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* * *

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR:  Well, welcome this evening.  I want to thank again the people of Oceanside for welcoming us back.  And, I guess, we're not too rowdy a crowd and so we continue to be welcomed back in Oceanside and we'll continue to move the meetings around to other cities in the -- in the area affected by the plant.

My name is David Victor.  I'm chairman of the Community Engagement Panel.  And tonight we're going to be focusing on the environmental issues, in particular, along with a number of other important updates.

A reminder of safety, there are two exits from this room, one is the door that you came in, the other exit, to my surprise, is through this magic curtain. You go past the Wizard of Oz and then there's an exit out the back there.

We have two officers from the Oceanside Police Department in attendance tonight.  I want to thank them for their service. They're here for your safety.

I want to remind everybody that this is -- this panel was set up by Edison, a group of volunteers,
18 volunteers; our purpose is to create a two-way conduit between the co-owners of the plant, as they're engaging in the decommissioning process, and the various communities affected by this, so that the communities can learn more about what's going on in the decommissioning process and so that the co-owners can learn more about what people care about.

So this is an engagement and informational group that has done already quite a lot to help focus this process, but we are not a formal decision-making body.

www.SONGScommunity.com is your favorite website and you can go there to get livestreaming of this event plus copies of previous meetings. All meeting materials and the agenda are posted there.

You can also sign up for Email Blasts, which was sent out on 20th of January and on the 11th of March, too, and you can opt in so that you can get notices of future meetings. You can also do that, I believe, at the table in the back of the room here.

There are hard copies of the agendas on all the chairs as well as copies of hard-to-read -- hard-to-read PowerPoint slides. We have a competition underway, to you have the hardest-to-read PowerPoint slide, and the winners of that competition are on your
chair.

You can also go to the website to sign up for tours of the site. The upcoming tours are on April 23rd, from 9:00 to 11:00 a.m., and May 14th, from 9:00 to 11:00 a.m., those are both Saturdays.

I want to acknowledge two guests -- guests in the room today: Cy Oggins, who is Chief Environmental Planning and Management from the California State Lands Commission, who will give us a presentation later on the California State Lands Commission process.

And so, Cy, welcome you here.

And, Marlayna Vaaler, from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, who is right there, who's waving. She is here as an observer, but you can find her during the break and after the meeting if you have any questions that relate to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission; she can either answer them or help you find places to get them answered.

There are two booths back there. So, during the break you can go get more information on various processes and we will continue to do that at these meetings. I think that's been a terrific part of the meetings, to give people a chance to get additional information.

The public comment period at near the end of
our meeting, which will be at 7:55 tonight, public
comment period, if you want to make a comment, please
sign up at the registration table, which you can do
during the break.

As before, Tim Brown, Vice-Chairman, and Dan
Stetson, Secretary of the Community Engagement Panel,
will keep track of all the comments and identify some
major comments for responses near the end of the
meeting and we will also put out a list of topics that
came up and questions and answers and -- and so on.

If you do not want to make a public comment
but you do want us to know about it, you can send an
email to this address here, at nucomm@SONGS.sce.com and
those comments will become part of the official record
of the meeting and will also be flagged in the -- in
the materials that Dan Stetson puts together that get
answers as a result of the Community Engagement Panel
process.

Please do make sure that you send those
comments within five business days at the end of this
meeting so that we can develop the public record in a
timely and efficient manner.

A couple of more items before we get started,
which is, we have our own version of Daylight Savings
Time here at the Community Engagement Panel, so,
starting with the next meeting, the next meeting will be June 16th and we'll focus on Consolidated Interim Storage, and you see a list here in front of you, up on the screens, of the major topics and dates for future meetings.

We may have to have a discussion about whether getting everybody together the third week in August is a good idea, but we'll talk about that off-line and be back in touch on that topic. Those meetings will begin at 5:30 and run to 8:30, so that's kind of our version of Daylight Savings Time.

And then, Panel Members, when you ask questions during the meeting today, please state your name for those watching on the Livestream and so we get a good record. Along the way, I'll call out various items. Dan -- Dan and Tim will call out various items to make sure that they're captured for the public record.

So those are the main items I wanted to -- informational items before we begin. As it's our custom, we're going to begin with an update on the decommissioning process from Tom Palmisano, who is Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer for Edison.

And, Tom, the floor is yours.

MR. PALMISANO: Thank you, David.
(Background noise.)

Let me get the mic repositioned.

Well, good evening, everybody. Thank you to the panel members for coming out tonight. It's an important topic. And thank you to the members of the public. It's important that we talk regularly about decommissioning, what is planned, and what is going on, and we appreciate the opportunity to talk.

