 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Let me interview here on this  
23 these. These -- these are very, very important  
24 questions. I think we need to have a workshop on this  
25 issue along with the fuel storage questions on the

1 casks.

2 We -- also, probably, that workshop would  
3 benefit from some information about what the industry  
4 through key firms that have owned a lot of reactors and  
5 the Edison Electric Institute, just one of the  
6 analytical and lobbying arms in the industry.

7 What people are doing in terms of the various  
8 options, because it's hard to predict what Congress is  
9 going to do in 6 months, 100 years is even harder,  
10 although maybe with the current congress, the  
11 prediction of nothing is a safe one.

12 We've got to have some sense of what some of  
13 the options are, what might be viable because that  
14 could really help this community. This site will not  
15 be the only one that after decommissioning process  
16 you've got this pad of fuel and it's -- it would be  
17 useful to have some strategy for non-operational  
18 reactors, maybe front line to be able to move the fuel  
19 off site, and I think we need to explore that option.  
20 I can not say we will convince Congress to do  
21 something, but we can look at this and help mobilize  
22 some action here.

23 We're going to move now to the next segment of  
24 our meeting. I want to see, do the panelist want to  
25 get up for three or four minutes and stretch your legs?

1 Yes. I see a lot heads nodding up, not anybody nodding  
2 off. We're going to take a three-to-five minute break  
3 just to stand up, stretch your legs, use the  
4 facilities, if you want to, and then we will reconvene  
5 in three to five minutes.

6 (A brief recess was taken.)

7 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: We have an hour already on the  
8 list of 30 people who would like to make comments. We  
9 have a timer that's going to count down for three  
10 minutes. If you're unhappy about three minutes, please  
11 bear with us, this would not be the only meeting of  
12 this panel.

13 And if you do not, for some reason, get to ask  
14 your question tonight, please send me an email or the  
15 co-owners who are managing this process an email, but  
16 copy me as well and we'll get you an answer.

17 There's a lot of people and a lot to be said,  
18 so I'm just going to go down the list as people signed  
19 up, first on the list is Donald Richie, then next Grace  
20 Thelo and Jennifer Massey, so if you could go ahead and  
21 already start to line up as I call ahead.

22 Donald Richie, you have the floor for three  
23 minutes. (Brief pause) We'll come back to Donald  
24 Richie. Grace?

25 MS. THELO: Good evening and thank you for all of

1 your volunteer service on this panel. The past  
2 decisions at San Onofre nuclear plant by Southern  
3 California Edison, San Diego Gas and Electronic,  
4 Sempra, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission regarding  
5 the defective steam generators have brought us to this  
6 very evening.

7 If you'll also look at [sanonofresafety.org](http://sanonofresafety.org) for  
8 the well referenced technical resources, we've learned  
9 that in less than 10 years some of the dry cask storing  
10 radioactive waste will have reached their approved safe  
11 life span.

12 If the fuel has deteriorated, becoming too  
13 dangerous to transport, it may remain on that site in  
14 an unstable, as well.

15 We'd request that Edison's Community  
16 Engagement Panel here schedule a first workshop to  
17 include independent nuclear experts who can recommend  
18 best practices in addressing the unknown of high  
19 burn-up fuel, safe storage of the waste with  
20 oversight by experts independent of SCE is an urgent,  
21 with our 8.4 million people across the Southland,  
22 dealing with freeway gridlock and vulnerable to the  
23 major predicted earthquake.

24 Just as Mr. Palmisano has said tonight, we'll  
25 have the largest amount of radioactive waste here. A

1 truly independent group, independent of the utilities,  
2 with experts in radioactive and high burn-up waste  
3 storage and transport, and independent accountant to  
4 audit and review the spending of the billions of  
5 dollars of ratepayer funds in the decommissioning fund  
6 need to place public safety ahead of stockholder  
7 profit. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you. Thank you very much.  
9 Please, can I ask -- people are going to make a lot of  
10 different kinds of comments and I really appreciate the  
11 applause around the comments, but maybe for the sake of  
12 getting the whole range of views out, we'll just hear  
13 the comments without additional support to the coin.

14 Thank you for that. But I can't acknowledge,  
15 but thanks. Jennifer Massey, also from San Clemente.

16 MS. MASSEY: Yes. Thank you all very much for your  
17 service. We're grateful. Yes. I, Jennifer Massey,  
18 have lived 5 miles from San Onofre for 33 years, and  
19 following our six key points to be addressed  
20 immediately. "Immediately" is the keyword here:

21 Number 1, we need for someone to pick a site  
22 in California far away from populated areas and  
23 transfer the waste that's already in casks immediately.  
24 Somewhere in the -- it has to be in California. We  
25 can't burden another state with this. This is our

1 stuff.

2 We've got to find a site somewhere out in the  
3 desert. Some people mentioned near a military  
4 installation, whatever, but some place, and we can do  
5 it. There is nothing stopping us. Let's get it done.  
6 We've got to get this stuff out of here.

7 Okay. Two, improve the safety at SONGS  
8 nuclear waste storage site for the waste which cannot  
9 yet be removed or so we're told. This would including  
10 building a 50-foot or higher tsunami wall. The waves  
11 at Fukushima were over that. The current one is 14  
12 feet at high tide. It won't do it. We need a higher  
13 tsunami wall.

14 We also need to create berms to divide up  
15 these nuclear fuel pools and we need to improve the  
16 storage of the spent fuel currently stored in open  
17 pools.

18 San Clemente -- Edison must provide the NRC  
19 and public a cask loading schedule and a relocation  
20 schedule. We have to know the schedule, what they're  
21 doing with all the spent fuel and when it can be moved.

22 We have to improve the security at San Onofre  
23 so there isn't a repeat of the recent shooter in Dana  
24 Point, escaping from police, that happened within the  
25 last month, I believe, to the SONGS area and he wasn't

1 discovered or apprehended for hours.

2 He was finally found 2:00 a.m. at the  
3 San Clemente State Park. And we also need to prevent  
4 wondering airplanes, like Malaysia air flight MH-370  
5 from flying into the plant. We also should consider  
6 scheduling a trial evacuation, so the public will  
7 understand the real challenges.

8 A nearly complete shutdown of the I-5  
9 March 20th, that's five days ago, for five hours  
10 because of a collision, it would be much worst in the  
11 event of a meltdown at SONGS.

12 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Just a few seconds.

13 MS. MASSEY: What I heard tonight about the  
14 decommissioning trust committee and Southern California  
15 Edison -- Edison's trust committee in line with CPUC,  
16 this is a gross conflict of interest. We must have an  
17 independent watchdog supervising our money.

18 Lastly, millions of life, their health, and  
19 wealth rest on your decisions. Please do what is best  
20 for the people depending on you.

21 And thank you very much.

22 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much. Sir, are  
23 you Donald Richie, by chance, who was waiting there?

24 Next we have Donna Gilmore and then Rachel  
25 Morgoe and then George Cook. And let me apologize in

1 advance if I do not pronounce your name correctly.

2 MS. GILMORE: Hi, my name is Donna Gilmore. I run  
3 the sanonofresafety.org website. I found the necessity  
4 to learn about nuclear power. When I learned that  
5 Edison was retaliating against employees for reporting  
6 safety problems to the NRC and then Edison has been  
7 cited by the NRC for mismanaging the steam -- steam  
8 generator project, so I don't have confidence that they  
9 can manage the waste.

10 So you probably all have a copy of this paper  
11 in front of you. These are some of the recommendations  
12 that we're making based on scientific and government  
13 data out there. The canning of the fuel assemblies is  
14 recommended for all fuel, which is actually a new  
15 recommendation.

16 Previously, we were focusing on high burn-up,  
17 but when you're talking about storing this fuel for  
18 literally hundreds of years, because I know people want  
19 it to go somewhere, but it's not going somewhere, so we  
20 need to make sure it's as safe as possible now.

21 And by canning it, we will have an extra layer  
22 of protection because the fuel is -- is breaking down  
23 the protective cladding, so that barrier is not going  
24 to be there. And also, by calculation, Edison is  
25 planning on using canisters that hold at least 32 fuel

1 assemblies versus the current 24 fuel assemblies and  
2 this is just going to increase our danger and it's a  
3 totally unnecessary risk.

4 I think it's very important that we focus on  
5 what's better for our safety rather than for the  
6 profits of Edison or -- anyway, I have -- there's a lot  
7 more details on here.

8 And if anyone finds an error on any of this  
9 information, I'm more than happy to correct it, and if  
10 anybody would like to meet independently, I'm more than  
11 happy to meet with you.

12 And in terms of saying that we have -- just  
13 because a dry cask has not failed, it doesn't mean that  
14 one isn't going to fail. I mean, Fukushima didn't fail  
15 the day before it failed. So that's not really a kind  
16 of analytical way of looking at things.

17 And the fuel that San Onofre is using is much  
18 more dangerous than the fuel that were originally used.  
19 The NRC will not approve dry cask storage for more than  
20 20 years or high burn-up fuel. There's been -- none of  
21 it that's approved. Perry Island is the first one and  
22 I've been watching the case on that and have details on  
23 that.

24 NRC will not approve transportation containers  
25 for high burn-up fuel because the cladding is becoming

1 brittle from the high burn-up fuel, which is subject to  
2 shattering, so if there was an accident, we could have  
3 a major radiation release from that, if anything  
4 breached the stainless steel container.