So can I have the next slide, please?

So our decommission principles that we established a couple of years ago as we entered the decommissioning process are important to continually reinforce with ourselves, with the panel, and with the public: Safety, Stewardship, and Engagement.

And Steward -- and Engagement, in particular, that's what tonight is really about. As David said when he opened the meeting, this is meant to be a two-way conduit to allow the panel and the public to understand what's going on, question what's going on, provide input to it. So this is part of our engagement principle. So we appreciate your attendance.

What I'll do is try to give a fairly short overview. The main topic tonight is, really, starting to talk about the California Environmental Quality Act and the associated permitting process. We've touched
on this just lightly in the last couple of years
because most of the last two years the focus has been
on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission requirements, now
we're moving past that into the California specific
requirements as we prepare for decommissioning.

Next slide, please.

So this is our 20-year plan. This, I think,
is one of the winners in the eye-test chart, so that
there is a larger copy on your chair. I won't try to
ask you to read a lot on -- on the screen. What I have
done is highlighted in green what is completed, that
will help us talk quarter to quarter in terms of what's
been completed.

In yellow is generally what are the most
critical activities to completing the decommissioning
in 20 years. Remember, over the last couple of years,
we've talked about a 20-year plan to decommission the
plant, to terminate the NRC license to where it is
reduced to just the spent fuel storage facility, which
will remain for a period of time until DOE removes fuel
from the site, currently expected to be 2049, and then
we would remove that facility by 2052.

So, what's in yellow, in the center of the
page is ISFSI, the Independent Spent Fuel Storage
Installation. We have the permits. We -- I'm going to
give you a milestone in a minute where we're going to start construction, but that would take about the next year to year and a half to build the new facility and then start off-loading the pools.

Down, on the bottom of the chart, you see CEQA, the California Environmental Quality Act permitting, that's really going to be the subject of tonight's discussion, that, really, now is needed before we actually start any dismantlement activities as part of decommissioning.

And then DGC is the Decommissioning General Contractor. We've gone out for a bid. We're in the evaluation stage of selecting the contractor who would ultimately be responsible to the owners to do this work. That's the big picture on the 20-year plan.

Next slide, please.

So the NRC, typically I've talked about NRC submittals; most of those are coming to an end, so I'm going to start talking a little more broadly about the NRC.

Next slide.

So this is a typical chart on the submittals. Everything that's shaded in gray is now complete and approved. We're down to some insurance and records exemptions. The requirements are really built for
operating plants, so these are exemptions to configure the requirements for decommissioning plants. And you can see the dates. I expect those to be approved by the NRC. They're under review now.

Next slide.

NRC Inspections: This is something we have not talked about a lot that we'll talk about every quarter. You know, the NRC, out of Region 4, is the inspection arm and they come in regularly.

They have an inspection protocol for decommissioning plants, so they continue to conduct regular, intrusive inspections to ensure that all our activities comply with our license and with the other requirements the NRC has.

Particularly, they look at any changes we're making to the plant. They look at the controls we have in place to make sure we control activities. As we, someday, start decommissioning, they'll actually look at the physical work, they'll look at effluent environmental monitoring and protection of radioactive material.

The NRC has looked at this regularly through plant operation, so this is not new to them or us, but these are modules really tailored for -- tailored for decommissioning environment.
And the last thing I want to call your attention is, the NRC has started some early work on potential rule-making for decommissioning. The NRC commissioned, about a year ago, and chartered the NRC staff with proposing some rule-making for decommissioning to clarify the rules.

They issued an advanced notice of public rule-making and they took public comments to that and that period closed on March 18th. This is about a five-year process, so it's expected somewhere about 2019. And as final rules are proposed and published, there will be additional opportunities for comments.

So I know a number of people in the audience and on the panel are aware of this and had opportunities to comment. I just want to make sure we keep that in front of ourselves.

Next slide, please.

So Site Activities Update: A little more detail in terms of what is actively going on on site currently.

Next slide.

So we're preparing for decommissioning. We've talked over the last year about Cold and Dark; this is really de-energizing unused plant systems, isolating
systems that are no longer required with the reactors
de-fueled and permanently out of service. Probably, 90
percent of the equipment out there is no longer in
service.

So it is systematically de-energizing that
equipment, draining that equipment, and preparing for
decommissioning.

Removing the Remaining Hazards From the Plant:
That is basically done with respect to acids
and caustics and oils, things that an operating plant
needed we have no need for, so all that has been
shipped off site and disposed of.

Placing the Plant in a Safe Condition for the
Non-Operating Configuration: That really means turning
off the power for unneeded equipment.