5 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much --

6 MS. GILMORE: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: -- for that comment. The paper  
8 to which you're referring is the San Clemente Green  
9 double-sided flyer that was handed out.

10 MS. GILMORE: Yes, it's a joint effort with a  
11 number of local organizations.

12 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Next is Richard Morgoe and then  
13 Dr. George Cook and then after that Daryl Gale.

14 MR. MORGOE: Good evening. My name is Richard  
15 Morgoe and I'm from Ramona, California, it's about an  
16 hour and 45-minute drive and about 45 miles away,  
17 within the 50-mile range, so I have concerns living  
18 down it.

19 I'd like to spend just a few moments giving  
20 you a little perspective of my understanding of the  
21 history of the spent fuel pools and potentially how  
22 that could play out in the future for the dry casks.  
23 The NRC and the nuclear industry players have  
24 incrementally moved their safety standards over the  
25 years.

1           As an example, in the 1960s and the 1970s the  
2 whole concept was that spent fuel pools would hold one  
3 reactor's worth of nuclear rods and that was it, and  
4 after they reloaded the reactor with a new set of rods,  
5 they would remove the set that was in the cooling pool  
6 before they refueled the next cycle, so there would  
7 only be one set of the reactors rod in the pool itself  
8 at anyone time.

9           That has since changed, the NRC has allowed  
10 them to put up to, I believe, 16 reactors worth of  
11 spent fuel in each one of the fuel pools, so that is  
12 made it -- so that's hugely more radioactive and much  
13 more of a problem than it was when it was initially  
14 designed and allowed to be put into place in the 1960s  
15 and 1070s.

16           The U.S. government did cause this problem,  
17 but they're also causing the problem with us needing to  
18 put it into dry casks. They're doing it again. This  
19 time their incremental safety increase is happening  
20 with this concept of the dry cask assemblies and how  
21 many are they going to hold.

22           I believe initially the design was for the dry  
23 cask assemblies to hold 24 or the dry casks would hold  
24 24 of these assemblies. And you've already in this  
25 meeting talked about the right casks holding 36, that's

1 your ground baseline.

2 All the ones that they have, I believe, that  
3 are currently being stored on San Onofre right now only  
4 hold 24, but they're already saying they can just hold  
5 36 because we want to get this thing as compact as  
6 possible and less -- less cost.

7 Well, that's putting cost over safety because  
8 they're putting a high concentration of the spent fuel  
9 rods into these small areas. So I think that it's  
10 important that we make sure that cost is put as a  
11 secondary and that these incremental changes that are  
12 happening of high burn-up fuel makes it even worst  
13 because what happens is the cladding that's holding  
14 these pallets together overtime gets degraded by this  
15 high burn-up fuel and then it falls apart in the cask  
16 and then they can't even get this stuff out.

17 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Okay. Thank you.

18 MR. MORGOE: So it's very disturbing.

19 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much.

20 MR. MORGOE: Keep an eye on these guys.

21 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Next is George -- George Cook and  
22 then Daryl Gale, after Daryl Gale is Marney Magda and  
23 then Michael Smith.

24 DR. COOK: I'm George Cook. How many of you in the  
25 front row up there have read this book, "Physics for

1 future presidents"? All right. I would suggest each  
2 one of you get one of these books and read the  
3 information on nuclear facts in here. It's very well  
4 written.

5 I'm a conservative. It was written by a  
6 Berkeley professor, but I really suggest you read it to  
7 separate the wheat from the chaff.

8 Well, the antinuclear environmental crowd is  
9 bludgeoning the Edison in the closing San Onofre. Now,  
10 where do we go from here? There is no such a thing as  
11 a free lunch. The 2 million dollar asset is going to  
12 take billions to dismantle.

13 The people that control nuclear energy in this  
14 state, the Public Utilities Commission blackmailed  
15 Edison by telling Edison they would not raise your  
16 electricity rate to fix the problem that they had, but  
17 they could raise your rates to end up dismantling the  
18 reactor system.

19 In this case, you're paying at least twice for  
20 the loss of power here in Southern California. Think  
21 of this the next time your utility bill goes up, you're  
22 paying for it. How are we going to get electricity  
23 into Southern California here? That's 2 megawatts of  
24 electricity that we've lost.

25 People are going to die in the desert because

1 we're not going to have enough electricity. Let's not  
2 kid ourselves. We will be a net importer of  
3 electricity. And I was at the University of New Mexico  
4 when the Four Corners Power Plant went in and some of  
5 the students there wanted to dynamite the power towers  
6 here in California. They're upset with us. So where  
7 do we go from here?

8 Don't complain folks when your electricity  
9 rates go up because that's what's exactly going to  
10 happen now that we've taken SONGS offline.

11 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Please, please respect his right,  
12 just as other respects other people's rights.

13 DR. COOK: How is Edison going to end up raising  
14 their money for capital to improve the power lines into  
15 this part of the state to rebuild the power plants that  
16 we need to replace SONGS? They're not going to be able  
17 to. Investors like me are no longer going to invest in  
18 Edison, so it's going to be expensive for Edison. And  
19 as I say, there isn't any such a thing as a free lunch,  
20 folks.

21 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much. Next on our  
22 list is Daryl Gale and then Marney Magda and Michael  
23 Smith.

24 MS. GALE: Thank you for letting me speak. I'm  
25 Daryl Gale and I came down here this morning on the

1 Amtrak because I'm very, very concerned about this  
2 issue. I'm very concerned about how all this waste is  
3 going to be stored, how it's going to be protected,  
4 handled, and transported.

5 Even though I live quite a while ways away,  
6 I'm very, very concerned. And the only way I can get  
7 home tonight is to take a cab to San Juan Capistrano,  
8 so I just want people to know that if there is an  
9 earthquake or another major highway problem, if you  
10 want to, you know, get out of here on Amtrak and the  
11 tracks are still intact, you'll have to get to either  
12 Oceanside or San Juan Capistrano.

13 But aside of that, it's very important that we  
14 have these workshops and I'm very pleased to be able to  
15 learn about the issues and I'm looking forward to  
16 learning more about it and coming to all the workshops  
17 I can by Amtrak or by bus or however I have to get down  
18 here, so thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much. Marney  
20 Magda and than Michael Smith and after that Christina  
21 Johnston.

22 MS. MAGDA: Thank you and thank you all for being  
23 here tonight. You, on my mind, are the guardians of  
24 the future of Southern California, you have taken on an  
25 incredible role. I've been involved since Fukushima,

1 studying at UCLA. I've attended ever nuclear  
2 regulatory commission on this, helping getting it shut  
3 down.

4 I'm terrified that I hear we have a 20-year  
5 plan here, that you were willing to leave the spent  
6 fuel where it is. I'm going to ask first, thank you,  
7 Larry Rannals for being here. Please, in that contract  
8 negotiation, demand greenfield; we want our marine safe  
9 from radiation, we want our children safe from  
10 radiation. We must demand that Edison leave it clean  
11 and you have the right to do that as the Navy; so,  
12 please do.

13 No. 2, the dry storage casks are wildly  
14 different. I have the nuclear Regulatory Commission  
15 pamphlet that say they can be certified for 40 years.  
16 We keep hearing 20, then we'll look at them again.

17 Obviously, there are very big deferences  
18 between some of the casks. And thank you, Val Macedo,  
19 for asking for what kind of stainless steel is in this,  
20 because you cannot accept somebody's bother's storage  
21 cask, it's got to be the best possible.

22 If you read the Blue Ribbon Commission Report,  
23 the president's January 2012 report in Idaho, the Navy  
24 must get all of its spent fuel out of Idaho at that  
25 site by two-thousand, I think, thirty-five. They're

1 putting it in what they call "Final deposit storage."

2 That's casks that are going somewhere by 2035  
3 or the Navy gets fined something like \$15,000 a day.  
4 So they will end up with 400 casks that have to go  
5 somewhere. That means it exists.

6 People know that it's going to happen. We  
7 can't let this and take the cheap way out and leave us  
8 with the problem in 20 years. I'm asking that the  
9 100-storage cask that you have right now that are not  
10 high burn-up, those could go immediately somewhere away  
11 from rising ride ocean, tsunami, terrorist possibility,  
12 and out of the population area, even if it were further  
13 into Camp Pendleton.

14 I would hope we find a military base somewhere  
15 in the desert away from aqua first. And I think this  
16 panel must get Barbara Boxer, Jerry Brown, everyone at  
17 the state and local level to start looking for a  
18 California solution. I know you think we don't have  
19 it. We must have it. Get the right storage. Get this  
20 job done right. It can't just be pushed ahead for a  
21 fast 20-year fix. My grandchildren will have to deal  
22 with no money and having to deal with it. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much. Next is  
24 Michael Smith then Christine Johnston and Gary Hedrick.

25 MR. SMITH: Good evening, members of the commission

1 and good evening to all the wonderful people from this  
2 community that are so concerned that are here today to  
3 see what the future lies with this very complex and  
4 incredible, scary problem.

5 I've lived here in San Clemente for 20 years.  
6 I ran a design and construction for California State  
7 University Fullerton for 18 years. I'm an active  
8 member of the Coastal Advisory Committee and I'm also a  
9 commissioner in San Clemente with Beaches, Parks and  
10 Rec.

11 And it's with my involvement in all of that  
12 and just being a citizen here that I'm glad that  
13 San Onofre is closed, but like probably so many other  
14 people here, I'm still scared to death about what's  
15 going to happen with this facility, so I'd like to make  
16 two comments:

17 One is that in the decommissioning process  
18 there are probably lots of opportunities to do  
19 something constructive rather than destructive, to be  
20 proactive rather than to be reactive.

21 And it will be nice to see the decommissioning  
22 process include an adapt of reuse of the facility. It  
23 would be -- seems to me it would be a shame to give way  
24 to the infrastructure that's been built there and the  
25 process of taking this nuclear generation plant out of

1 circulation.

2 The infrastructure that's there could help  
3 serve the community with power distribution and it may  
4 be an opportunity for some clean, green power  
5 generation as an alternative.

6 The second comment I'd like to make is that in  
7 the State of California we have something called CECA,  
8 California Environmental Quality Act, and that law  
9 requires that projects of big magnitude have an EIR,  
10 environmental impact report, and I have yet to hear  
11 from anyone involved in this process about the CECA  
12 Act, and I would like to ask all of you to bear that in  
13 mind and demand that the California Environmental  
14 Quality Act is followed and there's an EIR demanded on  
15 the decommissioning of this nuclear generation plan.  
16 Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very much. And  
18 let me just say that I will cycle back with co-owners  
19 and other members of the community and then panel  
20 members to make a list of the major topics that come up  
21 and some of them we may be able to address through  
22 written comments and some we should put on agendas for  
23 future meetings. The transcript of this meeting will  
24 be helpful.

25 Next is Christine Johnston and Gary Hedrick

1 and Ace Hoffman.

2 MS. JOHNSTON: Thank you so much for doing the work  
3 of trying to bring this to some closure with the high  
4 spent fuel. It seems to me with the previous comment,  
5 it's difficult for us to be protective with the  
6 potentiality of -- I mean, a real possible disaster,  
7 and so I think we are put into a position of  
8 reactivity.

9 And that being said, no one here can negate  
10 the reality that we have had nuclear accidents around  
11 the world, and so we're dealing with high spent fuel  
12 here. And I don't know how many of you here on the  
13 panel, I'm sure there are several of you, that live  
14 within a 40-to-50 miles radius San Onofre, but it's  
15 terrifying for individuals who live here to realize  
16 with freeway gridlock that we have no way out. We're  
17 sitting ducks. And I would like an evacuation plan.

18 How is that done? Is that staged? How do we  
19 get out of here? And I hope that we can all work  
20 together to figure that out. Thank you so much.

21 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much. Gary  
22 Hedrick then Ace Hoffman and Sharon Hoffman.

23 MR. HEDRICK: Good evening. My name is Gary  
24 Hedrick. I am founder of San Clemente Green and it's a  
25 huge burden, to tell you the truth. We have about

1 5,000 people that have gotten behind our concerns and  
2 share our concerns and I appreciate your service on  
3 this panel.

4 It's going to become more and more of a burden  
5 on you, I'm afraid, too. And the situation we're faced  
6 is we have to deal with reality and so far the track  
7 record has been very disappointing with Edison and the  
8 NRC and we have to be able to kind of take the really  
9 big view of this.

10 We have to look at this from so much further  
11 beyond just our own existence. That's really the  
12 nature of the problem. And the way that NRC and Edison  
13 have been working in the past it's not functional.  
14 That's why we're here today. That's why their -- their  
15 way of understanding safety is the presumption that  
16 everything they plan is going to work accordingly and  
17 we saw that not work with the steam generators.

18 And that's a small scale. When you talk  
19 about, you know, the fact that we have 89 times the  
20 amount of radiation here that was release in Chernobyl.  
21 This is going to be a problem for people for a long,  
22 long time.

23 And we have to elevate ourselves in the way we  
24 think of it regardless of our past or our relationships  
25 with Edison or anything else. We have to get to the

1 point where we're thinking about what can we do above  
2 and beyond what's just required? Because what's  
3 required it's not enough.

4 And I'm very happy to know that you're  
5 contemplating a workshop with independent experts. I  
6 think that's really a big step forward, but I'm  
7 concerned about some of the other comments that have  
8 been made tonight.

9 We're on a such a short time frame and it  
10 really -- I can't help but feel like Edison is rushing  
11 this within this 20-year window. We've got -- very  
12 likely we're going to have the biggest earthquake we've  
13 ever imagine. If you see the computer modeling, these  
14 like mountain ranges are moving 30 feet this way and  
15 that way.

16 It comes through -- you know, it's going to  
17 trigger every fault that's around, including the one  
18 that's right off the coast. And we have to be  
19 realistic about this and secure the waste, not cut  
20 corners, not try to -- not try to figure out, you know,  
21 "How are we going to save the most money?"

22 We've got things we could do to protect  
23 ourselves, to make this a much safer event when we do  
24 have the emergency. And I think we just have to kind  
25 of reanalyze the game, listen to independent experts.

1 And, you know, this is a real deep, moral ethical  
2 question for all of us here.

3 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much.

4 MR. HEDRICK: And I appreciate your taking this on  
5 and we're going to be with you. We want it out as much  
6 as anyone else.

7 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much, sir.

8 Next is Ace Hoffman and then Sharon Hoffman  
9 and then Joe Holtzman.

10 MR. HOFFMAN: Oddly enough, this is one of the most  
11 amazing panels I've ever seen and I've been fighting  
12 that plant at San Onofre for about 20 years. I didn't  
13 know that I could bludgeon a power plant with a  
14 microphone, but I guess we did. And, Tom, I'm sorry  
15 for the bludgeoning, I don't think you deserved it.

16 I would like to say something about the  
17 employees at San Onofre. We've heard a lot of talk  
18 about their being intimidated. We've heard that they're  
19 not doing a good job and so forth, and maybe that's all  
20 true. I don't really know. I haven't been on the  
21 site.

22 But I do know that in 20 years of fighting  
23 that plant, not one of them has ever been rude to me,  
24 not one of them has ever been impolite to me. I don't  
25 even think they've even lied to me, I mean, the

1 spokespersons maybe did, someone of an exception.

2           But the point is that it's been a fair fight,  
3 in my opinion. And we've been working very hard and we  
4 now have a large team of people who are fighting  
5 against that plant and have decided to continue that  
6 fight here because there is still concern and that's  
7 the right way to be because that fuel right now it's  
8 much more dangerous than it's going to be as we go down  
9 the road.

10           It becomes exponentially less dangerous, but  
11 unfortunately there's the plutonium aspect which is  
12 going to last for tens of thousands and hundreds of  
13 thousands of years. But the importance of taking care  
14 of it right now is just unbelievably important.

15           And, Honorable Bill Horn, I'm from the  
16 San Diego County area and I'm delighted to see him on  
17 the panel, and his questions are spot on. That  
18 railroad is way too close.

19           I have a letter from the Nuclear Regulatory  
20 Commission, I'll try and dig it up and send it to you,  
21 that I've got many years ago, maybe 10 years ago,  
22 saying that they're not worried about the rail line  
23 because of the distance between it and the reactor,  
24 which I think they said five car lengths, five rail  
25 road car lengths.

1           Now, I don't think it is that far from the  
2 rail line to the spent fuel platform. I think it's  
3 closer. And I don't think that's even enough because  
4 some of the loads that carried on those trains can have  
5 explosions that'll go on half a mile, that's way more  
6 than fire car lengths. So these are some of the  
7 problems.

8           Now, we're encasing this stuff in steel and  
9 lead and concrete because that's inexpensive and it's a  
10 very expensive job. But we've seen that airplanes can  
11 be stolen, they can be crashed into things. And we've  
12 got all these casks lined up, there is no working berms  
13 around them.

14           Then you can't put them in a depressed area in  
15 the ground because the National Academy of Sciences did  
16 a study and a large airplane crashing into those things  
17 the pool -- the fuel could pool if there was a  
18 depression, so you need berms, but not a depression,  
19 and you need places for the fuel to escape.

20           All these things have been studies and instead  
21 all we get is these dry casks. Well, they can do a lot  
22 better, but it's going to cost a lot of money, so  
23 please study it all and come back to me with any  
24 questions if you have them.

25           CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much. Next is

1 Sharon Hoffman and then Joe Holtzman and then Lisa  
2 McClure.

3 MS. HOFFMAN: Good evening. My name is Sharon  
4 Hoffman and I want to thank everybody on the panel. I  
5 was really impressed by a lot of the questions. I want  
6 to talk about a couple of things that put the issue of  
7 the waste in perspective because the waste is the issue  
8 now that we're no longer producing any more waste at  
9 San Onofre, the waste is the whole issue.

10 There were a number of questions about the  
11 life of the casks and we heard that they're licensed  
12 for 20 years and perhaps they could be licensed for  
13 another 20 years and perhaps another 20 beyond that,  
14 it's still the outside numbers there are significantly  
15 under 100 years and this stuff is dangerous for tens of  
16 thousands of years.

17 It is immediately dangerous in terms of  
18 decision projects for hundreds of years. So nobody  
19 knows what's going to happen, nobody knows what's going  
20 on inside of those casks. Nobody knows what's going to  
21 happen in 20 or 40 or 60 years when they're opened and  
22 try to transfer to some new cask technology that has  
23 been created in the interim.

24 So this is not San Onofre's problem alone, but  
25 this panel all of a sudden has to face this problem,

1 and looking at the short term is a very dangerous  
2 thing, that's what got us in this problem in the first  
3 place. Oh, it's electricity too cheap to meter and  
4 we'll figure out what to do with the waste. At least  
5 we figured out to stop making more of it here.