And, then, Preparing the Plant for Eventual
Safe Decommissioning While Protecting Used Nuclear
Fuel: So we have spent fuel or used nuclear fuel
stored in two fuel pools and a third of it is already
in the dry cask storage system from the last decade.

So, as we prepare for decommissioning, it's
important we protect that and that's our responsibility
to manage that properly and protect the health and
safety of our workers and the public and, eventually,
we will empty the spent fuel pools, so it will all be
in dry cask storage and further assures protection as the decommissioning takes place.

Then, I expect this work to be done -- the spent fuel pools won't be emptied for a couple of years, but this work to be done by July of 2016.

Next slide, please.

Yes?

MR. QUINN: Ted Quinn.

Tom, I wanted to ask you, you could describe lessons learned from earlier plants that are ahead of us, like Zi -- Zion is an example.

MR. PALMISANO: Cert -- certainly.

MR. QUINN: Could you give an example of how you see lessons learned?

MR. PALMISANO: So, what we have done in the last two years, we have visited every plant currently entering decommissioning, in particular, the Zion Plant, which is in similar size 2 Unit plant just north of Chicago, in quite a dense population area, as well.

They are ahead of us in decommissioning, but they are actively decommissioning. In the last two years, they've emptied their spent fuel pool, they've removed their major components, and they're preparing for the major structure removal. So we have visited them quite a bit and they've been very gracious in
hosting our various teams.

So the things we've learned are really embedded in some of this Cold and Dark activity; the need to remove hazards as soon as you can, the need to de-energize the plant as soon as you can, get the plant in a Cold and Dark condition, the need to make sure that the NRC is well aware of what we're doing so we have good communications.

And then as we mobilize contractors, the need to be clear on expectations and that the contractors understand and perform effectively.

There are some very specific technical things we've learned but, generally, it has been very helpful to get us off to a good start with our planning and preparations.

MR. QUINN: Thanks.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Tim Brown, do you have a question?

MR. PALMISANO: Okay. Yes, Tim.

MR. BROWN: You know, one thing, Tom, that I wanted to ask, you have the NRC inspections on the decommissioning process.

MR. PALMISANO: Right.

MR. BROWN: But there's also separate inspections on the storage, on the fuel that's being
stored on site, as well.

MR. PALMISANO:  Sure.

MR. BROWN:  Or and -- and could you just, just so that everyone understands, you know, how -- how those inspections work, because it's --

MR. PALMISANO:  Yeah.

MR. BROWN:  I would imagine it's a different process.

MR. PALMISANO:  Well, it is. Different inspectors with different skill sets. So, think about it this way: The NRC knows exactly where we are and what we're doing on site, we have phone calls every two weeks, we provide them our schedules.

So the NRC has an inspection plan for San Onofre that they lay out nominally a year in advance, identifying some key things. They have some things they must inspect regularly, like they would come in and look at radiological protection controls regularly, I believe, say, on a two-year basis.

They'll come in and inspect emergency planning because we still have an emergency plan. They'll come in and inspect security. So there are a lot of non-decommissioning topics, if you will, that they would do routinely.

They would come in and inspect spent fuel
stored in the pools as well as spent fuel stored in the
dry cask storage system on a regular basis. In fact,
over the last two weeks, we had recent inspections,
looking at spent fuel looking at how we're caring for
spent fuel and our recordkeeping.

So they have a full regime of inspection
activities that they implement. Then they will have
some decommissioning-specific things as I'm doing a
major activity, they will come out and periodically
inspect as we build the new dry cask storage system,
for example. So that's generally how it works.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: We should let you go on.

I just want to say, I know many members of
this panel and the public are concerned about how we
speed up the removal of fuel and that will be the main
update item right after the break when we come back.

MR. PALMISANO: Right. And even before the
break, I'm going to touch on a couple related topics
that we've been working on.

So the ISFSI, this is the Independent Spent
Fuel Storage Installation or the dry cask storage
facility. On the picture, above the diagram, that's
outlined in red, is the existing dry cask storage
installation. We have 51 canisters, 50 of which are
loaded with spent fuel from units 1, 2, and 3.

The new system that has recently been permitted is outlined in red, that is the new Holtec underground system called the UMAX System. So that is the location that's been approved by the California Coastal Commission.

Let's go to the next slide, please.

So the timeline, so the project initiated in the fall of 2015, really, talking about the Coastal Commission work at that point. Construction scheduled to complete in mid-2017. We will actually start construction, I'm expecting, in April of 2016.