6 The other thing I want to say is, just put in  
7 this perspective, how dangerous this waste is. It's  
8 very personal. This afternoon my radiation oncologist  
9 said to me, "We want the cells that were trying to kill  
10 the cancer cells to be multiplying, we want them to be  
11 dividing normally because they're easier to destroy  
12 that way."

13 That means also that the cells of a child that  
14 are randomly hit by radiation from this nuclear waste  
15 are more easily destroyed. We all know that children  
16 are more vulnerable than adults, fetuses are the most  
17 vulnerable, women are more vulnerable than men.

18 A year ago I never knew what a radiation  
19 oncologist was. I hope that all the grandchildren and  
20 children of the people in this room don't have to find  
21 out because of the waste at San Onofre. Please take  
22 the time to figure out a real solution. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much for your  
24 comment. I can assure you we are taking up that  
25 mission. Next is Joe Holtzman and then Lisa McClure

1 and Don Laufer.

2 MR. HOLTZMAN: Yeah. Joe Holtzman. I live in  
3 Mission Viejo, 17 miles from ground zero. My journey  
4 started in 1978 to this podium. At that time I was  
5 sent by my company over to Japan to study the setting.  
6 On one of the weekends, I visited the museum in  
7 Hiroshima and saw the devastation that took place.

8 Now, whether you agree with President Truman  
9 on dropping that bomb or not is not the issue. The  
10 issue is the devastation from radiation is incredible,  
11 absolutely incredible. Have you ever seen skin falling  
12 off of live people? Is that what you want from your  
13 children?

14 Let's fast forward to 11 years ago when I got  
15 engaged in this mess down in San Onofre. Now, Tom, in  
16 all due deference to you, I believe you're the fourth  
17 nuclear officer that's been in charge in that time.  
18 Right?

19 MR. PALMISANO: It could be.

20 MR. HOLTZMAN: Not could be, it is. So we've got  
21 about an average of two plus years for each one of  
22 these people. Now, I've got document after document  
23 after document stating, showing and proving that Edison  
24 is incompetent. They lied about customer satisfaction  
25 surveys. They falsified those. They falsified the

1 Health and Safety records at San Onofre.

2 They lied to us about the generators and the  
3 builds and installations of both of them and to talk  
4 about bludgeoning them into shutting it down, they  
5 bumbled into shutting that place down, that's the real  
6 fact. Okay?

7 So you're dealing with a company, you know,  
8 they talked about safety, they talked about  
9 stewardship, they talked about engagement. It's really  
10 not in their DNA. It's not in their DNA. I question  
11 some of the composition of this panel, too. Pat, I  
12 don't think I've ever seen you at one of these meetings  
13 before, and you're my district supervisor, the Fifth  
14 District. Congratulation on coming.

15 You've got 3.7 million people in Orange County  
16 that are subject to the peril in this area. I hope all  
17 of you take this serious. I hope you will go up and  
18 bring in Marvin Resnikoff and some of the other  
19 experts, like Arnie Gunderson to talk to you and  
20 certainly you must spend the time to go through Dona  
21 Gilmore's sanonofresafety.org because all the questions  
22 that were asked tonight are pretty much answered in  
23 there. It's been an 11-year journey for me. Get  
24 serious about it folks. We've got 8.5 million people  
25 that are in peril here.

1           CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Okay. Thank you, sir. Next is  
2 Lisa McClure, then Don Laufer, Mel Herman.

3           MS. MCCLURE: Hi, my name is Lisa McClure. I live  
4 in San Clemente. I actually live in the Trestles  
5 Community two miles from the plant, on a very short  
6 street and we've buried three people from brain cancer,  
7 two people from breast cancer.

8                   My across-the-street neighbors have had  
9 thyroids from her and her children who had thyroid  
10 problems. My daughter at Concordia, I was talking to  
11 her teacher and she said, "Well, you know, that's  
12 funny. There is four people on my street with brain  
13 cancer." So this is really personal.

14                   And I thank you very much for your work and  
15 the days that you have ahead of you they're not going  
16 to be easy. True transparency and true collaboration,  
17 because we are really in this together, are going to be  
18 very, very important.

19                   And I really want you to know that you're  
20 charged with protecting lives, not protecting property  
21 values, protecting lives in Southern California. So in  
22 the spirit of transparency, I would like to know two  
23 things, I would like an online radiation detection  
24 system put online that we can go to that's realtime.

25                   And I'd also like in the spirit of financial

1 transparency to know who on the panel is currently on  
2 the payroll of Edison, a paid contractor or a  
3 consultant, and who has received political  
4 contributions or contributions to a nonprofit for which  
5 you are affiliated because I've had experiences with  
6 community outreach and I just -- this is really  
7 important. These are lives. I thank you very much for  
8 your service.

9 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much for your  
10 comments. Next is Don Laufer. Pass? Mel Cornahan.  
11 No Cornahan? Richard McPherson.

12 MR. MCPHERSON: Good morning.

13 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: If I call your name and somehow  
14 I've not heard you, why don't you just come on up and  
15 then let me know who you are and I will make sure you  
16 get the floor. Please, sir.

17 MR. MCPHERSON: Good evening. And thank you very  
18 much panel for volunteering to do this job. It is a  
19 very important job. This is my 50th year in nuclear  
20 power. I don't share the sentiments of most  
21 anti-nuclear people here at all.

22 I have lived with fuel -- refuel plants, been  
23 in spent fuel facilities, been in facilities that make  
24 fuel, been MOX facilities in France and then Japan. A  
25 year go I was on top of in No. 4 Fukushima Daiichi.

1 I've actually been there, don't the calculations, been  
2 a part of the process for 50 years.

3 There is very little to fear. It is a big  
4 problem and it needs to be managed and managed well. I  
5 think this panel is an important piece to help Edison,  
6 the NRC, the state government, local governments and  
7 specially the federal government do that.

8 The single biggest problem we have today is  
9 the politics of the federal government. Over the years  
10 it was driven by the anti-nuclear people to cause us  
11 not to have Yucca Mountain and other places open. We  
12 need them open. We need to get the politics out of it,  
13 specially interest to the ones that are causing. Thank  
14 you.

15 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much, sir. And  
16 just for the record, that was Richard McPherson. Thank  
17 you. Did I call your name already?

18 MS. CARNAHAN: Mel Carnahan.

19 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Mel Carnahan. Please, the floor  
20 is yours. Mel Carnahan.

21 MS. CARNAHAN: Hi, my name is Mel Carnahan. I'm  
22 from Laguna Woods, which is 22 miles north of here.  
23 I've been an anti-nuclear activist since 1956. I'm one  
24 of the old ones. In '74 I ran the Orange County  
25 Campaign Headquarters with a diverse of tree huggers to

1 get Proposition 15 on the ballot.

2 That would've banned further construction of  
3 nuclear plants until something was found to safely  
4 dispose of waste. We were no match for the millions of  
5 dollars the nuclear industry fed to defeat Proposition  
6 15. They won that round and we lost.

7 However, the California State Legislature  
8 passed a moratorium on further development of nuclear  
9 power until a permanent solution to save high-level  
10 storage was in place. That moratorium still exists  
11 today 40 years later and so do I.

12 Now, this -- this is what the occurs to be, it  
13 was a brilliant scientists who split the atom in the  
14 first place and they found ways to hitch it to the  
15 industrial wagon, then off they went to make more  
16 brilliant discoveries. None of these geniuses saw it  
17 fit to linger behind the pooper scoop, the waste left  
18 to the tracks of the industrial wagon, yet they knew  
19 this poisonous excrement would be lethal for thousands  
20 of years.

21 So let's bring in the scientists and the  
22 nuclear scientists, the geologists. We must focus on  
23 safe containment of the radioactive garbage they left  
24 behind when they figured out how to burn electric  
25 lights with nuclear power.

1           The solution is centuries -- centuries long  
2 safe containment of radioactive waste must be the  
3 priority of scientists; funding that solution must be  
4 top priority. It's a moral imperative. Thank you very  
5 much.

6           CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Great. Thank you very much for  
7 your comments. Next on the list is Roger Johnson and  
8 Adam Gentzel and Willis Free or Freek.

9           MR. FRICK: Frick.

10          CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Frick. Thank you very much. And  
11 as Roger Johnson comes up to the microphone, let me  
12 just say we have 10 more speakers, so if everybody  
13 takes tree minutes, we will not be able to hear from  
14 all the speakers.

15          MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. A few quick points and  
16 then a comment: First of all, it was asserted earlier  
17 that the casks did not leak. They do leak and they  
18 have leaked, the ones at Three Mile Island are already  
19 leaking. Anyone who thinks that these casks are going  
20 to last 20, 40, 60, 80, 100 years without a problem,  
21 forget it, it's not going to happen.

22                 The second, there is been very little  
23 discussion of terrorism. I urge you to go online and  
24 look at the Sandia National Labs who did a study of  
25 terrorism and the redacted part even says that a

1 medium-sized truck bomb outside the perimeter exploding  
2 would cause enough damage to release large amounts of  
3 radiation.

4           Okay. The fuel pools are vulnerable. The  
5 casks themselves they may withstand certain  
6 earthquakes, not all earthquakes, a direct hit from  
7 missiles. North Korea has three-stage missiles, which  
8 can reach here. We're one of the choice targets in the  
9 whole country.

10           The third is, don't forget about low-level  
11 waste. The decommission process, there's going to be a  
12 lot of dirty rubble, a lot of contamination, all that  
13 equipment and somebody's going to wash it into the  
14 ocean, it's going to be hosed down, it's going to get  
15 particulate into the atmosphere.

16           Who is monitoring and overseeing this process?  
17 The NRC supervisors are going to be leaving the summer.  
18 We have to watch. We have to watch about that.

19           The fourth thing, cancer has been brought up  
20 here. I have seven people in my neighborhood who  
21 either died of cancer or have it now. The National  
22 Academy of Scientists you probably noticed are having a  
23 meeting at UC Irvine next week, a week from Thursday.

24           I hope you all show up. They're now doing a  
25 long two-year study and studying cancer streaks in a

1 30-mile area around San Onofre.

2 Finally, I'd like -- let's see, I'd like --  
3 the comments about Yucca Mountain. It's not Harry Reid  
4 who caused the problem. Scientists concluded there is  
5 no way to seal from moisture for 10,000 years  
6 underground in anything, it can't be done. They tried  
7 it and it has failed.

8 And it recently failed with all the military  
9 nuclear waste at the facility in Carlsbad and New  
10 Mexico. They thought that was a secure site; it isn't.

11 So the people of Nevada did not want it and we  
12 don't want it either. So the elephant in the room is,  
13 what to do with all this nuclear waste? And I think we  
14 have to think outside the box.

15 If you're going to wait for a permanent  
16 national solution to solve everybody's nuclear waste  
17 problem, military/civilian from all the states, forget  
18 it. Do you think the Congress and the United States  
19 Department of Energy is going to come up with a  
20 solution any time soon in a half century?

21 First of all, there aren't any solutions and  
22 to get them to cooperate is ridiculous. I think what  
23 we need is a California solution and that was suggested  
24 a little while ago.

25 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much for your

1 comments.

2 MR. JOHNSON: I would urge that it be taken  
3 elsewhere in California. It can be done.

4 CHAIRMAN VICTOR. Next -- thank you. Next is Adam  
5 Gentzel and then Willis Frick and then Patty Davis.

6 MR. GENTZEL: So my name is Adam Gentzel. I live  
7 here in San Clemente and have pretty much my whole  
8 life. And just reading the pamphlet that was provided,  
9 I noticed that it said "spent fuel would be stored  
10 safely on site until the federal government fills its  
11 contractual obligation to open a permanent spent  
12 nuclear fuel facility."

13 I apologize for just using your first name,  
14 but I spoke with Tom during the break and Tom said that  
15 he was going to get that information to be public  
16 record, the public can see what the actual specific  
17 contractual obligation is, which I think it would be  
18 important.

19 And in looking at all the members of the  
20 panel, we have various people from local government,  
21 and then I see probably the one individual who is most  
22 connected to federal government would be Larry. I  
23 apologize for using your first name again.

24 And it would probably be in the best interest  
25 of the Navy to have an active role in this. And just

1 maybe throw in an idea, they're trying to get it away  
2 from the Ocean. If I -- if I spill a drink, it's going  
3 to go in the ocean.

4 If something spills, I'm not seeing in a year,  
5 I'm not seeing it in 10 years, but if we don't have a  
6 permanent solution to the Navy's best interest to try  
7 to look after the long term and maybe trying to expand  
8 it a little bit inland. I don't know.

9 But having the Navy, as close as we can get to  
10 the federal government, have an active role in deciding  
11 how it's going to be not a site but the pad, the pad  
12 will be the area where the spent fuel rods and all of  
13 that is stores. Thank you For your time.

14 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you ver much. Next is  
15 Willis Frick then Patty Davis and James Cummings.

16 MR. FRICK: Thank you. My name is Willis Frick.  
17 I've lived in San Clemente about 25 years. And I want  
18 to share two things with the panel:

19 The first is a follow on to the discussion you  
20 just had about the contractual obligation of the  
21 federal government to take the spent fuel.

22 I would point out it has already been paid  
23 for, just like the decommissioning trust fund, every  
24 kilowatt of nuclear generation gives a small amount of  
25 money to the federal government to store this spent

1 fuel. This is paid for already.

2 A lot of that money went to Yucca Mountain.  
3 I've had the privilege of being at Yucca Mountain and  
4 in the tunnels of Yucca Mountain and I say, from my  
5 personal experience and from what I've read about Yucca  
6 Mountain, the licensing, documents, and such that there  
7 was hardly a better place from the point of view of  
8 hydrology, geology, the surrounding community, which is  
9 the middle of nowhere and then you've got to go a good  
10 deal further to get to Yucca Mountain. It is the place  
11 to put it.

12 And the obstacle to it being there and being  
13 out of our community it's not a technical one, it is a  
14 political one. And so I would encourage the elected  
15 representatives that are on the panel to take that as  
16 part of your challenge, and your assignment is to take  
17 what you learn here and work through the political  
18 process to try to cause that change to occur, so that  
19 we can move the NV chief, Mr. Reid, out of the way and  
20 take the spent fuel where it belongs, the ideal place  
21 for it to remain for a very long time.

22 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much, sir. Patty  
23 Davis and then James Cummings and Beverly  
24 Finlay-Kaneko.

25 MS. DAVIS: Thank you. Just quickly, Chairman

1 McFarland put a very detailed and very thorough report,  
2 Chairman McFarland of the NRC and she's a geologist,  
3 she's a serious scientist, and the nuclear industry  
4 likes her, they picked her to be on the -- on the NRC  
5 and her report is about why Yucca Mountain would not  
6 work.

7           It's part of the water table for the Colorado  
8 River basin, which is where we get a lot of our water  
9 and a lot of Southern California does. Also, it has  
10 porous rock, as well as rock that has been damaged from  
11 nuclear testing, of all things. So there is that.

12           I'm concerned about where the money is going  
13 to go. I want to make sure that the money that is set  
14 aside for the safe decommissioning of this plant, I  
15 want to make sure that that money is not going into  
16 political campaigns, that money is not going into  
17 donations for favorite organizations of different  
18 people who may be on this panel or with Edison or other  
19 community leaders.

20           Money needs to go into the safe operations of  
21 the decommissioning of that plant. It needs to go to  
22 the workers that are actually doing the work, not to  
23 pad salaries of executives that might live some 50  
24 miles away.

25           It should be going to make sure that those

1 workers are well trained, well equipped and well able  
2 to deal with the high burn-up issue. We don't have a  
3 way right now to know what's going on inside of the  
4 casks and we need to have that information because it's  
5 an unknown. The high burn-up fuel is a whole different  
6 issue, it takes -- the standard nuclear fuel  
7 decommissioning process that has been used in the past  
8 and it puts it in a whole new light, and it has to be  
9 dealt with very, very seriously.

10 And it's difficult to trust Edison with this.  
11 Last year Edison told us we would have blackouts and  
12 brownouts and we've all be living with candlelight if  
13 we didn't have San Onofre Unit 2 starting back up.

14 And did you notice that that never happened?  
15 Also Edison said that it was very, very safe to start  
16 up Unit 2. But Edison changed its position when they  
17 got to the CPUC, the California Public Utilities  
18 Commission, and began to bemoan, "Oh, that nasty  
19 Mitsubishi sold us those defective steam generators,"  
20 and that was a debacle of what, some over 700 million  
21 plus to the ratepayers?

22 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much for your  
23 comments. Next is James Cummings.

24 MS. DAVIS: Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: And Beverly Finlay Kaneko and

1 then Patty Von Rickon.

2 MR. CUMMINGS: Good evening. My name is James  
3 Cummings. I'm retired from Southern California Edison.  
4 I worked there for 25 years. I was an operator there  
5 at Unit 1. I was very pleased to service each one of  
6 you folks every morning with the power that came from  
7 that generator.

8 And each one of you had your homes lit and you  
9 were able to go out in safety every day, that the  
10 streetlights would work and that you were safe and  
11 sound. Today that's not -- it's not as likely as it is  
12 today in my most humble opinion.

13 I can remember an incident in 1969 when we had  
14 the heavy rains, the rains through the San Juan Creek  
15 toppled over one of the towers. They called me out for  
16 work. I lived in San Juan Capistrano at that time. I  
17 got out. I looked out. I saw nothing. It was pitch  
18 black at 4:00 in the morning.

19 There was a light in San Clemente, there  
20 wasn't a light in San Juan, there wasn't a light to be  
21 seen everywhere because Unit 1 at that time had tripped  
22 off the line. It eventually did come back, but it's  
23 frightening when you have no electricity.

24 And I think you folks can remember just about  
25 18 months ago what happened to units 2 and 3 and the

1 tie between Palos Verdes and San Diego, San Diego gas  
2 electric does not have enough generation for its own  
3 needs right now, and we rely on Palos Verdes, the big  
4 nuclear power plants in Arizona, when those lines trip,  
5 they're going to go down.

6 The lady will be, she might be wrong, because  
7 there's gong to be black because units 2 and 3 won't be  
8 here to service you again. They're gone. They were  
9 able to bring 2 and 3 back up after that trip in 12  
10 hours, San Clemente covered its power.

11 I don't know what areas of responsibility you  
12 folks have, but you need to be concerned about the  
13 generation and being local. We've got to be able to  
14 provide power. The panels are great on your home, but  
15 they're not going to do the necessities the baseline  
16 power that we all need to come and expect.