It's about a 15-month construction period to build the new system, build the appropriate security system around it. I would expect us to be ready to offload fuel from the two spent fuel pools in the fall of 2017 into the new system.

And, then, our current plan is, all the fuel will be out of the two fuel pools into the ISFSI facility in mid-2019, potentially a bit earlier, but that's a good date right now.

So those are the key milestones and we'll status this every quarterly Community Engagement Panel meeting.

Next slide, please.
So one of the topics we touched on last time, which really is part of what we'll be talking about later is, you know, we're very interested. It is important to move the fuel out of San Onofre as soon as we can practically do that. We're all aligned on that.

It is not -- it is in our best interest to work to find an off-site location where there's Consolidated Interim Storage or permanent repository.

The issue is the Department of Energy, and I'm sure we're going to talk about that in a minute. But the question is, what is available today and when would the fuel be ready to be transported?

So there -- there's requirements on the spent fuel as to how long it sits in the spent fuel pool before I can put it in canisters. There are other requirements for how much longer it needs to wait before it can be transported off site; that's what this is talking about.

So, today, this is -- this is kind of a high-level view. Out of the unit 2 and 3 fuel, there's 33 canisters, some of which are ready and meet the requirements to ship today, if there was a place to ship it to, and the remainder of the 33 will be qualified by 2019 to be moved off site.

The Unit 1 canisters are actually a little
different story. There are 17 canisters and they won't
be ready until 2018 and some will have to wait until
2030. You may ask why that is.

The reason is because the material in the
Unit 1 fuel is stainless steel that is surrounding the
uranium pellets. That's an old fuel design. Today the
industry uses a different material called zirconium.
Nobody try to remember that. We'll put it on our
website.

The newer materials are able to ship much
sooner because they are less active and less
radioactive. The old stainless steel is more
radioactive and just takes longer decay time, so that's
why the Unit 1 canisters, and Unit 1 has not operated
since 1992, but that's why the canisters have to wait
so long until they're eligible to ship.

And then the remaining canisters we're going
to load 73 canisters, starting in late 2017. With the
newer design canister systems, they will virtually be
ready to all ship by 2020 because, again, they're
improved canisters, with better shielding and
heat-removal designs, and they will be eligible to ship
virtually as soon as they're on the pad.

So that's the picture in terms of when things
could be shipped, that's not when -- when things will
be shipped, that's when they could be shipped. That is an important factor as we talk about giving priority to decommissioned plants, like San Onofre.

Next slide.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Tom, before you go on, can I suggest, you and I have had some email exchange over the last month about exactly when the different canisters --

MR. PALMISANO: Right.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- will be ready to ship, assuming there's a place for them to go.

And this slide, I think, is very helpful. Maybe we could turn all that into a short memo of just a paragraph or so.

MR. PALMISANO: I'll be glad to.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Along with this slide, and put this up on the website because I know a lot of people are interested in this question, that would help.

MR. PALMISANO: Yeah. What we're talking about, for those 33 canisters, I can show you, virtually, every day and when it's going to be eligible, same thing for the remaining 17. So we'll be glad to do that and we'll take an action and post that on the website.
CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Bill Parker.

MR. PALMISANO: Yes, sir.

MR. PARKER: Bill Parker.

Tom, you talked about when the canisters are eligible to be shipped, but there's still issues of the design of the transport vehicles --

MR. PALMISANO: Right.

MR. PARKER: -- permitting for transport and so on. Can you estimate how much longer beyond these eligibility dates we'd be in a position to practically transport these canisters, assuming there was a place to transport them to?

MR. PALMISANO: Sure. Let me ask you to hold that thought because I'm going to talk about the railcar in a minute.

And, David Victor, are you going to talk about some of that after the break or your focus is mainly on storage?

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I'm going to talk briefly about what we've been learning at the federal level --

MR. PALMISANO: Okay.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- and the transport side, as well, but you should definitely talk about this and the railcar.
MR. PALMISANO: So I'll cover this now and we'll cover it again later after the break because it is very important. Because, the big picture, we all want to move the spent fuel out of San Onofre as soon as we practically can.

The canisters and the shipping transportation cask is one issue and that really is falling into place. The other issue is, really, the railcar to transport it, the transportation routes, and all the requirements for transport, and then, ultimately, where does it go to, a licensed facility for either interim storage or for final repository.

Big picture. The good news, and I recently talked to the DOE at fairly high levels, we're encouraging to bring up their experience outside the commercial world. The DOE has a wealth of experience with shipping spent nuclear fuel out of the government program, such as the Nuclear Navy. So they have a lot of experience and capability they can bring to bear to the commercial side.

Next slide.

So one important meeting, and there's an opportunity April 26 is San -- Sacramento, the DOE has revised its strategy following the Blue Ribbon Commission a couple of years ago to start talking about
consent-based siting.

There's been a couple of difficult lessons learned in the industry by the commercial industry and by the Department of Energy, one of which is Yucca Mountain, which really ran into a lot of state and local opposition and, ultimately, you know, essentially got put on hold in spite of being required by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act.

The other is private fuel storage, which was actually a facility licensed in Utah for Consolidated Interim Storage, but never got built because although there was local support by the Indian tribe, there was not sufficient support at a state level.

So one of the things the DOE has realized they've got to do differently as they site a facility is get more consent-based, particularly, the hosting community. So they've got a series of meetings around the country, Chicago and Atlanta are coming up very quickly and Sacramento, where they are looking for public comment and stakeholder comment.

And I believe this is also available on the Web, so if you -- if you can attend, if you can listen to the Web cast, it's certainly worth doing if you have a passion on this. And you can see the other meetings.

Next slide.
So, Railcar: So the good news is, the DOE has actually let a contract to develop a concept railcar. This -- this is an example of one: That would be one canister in a transportation overpack mounted on the low part of that railcar and it's designed with impact limiters and these things are tested.

So they're actually in the early development stage. They've set a contract with AREVA to develop the cask and the buffer railcars and the railcar itself. The other thing is private fuel storage facility, and we actually were part-owners of that. We actually engineered and built a prototype railcar.

So that, coupled with what DOE does in their non-nuclear commercial program, such as for the Nuclear Navy, they have railcar expertise. So -- so that is starting to move in parallel with consent-based siting.

Next slide.

This is a DOE slide. It's not my slide. So I apologize how busy it is. Their remarks on private storage. They would like -- they are supportive of this initiative.

They see a role and this is important because they really need to move off the permanent repository to work on interim storage, so I'll leave that for you to read.
But this is encouraging. That's what -- this is an encouraging development in the last year with the DOE, stepping out and taking this.

Next slide.

Before I get to these topics, coming back to -- to Bill Parker's question, so "How long will things take?" Okay. We've talked to the vendors who are proposing consolidated private storage facilities in New Mexico and West Texas; one is about to apply for the license in Texas, and the New Mexico facility will apply probably this summer.

Practically, with the experience in private fuel storage, they can license these in three years. These are essentially, centrally-located dry cask storage systems similar to what we already have. So there's a lot of construction experience. They could have a facility open 2020 to 2022, licensing and construction.

Now, the next step is you need the railcar and you need the transportation logistics worked out. You know, I will tell you, that's probably a 10-year effort, just my -- my estimation. But I would think they could be ready to accept fuel as early as the early- to mid-2020s.

And I think rail and transportation, with the
DOE's other experience brought to bear could be ready. And, then, you've heard me say it before, for us to fully empty our 120-some canisters, it's probably an 8- to 10-year process when you look at the number of trains in and out to ship the fuel. So that gives you a high-level answer, hopefully.

MR. PARKER: Yes.

MR. PALMISANO: Okay. Next -- next slide.

So if you remember, a couple of last meetings we were asked to do an economic comparison of the economic impact or inflow to the communities of decommissioning and compare it to when we were an operating plant. This really just closes out the last action item.

Effectively, in decommissioning, for part of the period, we will have about 17 percent of the numbers that we had during operation. FTEs are Full-Time Equivalence or, you know, full-time employees.

The labor -- the labor budget or labor income will be 12 percent of what we had during operation, and the decommissioning total output for the total output during the entire compared operation, we will contribute about 9 percent to the local communities in terms of spending versus what the plant did when it was
fully operating.

So I think that was an action item that you had asked for.

HON. TIM BROWN: It was. And the reason, just so that everyone is in context on this, there was a decommissioning study that was done in terms of economic impact.

MR. PALMISANO: Right.

HON. TIM BROWN: The problem was is that it existed in isolation. It simply said --

MR. PALMISANO: Right.

HON. TIM BROWN: -- "Here's all the -- here's the economic activity generated by decommissioning," and what it lacked was context based on --

MR. PALMISANO: Right.

HON. TIM BROWN: -- full operation to decommissioning to Cold and Dark to remove. And so this is -- this is designed to give context to those numbers. If you have a plant fully operational and this -- the decommissioning activity, although significant in terms of economic impact, this helps get context in terms of what type of fraction it is based on full operating.

MR. PALMISANO: Right. If you would roughly -- I think it's about 10 percent of what we
contributed when we operated.

HON. TIM BROWN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you.

MR. PALMISANO: Okay. Next slide.