17 We are civilized society. We demand extreme  
18 amounts of money and that money, the extreme money,  
19 efforts for the electrical companies. Hundreds of  
20 people work every day tirelessly to provide this light  
21 that you're using right now. Please keep that in mind.  
22 These gentlemen and the ladies are working so far to  
23 protect us and keep the systems going. Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you for your comments, sir.  
25 Beverlay Finlay-Kaneko, then Patty Von Rickon and

1 Mickey Bay.

2 MS. FINLAY-KANEKO: I almost didn't show up  
3 tonight. A pseudo-watchdog panel cracked it by  
4 Edison's PR department with cherry picked experts and  
5 community members only one of whom represents the  
6 environmental movement. It didn't seem worth my time.

7 Although, I've been pleasantly surprised by  
8 some of the comments, Mr. Horn, Professor Parker. My  
9 son has football practice in Huntington Beach. It's a  
10 school night. And as a de facto single parent, for the  
11 last three years since March 11, 2011, when my family  
12 was separated by the ongoing uncertainties in Northeast  
13 Japan, my priority should be firmly placed with my son,  
14 but that's why I'm here.

15 I want you to understand that the big picture  
16 issues concerning decommissioning can be rendered in  
17 broad strokes meant to blurt the complicated safety and  
18 financial details involved. The big picture of our  
19 population, namely the 8.4 million in Southern  
20 California that could be affected if the huge stockpile  
21 of dangerous nuclear waste were damaged by a tsunami,  
22 earthquake, terrorist attack, human error, engineering  
23 miscalculation, ill-fated cost cutting endeavors, and  
24 so on.

25 What does an accident mean in the most

1 intimate human terms? How do errors and missed troops  
2 end up affecting your neighbors and your children?  
3 I've been working on an oral history project on  
4 Fukushima with my husband, who resides in Japan for 75  
5 percent of the year.

6 Each and every person affected by 3/11  
7 disaster has a story, has a truth. My truth comes into  
8 sharp relief at the dinner table each night as my son  
9 and I Skype with his dad through our meal. My son has  
10 grown from a 9-year-old, who bravely saves his tears  
11 until the plane pulled away from the gate to an almost  
12 13-year-old, whose occasional solemn moods mask a deep  
13 longing for his father. This is our truth.

14 This is what lies and miscalculations, human  
15 error against angst stupidity did to my family. This  
16 is what complacency reliance on corporate spin sessions  
17 like this has done to Japan and could do to Southern  
18 California or anywhere that has a nuclear power plant  
19 or a waste dump in the making.

20 Frankly, I'm appalled that Southern California  
21 Edison is even being passed with the decommissioning  
22 job, given the fact that there is an ongoing  
23 investigation into the mismanagement that led to this  
24 steam generator fiasco.

25 Why are we just letting a company that failed

1 in such a huge way be responsible for the dangerous job  
2 of decommissioning and securing toxic waste? We can  
3 and we should do better.

4 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you for your -- please, I  
5 can appreciate that folks want to applause certain  
6 views. It is really not respectful to the wide range  
7 of opinions to do that, I think. Patty Von Rickon  
8 please, and then be Mickey Bay. Thank you. Mickey  
9 Bay.

10 MS. BAY: Hi, my name is Mickey Bay. Thank you for  
11 having me to speak up. I am from Japan but living in  
12 Orange County. We have to learn from Fukushima. The  
13 public has -- has the right to know what Edison plans  
14 for the long-term stretch of the spent fuel rod at  
15 San Onofre and earthquake-prone region next to the  
16 ocean.

17 Since 3/11 what has Edison done to protect  
18 Orange County and San Diego County? The incident from  
19 Fukushima are the unexpected should be expected. What  
20 has Edison done to prepare for the unexpected?

21 I know a woman from Fukushima her house was  
22 one mile from Fukushima Daiichi. After 3/11 she had to  
23 evacuate to Tokyo because she never been back to her  
24 hometown.

25 She told me that when Tepco asked her to

1     displace her, she thought that she can come home soon,  
2     so she just grabbed \$50 and went to the evacuation  
3     place, but since then she only went back to home twice  
4     with full suits. She has to put the mask and protect  
5     herself.

6             I think we all could be her. We are so close  
7     to the nuclear generator of San Onofre. So please,  
8     please keep up the great work for our children and  
9     please listen from the voice from Fukushima. Thank  
10    you.

11            CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much. Next in  
12    line is E -- the name is hard for me to read,  
13    Weiseberg, I think, and then Ray Lutz and David --  
14    Daniel Davison. It's Eve Weiseberg here? Is Mr. Lutz  
15    here? Yes. Then David Davison and then Madge Torres.  
16    Go.

17            MR. LUTZ: Hello there, my name is Ray Lutz. I'm  
18    with Citizens Oversight and Coalition to Decommission  
19    San Onofre and actually I'm a party at the CPUC  
20    proceedings.

21            It was Chief Justice -- what was his name?  
22    Anyway, he said that the most important office in a  
23    democracy is out of a citizen. His name is flipping my  
24    mind, that's what I get from being -- but the citizen  
25    has the most important office.

1           You guys are volunteers here as citizens  
2 representing a last level of are oversight. Please do  
3 your job, if you will. This is what I'm asking, to  
4 provide a complete oversight.

5           Now, the chair artfully took off the topic of  
6 the money, saying that the CPUC has that all under  
7 control. Trust me, the CPUC does not do a very good  
8 job of watching the money. They don't care about  
9 anything less than 10 million, that's just pocket  
10 change.

11           So one of the tasks that somehow we need to  
12 deal with as a public and you guys hopefully as our  
13 front line is, how can we watch this money? Right now  
14 there's an advise letter from SCE for 215 million  
15 dollars. 15 million for planning, another 200 for  
16 money to be spent before the plants are done.

17           Well, we're demanding that they finish the  
18 plans first before they start asking for a whole bunch  
19 of money and then watch every step of the way as it  
20 goes, otherwise people are going to try to steal it.

21           Anytime you have over 3 billion dollars,  
22 experts come out, experts at stealing. So we need to  
23 watch the experts and there isn't any excuse at any  
24 level all the way down to the citizens, us.

25           We're here to make sure it doesn't happen. It

1 happens at all levels, so that's really important is to  
2 watch it. We don't want us to pinch pennies, but we  
3 don't want to lose them. We want to make sure it's  
4 done right, done safely, and there are concerns.

5 The fuel, if at all possible, let's get it  
6 away from this dangerous high-density population area.  
7 There's got to be some other places to put it. The  
8 idea of in California, that may be the only solution,  
9 but right now we've got a big problem.

10 This fuel is really dangerous. It isn't what  
11 we signed up for when we put this plant in, nobody  
12 realized it was going to be this bad and they didn't  
13 expect it to be here. They thought it was going to be  
14 gone, 1998 or 1999 it was suppose to be gone at that  
15 point. So thank you very much.

16 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much. Last folks  
17 on my list, David Davison, Madge Torres and then Andy  
18 Zeley.

19 MR. DAVISON: David Davison. I live here in  
20 San Clemente, been here for 27 years. The head of  
21 San Onofre safety, he says -- he talks about Edison's  
22 track record.

23 Well, if you look at the track record of the  
24 anti-nuclear folks, they lied about the San Onofre's  
25 emergency batteries saying that they were disconnected

1 for four years.

2 They lied about the steam generators. In  
3 fact, if you go on their website, you can still hear  
4 Arnie Gunderson lying about the steam generators, it  
5 hasn't been taken off.

6 They have videos of guys talking about TMI and  
7 all of these crazy two-headed sheep and two-headed cows  
8 being born as result as a result of TMI. It's -- their  
9 head also made a statement comparing San Onofre's tube  
10 leak on January 31st, 2012, comparing, saying, we  
11 almost had a worse accident than Fukushima, that's a  
12 materially false statement. That is just preposterous  
13 hard wash.

14 And now the same people are coming up here and  
15 telling you all of these scare stories that this is all  
16 dangerous. I've moved spent fuel. It's a routine  
17 operation. My butt has sat on the machine just feet  
18 above the water, it is not a dangerous operation.

19 So when you were considering future  
20 communications, I hope that you'll be correcting the  
21 fault statements out of these groups and I hope out of  
22 this committee we don't hear it referred to as a  
23 nuclear waste dump. Remember, 45 years worth of fuel  
24 in one building in two pools and one concrete pad.  
25 You've all enjoyed the electricity.

1           Now, I want some accurate information and I  
2 hope you guys will ensure that we get the accurate  
3 information. Thank you.

4           CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much for your  
5 comments. Next is Madge Torres then Andy Zeley.

6           MS. TORRES: Hi, my name is Madge Torres from  
7 Carlsbad, California. After the tsunami that caused  
8 the destruction of the nuclear power plant in  
9 Fukushima, we knew that we needed to have higher  
10 barriers to keep the waves out, but even though  
11 San Onofre was an active nuclear power plant at that  
12 time, they didn't do anything to change the walls.

13           And that leaves me to think that maybe they  
14 can't be trusted with a lot of their responsibilities.  
15 After the 9/11 attack on the World Trade Center in New  
16 York City, we still have storage of our nuclear waste  
17 and even though it was an active nuclear power plant,  
18 Southern California Edison didn't do anything to  
19 protect the dry cask storage and the other storage that  
20 we have in the open pools.

21           And I like that you take a careful look at  
22 what way Southern California Edison is carrying out  
23 their decommissioning of San Onofre nuclear power plant  
24 because they don't do anything that would be a logical  
25 step to protect the community.

1           We're not their priority, their shareholders  
2 are their priority, and that gives me concern because  
3 then I know I have to count on you to be their  
4 watchdog. And I do appreciate all the wonderful  
5 questions that you've asked them this evening and I  
6 hope you continue to be watchful and vigilante because  
7 our lives are in your hands. Thank you so much.

8           CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much. Last  
9 comment from Andy Zeley and then we'll have a final few  
10 minutes of discussions on what we do next as a panel.

11           Sir?

12           MR. ZELEY: Hi, I'm Andy Zeley. I'm an engineer.  
13 I've been involved with the decommissioning of the  
14 Hotsel at General Atomics. I developed the aspersion  
15 models that NRC uses. I live here in the area. I'm  
16 within 13 miles of San Onofre.

17           I'd like to be a part of the solution rather  
18 than the problem. I'd like to focus on adding value to  
19 the community. My wife wants to leave. She says "I  
20 don't want to live next to a nuclear plant." I want to  
21 live here. I believe -- I teach risk assessment. So  
22 I'm safe. I feel comfortable with what you all are  
23 doing.

24           I'd like to add value to what you're doing.  
25 One of the points that you made is about the conduits

1 at Unit 1. Those conduits are right there, you can use  
2 them for desalination.

3 We have a shortage of water. We have a 4  
4 million acre of short. When we talk about green, we  
5 should have water. You have the opportunity at  
6 San Onofre to do a 50 million gallon desalination plan.

7 You could add value to the community. The  
8 next generation of people could say, "Look, you have a  
9 nuclear power plant in your backyard and you did  
10 something about instead of fighting against Edison,  
11 fighting against NRC, and fighting between yourselves."  
12 I'd like to be a part of the solution, I'd like to  
13 volunteer my time.

14 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much for those  
15 comments and for that offer. I think those are very  
16 important perspectives.

17 I'd like to say a couple of words about my  
18 sense of where we go next. This has been a general  
19 meeting to help lay out the decommissioning timeline,  
20 the key points, places where this panel, which is not a  
21 formal decision-making panel and not a formal watchdog  
22 panel, the way this panel can help in opening a conduit  
23 and looking into questions in depth on behalf of the  
24 community where we can be useful.

25 From now on, we're going to focused on much

1 more specific topics as the need arises in this  
2 decommissioning process.

3           From the transcript tonight, we're going to be  
4 able to identify a whole series of questions that CEP  
5 members and members of the public have raised, and  
6 those will go back to Edison and to the CEP panel, and  
7 we'll be able to collate some responses, many of the  
8 questions have raised have ready responses or  
9 additional technical information that can be brought  
10 there and many of them suggest things that the panel  
11 needs to work on for future -- for future meetings. We  
12 will organize all of that into some kind of synthesis  
13 memo and so on.

14           This panel has been set up, I think, with  
15 diligence but nonetheless with speed and as a byproduct  
16 we do not yet have a vice-chairman and we do not yet  
17 have a secretary, but I'm sure that over the next few  
18 weeks the co-owners are going to work with me and the  
19 other members of the panel to fill out those positions.

20           And then those folks, the secretary in  
21 particular, is going to play a central role in this  
22 feedback loop so that every meeting has a readback on  
23 it and then some respond to questions and then an  
24 adjustment to the agenda for our work going forward.

25           I'd like to say just a couple of works --

1 comments about future workshops and meetings: Clearly  
2 we need to have a workshop, maybe more than one  
3 workshop on these issues of fuel management and  
4 possibly long term storage or solutions and what can be  
5 done at the federal level on a time line of regulatory  
6 filings and so on.

7 I am going to consult with the members of the  
8 panel over the course of the next few weeks and come up  
9 with a game plan for workshops going forward. And also  
10 on agenda for our next meeting, our next meeting will  
11 be held in May. We're looking at two dates right now  
12 and as soon as we get those dates settle down, we will  
13 announce that on the website.

14 We will at the next meeting hand out physical  
15 copies of the agenda. I gather not everybody saw it on  
16 the website and so it would be helpful to everybody to  
17 be able to have a physical copy of the agenda.

18 So I apologize in advance to the trees, but  
19 there'll be not that many trees harmed by this process.  
20 Everybody will get a physical copy of the agenda at the  
21 door at the next -- at the next meeting.

22 If you didn't get to ask your question or if  
23 you have other questions or concerns, please send us an  
24 email and we will do our best to collate all those and  
25 respond to those and to use that to guide the work of

1 the commission going forward.

2 I'd like to pause for a moment and ask if  
3 there are other members of the panel who would like to  
4 comment on particular agenda items and priorities for  
5 us going forward?

6 MR. BROWN: I think it's something very important  
7 and certainly it comes out tonight is, how do we  
8 communicate? Before we get into the weeds with  
9 workshops on specific items, I would like to see how  
10 the co-owners plan to communicate with the communities  
11 in the areas.

12 I think they can certainly -- I think we would  
13 all attest, they can do a better that hasn't been done  
14 in the past. You know, we can do a website, there is  
15 other things. But how do we tell the story?

16 The story is going to go on and on and it's  
17 going to be complicated. And I would like to see --  
18 I'd like to see somebody or work together to develop a  
19 plan.

20 I don't mean just bring in people to do a  
21 spin. I mean people who can tell the story, what we're  
22 doing, what we, as a community are doing, certainly the  
23 whole decommissioning process, but I think interictal,  
24 at the very beginning of this, is to get -- to get  
25 communication plan, how we communicate to the

1 communities.

2 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: And I think if you have advice  
3 and other panel members have advice along the way on  
4 places where the communication is not happening  
5 properly, we need to community that as it were.

6 Other comments on this side of the table  
7 before I turn down there, please?

8 MS. BOSTON: Thank you. Donna Boston with the  
9 Orange County Sheriff's Department. One of the themes  
10 that I heard repeatedly were concerns about things  
11 related to emergency planning, emergency response in  
12 your off site communities, and by "off site" I mean not  
13 part of your plant, but in your communities how you  
14 would evacuate, and it seems perhaps appropriate at  
15 some point along the way to have a workshop for you to  
16 explain how response operations work and the plans that  
17 are in place to cope with any emergency, and so we can  
18 work with the Inter-jurisdictional Planning Committee  
19 that has experts in those areas that work in your level  
20 of communities to work on those emergency plans.

21 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: I think we will -- let's have a  
22 workshop on that. And I think the other thing that  
23 struck me, having visited the plant recently, is that  
24 as the footprint of activities shrinks, I'm sure that  
25 people -- tonight everybody is concerned about security

1 and so on, we should have some sense of what's being  
2 done on the security front and against natural hazards  
3 as well.

4 Other comments here? Please.

5 MS. BATES: Pat Bates. I think some very  
6 legitimate issues have been raised about the trust fund  
7 and ensuring that that money that is there is going for  
8 the purpose other than just administration and some of  
9 the variety of things that various state agencies find  
10 for the use of that, so I'd like to see that on our  
11 agenda going forward. I think that's critical to  
12 meeting all of the asks that were presented by the  
13 folks tonight.

14 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very much. And  
15 I think we also need to understand, in addition to what  
16 the issues are there, what the existing oversight  
17 mechanisms are and whether those are adequate because  
18 maybe that's something we as a panel should be working  
19 on, maybe that's something that other folks should be  
20 doing a better job. And I don't know myself if you got  
21 a good feel for that.

22 Other comments? Bill Horn?

23 MR. HORN: Yes. Thank you. Is this on?

24 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Yeah.

25 MR. HORN: A couple of issues and I can only speak

1 for San Diego County, but I'm sure Orange County must  
2 probably has their equivalent. I have a chairman of  
3 the Emergency Operation Center in San Diego County.

4 As you now, we have had a number of major  
5 fires. The last fire we evacuated over 600,000 people  
6 with our Sheriff's Department. We had -- we do have  
7 evacuation routes out of San Diego, I-5 happens to be  
8 one of them. But if that's closed, we have I-15.  
9 There's nowhere else to go except out of the 8 and head  
10 for the desert.

11 I happened to live within the 50-mile radius  
12 of this plant. I was always hoping the west -- the  
13 winds would blow it into Riverside and not into my  
14 farm. But a number of concerns were issued about the  
15 tsunami in Japan. We monitor that, the San Diego does,  
16 24/7, all yearlong. We monitor the Western Pacific, on  
17 our side, the Eastern Pacific.

18 We have San Clemente Island, which is your  
19 namesake and Santa Catalina, so if we were to get a  
20 wave like hit Japan, it would be protected by those two  
21 islands. And I'm not -- I'm not -- you know, I don't  
22 know where else the wave would go unless it went down  
23 the corridor, it might get to Point Loma, but I don't  
24 think it'll affect the plant.

25 However, the walls are an issue and the tie is

1 an issue. I've -- listening to everyone's testimony  
2 and listening to the stakeholders right here, I think  
3 our first choice is to get rid of this fuel and move it  
4 out of here.

5 But without any guarantee that that's going to  
6 happen, I want to make sure that the safest storage  
7 that we currently have is in place, that the public is  
8 protected. And as much as we can reduce that  
9 footprint, that's important.