And with that, I want to take any questions from the panel at this point, anything else that --

(Simultaneous colloquy.)

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Any questions --

MR. PALMISANO: -- we haven't touched on?

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- from the panel?

(Brief pause.)

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. So thank you very much, Tom.

MR. PALMISANO: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: This is, as always, very helpful. Thank you also for following up on this item on the economic impact.

So the core topic for tonight's meeting concerns the environmental review and permitting process. We're going to have two presentations: First from Linda Anabtawi, who is with the Licensing and Environmental Law Group at SCE, and then we're going to hear from Cy Oggins, from -- from the State.

So, first, Linda, the floor is yours.

(Brief pause.)
MS. ANABTAWI: Okay. Thank you, David.

Good evening. I'm very pleased to be here today to discuss this important topic with you. As David mentioned, I'm in-house counsel with the Southern California Edison Law Department and, for the last several years, I've been working on SONGS-related environmental issues on behalf of the co-participants.

If we could turn to the next slide, please.

I will be providing a high-level overview of the permitting for decommissioning. But before we talk specifically about decommissioning, I think it's helpful to provide some context for the SONGS regulatory framework.

So, like all other nuclear plants, we are subject to regulation and oversight by the NRC.

But we are somewhat uniquely situated for a number of reasons:

First, we're located along the California Coast, which makes us subject to coastal zone regulations. We also don't own the land upon which the plant is located, so we have state and federal agencies acting as landowners.

This combination of the state and the federal agencies means that we are subject to environmental review under both CEQA and the federal equivalent,
which is the National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA.

So, as a result, we have a long and substantial permitting history at SONGS, involving numerous agencies, and that will continue to be the case as we move into the decommissioning process.

So, specifically for decommissioning, we have really two sets of approvals that we're looking at:

We have state approvals that will be subject to a CEQA review and that scope will cover the decontamination and dismantlement work, also referred to as D&D, as well as the offshore conduit disposition.

I should clarify here that although we say "decontamination," what we're talking about is not so much the radiological issues associated with decommissioning, what the state agencies are looking at, really, is the physical work, the physical activities that will be conducted to decontaminate.

In addition to the state approvals, we will be obtaining several federal approvals, which will then trigger their own environmental review process under NEPA, and that process will really be for the site restoration activities and the ultimate license termination.

For today, our focus is on the state process, and the reason for that is, these approvals will be
needed to start the D&D work and that is our priority at this time. I believe the federal approvals will be addressed at a future CEP meeting.

If we can turn to the next slide, please.

So this aerial image just helps to show you the way of the land, so to speak. As I mentioned, there are several landowner agencies that are involved. So, what you see here outlined in red is the State Lands lease for the offshore conduits. These structures extend offshore. They are buried beneath the sea floor.

In addition, the onshore components of the facility are outlined in yellow there, that is the Navy easement area, which is approximately 84 acres. We also have a lease from the Navy that covers several parcels, including the one you see outlined in white there.

So, again, this just gives a big picture perspective of these various land rights that are at play here at SONGS. And I believe you have this image of the handout as a larger printout form, so you can see some of the details a little bit better.

So, the next slide, please.

To give you a better idea of the types of agencies that will be involved, this is a
non-exhaustive list of the state and federal agencies that will have some role in overseeing the SONGS decommissioning process.

As I mentioned, the key approvals we need now in order to start the D&D work are state approvals and, more specifically, the State Lands Commission and the Coastal Commission will both be issuing approvals that will be necessary to begin the work.

If we can please go to the next slide, I'll talk a little bit more about State Lands Commission and Coastal Commission roles.

As I mentioned, we have a lease for the offshore conduits for Units 2 and 3. We have requested a modification of the lease from the State Lands Commission for two reasons:

First, that lease will be expiring in 2023, so we are seeking to extend the term to cover the decommissioning period. In addition, we are requesting that State Lands approve an alternative that will allow for the partial removal and abandonment in place of the conduits, which is similar to what was approved for Unit 1.

This action by the State Lands Commission in reviewing the lease triggers the CEQA review process and, as the lead agency under CEQA, State Lands will be
preparing the Environmental Impact Report or EIR.

And although the State Lands Commission is approving the offshore component of the project, as the lead agency under CEQA, State Lands will be looking at the entire decommissioning project, which would include both the onshore as well as the offshore activities.

And Cy Oggins, from the State Lands Commission, has graciously agreed to participate in today's meeting so that he can provide all the details about the State Lands Commission process, including all the opportunities for public involvement.

In terms of the California Coastal Commission, because we are located in the coastal zone, we will be obtaining or -- sorry -- we will be applying for a Coastal Development Permit or CDP that would authorize the onshore and the offshore activities.