10 I would like to see us at a workshop. I think  
11 it would be important for the public and me. I  
12 volunteered to do this. I want to know what the rad  
13 level is at certain intervals around this storage. I  
14 mean what is it going to be if I have to live with it  
15 for 20 or 30 years? How many feet? How many yards?  
16 Are affected by this? So, anyway, those are things I  
17 think we ought to talk about.

18 I also -- I don't think it has to be  
19 workshops, but I'm sure the Orange County has emergency  
20 operation center just as we do in San Diego and we're  
21 happy to make that information available to you.

22 San Diego, by the way, because it has the  
23 least amount of earthquake faults in the state, it's  
24 the logistic center for the next big earthquake you all  
25 talked about. All the logistics will come into

1 San Diego and we will move it out to the rest of the  
2 state because we don't have those kind of faults.

3 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very much.  
4 Briefly, Gene Stone, then I see Dan Stetson.

5 MR. STONE: Well, I'd like to -- I have three  
6 comments: I'd like to set the record straight about  
7 that dry cask leaking. If you read the paper, you had  
8 to have read about Hanford leak and it's leaking to the  
9 tunes of millions and millions of dollars into the  
10 river, and so that's a major leak of nuclear waste, our  
11 oldest storage site.

12 Also, as Roger Johnson pointed out, there are  
13 dry cask leaks at the Three Mile Island. To the  
14 gentleman who was concerned about the loss of the 2,000  
15 megawatts of power, just last month alone California  
16 hit 2000 megawatts of solar panel -- solar energy to  
17 replace that, as well, not in the same Pacific grid  
18 location, of course.

19 But -- and those figures don't even count for  
20 all of the rooftops solar, that's not accounted for, so  
21 we don't have a real good figure about that. But we  
22 know that there is plenty of that as well.

23 So, but the other thing that I think it's  
24 really, really important that I've got from tonight's  
25 meeting is how the community here and here, since it's

1 all one community, all of us on this panel, all of the  
2 elected officials that are here are military  
3 representatives.

4 We can all work together to help solve a  
5 national problem, everyone in the world is watching  
6 San Onofre since it shut down. We are a model for the  
7 anti-nuclear movement, to say the ver least, but we are  
8 also a model for the IAEA.

9 People are watching what happened in  
10 San Onofre, what's going to happen here with this panel  
11 and this decommissioning. And I want to say that to  
12 Chris Thompson and Tom there that I fully support us  
13 being the leading edge technology in decommissioning.

14 And the other opportunity that we have is to  
15 reunite the movement in the United States to do  
16 something with nuclear ,waste which has been promised  
17 since I was kid in 1952.

18 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much. That's a  
19 very important comment. Briefly Dan Stetson and then  
20 Larry Rannals.

21 MR. STETSON: Sure. Thank you very much. One  
22 question I'd like to have addressed maybe in a future  
23 meeting, the slide which shows the easement from the  
24 Navy, they're all land side, but still there is quite a  
25 footprint that goes out on the other side of the Coast

1 Highway into the ocean, so I'd like to please  
2 understand what the plans are for the pipes and all of  
3 those pieces.

4 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Yes, I think we should have a  
5 workshop on that. There's a whole series of issues  
6 around that, some compliance issues there and obviously  
7 some Coastal Commission related questions. Thank you  
8 very much.

9 Larry Rannals?

10 MR. RANNALS: Yes, sir. Mr. Chair. I fully  
11 support your recommendation that we have some workshops  
12 particularly on the spent fuel storage question and I  
13 would propose we try and put those together sooner  
14 rather than later because we don't have a lot of time  
15 for the remainder of this year.

16 And with SONGS plant schedule on trying to get  
17 their decommissioning plan submitted to the NRC, I just  
18 want to argue we should put those workshops together  
19 soon.

20 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Okay. Thank you.

21 MR. RANNALS: There were a couple of comments made  
22 from some speakers about we need to consider moving  
23 this fuel maybe out in the desert and maybe put it next  
24 to a military installation somewhere.

25 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: We've been waiting for you to

1 comment on that.

2 MR. RANNALS: Well, it's already on a military  
3 installation, as you know. And I'd like to know who in  
4 this room is going to nominate the location out in the  
5 desert, but wherever you're thinking where do you want  
6 to nominate and are you going to contact the local  
7 citizens in that area to make them aware of that's what  
8 the plan is?

9 PUBLIC MEMBER: They know who sent them the large  
10 container.

11 MR. RANNALS: Secondly, a couple of other  
12 commentators made statements about is the Navy going to  
13 require SONGS to return our land to greenfield  
14 conditions? What the navy is going to require, to my  
15 understanding is, we're going require that that land be  
16 returned for unrestricted reuse for any purpose, to  
17 include family housing, if we wanted to build family  
18 housing there, or training area, or whatever it may be  
19 that we want to put in that location.

20 What I want to walk way from here tonight to  
21 make sure I understand correctly is, I want ask  
22 Mr. Stone, if you can explain to me what's meant by a  
23 "greenfield condition."

24 MR. STONE: Well, it's a term --

25 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Let's -- we don't have time right

1 now to -- we're already overtime on this particular  
2 issue, but I have -- I can assure you that we will  
3 spend some time in a future meeting and maybe we'll put  
4 this on the agenda for the next meeting and prep it  
5 properly so we have some sense of the different levels  
6 and standards and what's also been done on other sites.

7 Because to do this, this discussion, properly  
8 requires I think more information than we have right  
9 now. Very briefly, Tim Brown.

10 MR. BROWN: One thing that I would as is that, as  
11 everyone knows here, San Clemente has been on -- we've  
12 received quite a bit of attention regarding this and I  
13 really enjoy homework, particular about this issue.

14 I love reading all about it, I read everything  
15 that's been given to me about it. And there were a  
16 number of assertions and fact patterns that were  
17 established tonight from the commentators, the folks  
18 who were making comments, and so I would ask to  
19 substantiate what you're referring to in terms of  
20 leaks, conditions, the science, the studies, that we  
21 have a submittal of that information so that the panel  
22 can review much of what you're talking about.

23 Because the information I review and the  
24 information that were -- that we should be on the same  
25 page about this, because what I see today is that, you

1 know, Southern Cal Edison for, frankly, all of the  
2 vilification I received tonight has been as open as  
3 possible with public documents for everyone to evaluate  
4 and see exactly what they're doing.

5 They have taken the time and spent the money  
6 to be here tonight to layout exactly what their  
7 intentions are, when they plan to do it and then grab a  
8 group of people that is in broad representation of our  
9 community at large.

10 This is not the sign of someone who wishes to  
11 hide it and -- to hide and confuse the public. I don't  
12 know -- I can't speak for what's happened in the past  
13 and the experience that happened in this crowd, all I  
14 can see is that from this step, from this meeting, this  
15 is a seat change.

16 And I would ask that as part of this  
17 communication process that we're having the information  
18 is being provided, provide the information back. This  
19 is the conversation we're going to have, but ultimately  
20 the facts will win out, the truth will be out and  
21 that's what I hope at the end of the day is what we  
22 stand with and so we can make decisions based on fact  
23 patterns and established truth.

24 CHAIRMAN VICTOR: Thank you very much for the  
25 comment. And I think as we also announce the schedules

1 for the workshops people have particular information  
2 that relates to those workshops in particular. We need  
3 to hear from you about that in advance.

4 Last brief comment, Bill Parker, and then I'm  
5 going to adjourn the meeting.

6 MR. PARKER: We've talked a lot about the issue of  
7 long-term storage of the spent fuel, but there is a lot  
8 of other material that has to be transported from this  
9 site and through our community.

10 As we go through the process, we ought to talk  
11 a little bit about the process of low-level waste  
12 disposal, where, how, truck how, what kind of safety  
13 procedures, monitoring the low-level waste, so I think  
14 that may be done through EIRs.

15 But I think, as a panel we shouldn't focus  
16 exclusively on the long-term spent fuel. There's going  
17 to be a lot of material that is mildly radioactive that  
18 has to be transported through these communities over  
19 all of our highways. What the ultimate destination?  
20 What are the safety precautions? Not just radioactive  
21 materials, but as you talked about acids and other  
22 corrosive materials, what's the -- the safeguard to  
23 ensure that that material doesn't end up in the  
24 environment or in the ocean, so I think we shouldn't  
25 focus exclusively on high-level waste.

1           CHAIRMAN VICTOR: That's wise -- wise advice  
2 indeed. Let me thank the members of the panel, Tom  
3 Palmisano, Chris Thompson, and others from So Cal  
4 Edison and the co-owners, and special thank all of you  
5 for spending your evening with us and sharing your  
6 perspectives. We have a lot of work to do. We should  
7 do it well. People are watching. We can get this  
8 right. And our meeting -- our first meeting is now  
9 adjourned. Thank you very much.

10

11                   (Whereupon the proceedings adjourned at  
12 9:06 p.m.)

13

14

\* \* \* \* \*

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, the undersigned Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of California, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceedings were taken down by me at the time and place therein set forth, at which time the witness was put under oath by me;

That the testimony of the witness and all objections made at the time of the proceedings were recorded stenographically by me and were thereafter transcribed under my direction; that the foregoing is a true record of the testimony and of all objections made at the time of the proceedings.

I further certify that I am neither counsel for nor related to any party to said action, nor in any way interested in the outcome thereof.

The dismantling, unsealing, or unbinding of the original transcript will render the Reporter's certificate null and void.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name on this date, SATURDAY, APRIL 12, 2014.



---

CARLOS R. HICHO  
CSR NO. 13111