The Coastal Commission will be very involved during the preparation of the EIR and, ultimately, the Coastal Commission will prepare its own staff report in connection with the permit and that staff report will rely on the environmental analysis that's contained in the EIR.

If we could go to the next slide, please.

To give you a better idea of the scope that will be covered in the CEQA document, the area that's
highlighted in blue are the project areas where decommissioning activities will primarily be taking place.

The -- this is the same area that would be included in the Coastal Commission CDP. And I believe we also have a printout of this aerial figure to show some of the details a little bit better.

MR. QUINN: So -- Ted Quinn.

Can I ask? In the relationship of this Coastal Commission to the Department of the Navy and the federal, do they both provide approvals? Or how does it work?

MS. ANABTAWI: That's a good question.

So the Coastal Commission will be playing a role both under the California Coastal Act as well as the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act. So, under the Coastal Act, the Coastal Commission is issuing the permit, which is the CDP.

Later on, when we undergo the federal permitting process, there will be a separate consistency review by the Coastal Commission, so they will be playing that dual role.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Can I just follow up on that? Which is, I've asked when the time is right for us to have a chance to talk with the folks in the Navy
and I think we -- we're in the process of trying to put that together and, I think, whenever that's appropriate, I think it would be very helpful for this panel to hear from the Navy, I think, for the community to hear it from the Navy.

MS. ANABTAWI. Okay.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Could you say something about if you leave the conduits in place, what gets removed and what gets left in place?

MS. ANABTAWI: So, what we did for Unit 1, I can use that as the example, for Unit 1, we were required to move all of the vertical structures, so that included the manhole access ports as well as the terminal structures.

And, then, the horizontal portion of the conduit, which is really the pipelines, so to speak, that remains buried underneath the sea floor.

The Unit 2 and Unit 3 conduits are constructed somewhat differently, but they also will have certain vertical structures. In this case, we have diffuser ports that are staggered all along the outfall conduit.

So we haven't really discussed the details of the proposal yet with State Lands, but similar to Unit 1, we'd be seeking to remove some or all of the vertical structures while leaving the horizontal
structure buried beneath the sea floor.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you.

Dan, do you want to comment on this?

MR. STETSON: I do.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Dan Stetson.

MR. STETSON: A quick question, so. Thank you. With reference to your drawings here, for Unit 1, are the conduits approximately of your image, of what you have for 2 and 3 in terms so that we're seeing Units 2 and 3, but for Unit 1, not shown on this diagram?

MS. ANABTAWI: Not quite. As I mentioned, the Unit 2 and 3 conduits are constructed somewhat differently. They're also different lengths than the Unit 1 conduit. So I think I have the numbers here for some reference.

So our Unit 2 and 3 conduits extend about -- the intake structures are 3300 feet long and the discharge structures are 8400 feet and 6,000 feet long, whereas our Unit 1 conduits, I think, we have the number for that and -- (brief pause)

We'll get that number for you, but there is a significant difference in the length of the conduits, so it doesn't look like what you're seeing there, but I think we've provided a link to the Unit 1 EIR and that
1 has a drawing that would --
2
3 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Maybe if that drawing
4 can be shared with the panel, that'd be great.
5
6 MS. ANABTAWI: Sure.
7
8 MR. STETSON: So -- I'm sorry. In the initial
9 agreement, though, with Southern California Edison with
10 State Lands, was it these conduits would be removed; is
11 that correct?
12
13 MS. ANABTAWI: Are you asking about the
14 original agreement for Unit 1 or for 2 and 3?
15
16 MR. STETSON: For both.
17
18 MS. ANABTAWI: Okay. So the Unit 1 conduits
19 were under a separate lease.
20
21 MR. STETSON: Right.
22
23 MS. ANABTAWI: And, yes, that lease originally
24 contemplated for removal, but an environmental review
25 was conducted in 2005 and that environmental review,
26 which Cy can speak more about, evaluated several
27 different options, and the EIR concluded that the
28 partial removal option was environmentally preferable
29 to full removal.
30
31 And so, based on that, State Lands Commission
32 then approved an amendment of the Unit 1 lease that
33 allowed for the ultimate disposition.
34
35 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Why don't we wait until
Cy gets his talk --

MR. STETSON: Correct.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- and then we'll cycle back on this topic.

MS. ANABTAWI: Okay.

MR. KERN: But where -- Hi, this is Jerry Kern.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: This is Jerry Kern.

MR. KERN: Where are the Unit 1 conduits in relationship to Unit 2 and 3?

MS. ANABTAWI: They are located -- I don't know if I can use the pointer, I might be able to show you here. They're located north of the Unit 2 and 3 conduits, so they would be somewhere over here (indicating).

MR. KERN: Okay.

MS. ANABTAWI: And those structures have now been fully dispositioned, so we've completed the work that was required in order to comply with the State Lands Commission lease.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: We should let you go.

MR. BROWN: I just --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Garry Brown.

MR. BROWN: I just have one quick question on -- on the difference of construction, 2 and 3 have
diffusers going out.

MS. ANABTAWI: Right.

MR. BROWN: Now, are those on vertical risers or are they attached to the -- are they a part of the running pipeline?

MS. ANABTAWI: They are attached to the pipeline. It's just that they rise above the sea floor, whereas the rest of the pipeline is approximately 6 feet beneath the sea floor.

MR. BROWN: Okay. In your proposal, and I know you haven't got the final details, but those would be plugged?

MS. ANABTAWI: We have not actually discussed the details for the diffuser ports. We just haven't gotten to that point. I can tell you that there are over 120 diffuser ports so we would really have to closely look at that before we propose an alternative.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I think when we get -- we should let you go on. I think when you have -- when there's a clear game plan there and this has been discussed with State Lands, it would be helpful to share with this panel and the public what that game plan looks like even if it's in draft form.

MS. ANABTAWI: Absolutely.

MR. PALMISANO: Just let me interject, what's
going to be covered in some public comment
opportunities through the whole process, so --

    CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR:  Okay.

    MR. PALMISANO:  Between both the CEP meeting
and the designed public opportunity, you know, comment
opportunities, we'll share all that, yeah.

    CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR:  Okay. We should let you
go on.

    MS. ANABTAWI:  Can we turn to the next slide,
please?  All right. Okay. Thank you.

So in terms of the progress we have made to
date, since retiring SONGS, we have obtained state
approvals for various projects.

    First, we went into the California Coastal
Commission last year and obtained approval for certain
interim activities, these include the Cold and Dark
project that you've heard Tom talk about.

    Most recently, the Coastal Commission approved
our Spent Fuel Pool Island Project, that was approved
in August of 2015. This project helped us to eliminate
our reliance on the ocean water for cooling fuel.

    In addition, the Coastal Commission approved
our ISFSI expansion, that was approved last fall and,
as you've also heard from Tom, that project is now
underway.
Most recently, we applied to the State Lands Commission to modify the conduits lease for Units 2 and 3; that application was submitted in November and that is the application that is triggering the CEQA review now.

We have not yet submitted our CDP application to the Coastal Commission, but we plan to do so, most likely mid-2017 or so.

Can we go to the next slide, please?

This time line really shows you the sequencing of the various permitting efforts and the decommissioning work. So, I'd like to point out a couple of things on this time line: So, first of all, these are all approximate time frames. This is our ideal schedule, but it is a tentative schedule.

And you'll see there there's also the dotted or dashed line, that's the demarcation in terms of the time period. So to the left of that line, these are quarterly intervals; to the right of the line, you'll see annual intervals or longer periods of time.

So, in the short term here, what we're looking at, starting at the top with the red bar, the ISFSI expansion project is underway. Over the next couple of years the fuel will be off-loaded and then we'll enter this period of storage until the eventual off-site
shipment of the fuel.

Jumping down to the blue bar, that represents the State Lands and Coastal Commission regulatory processes that are associated with the lease and the CDP. That process has been initiated through the filing of the application with State Lands last year.

And in parallel with those processes, the State Lands Commission will conduct its CEQA review, the output from the CEQA review will be the EIR and that will help inform decision-makers at the State Lands Commission and the Coastal Commission.

And once we obtain the necessary approvals, it's our goal to be able to commence the D&D work at the end of 2017, if all goes well, and that will continue on for a number of years.

In the meantime, probably sometime, again, around the middle of 2017, we will initiate the federal approval process that will trigger its own NEPA review that will look at the site restoration activities.

So, again, that will be something we'll likely discuss in a future meeting, but the time line really serves as a road map of where we're headed in the short-term as well as the long-term for permitting efforts.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And you're telling us
that the NEPA review, the federal environmental review, the NEPA review is triggered by the Navy, the Navy relationship, could run through 2020.

MS. ANABTAWI: It actually could -- yes, it could run through 2020. And this is only just a very tentative projection. We're still working with the Navy early on to determine how long they think their NEPA process will take, so I don't think we have a very good idea of that yet, so we've just kind of mapped out what we think would be a reasonable scenario.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Ted Quinn?

MR. QUINN: Yeah, it's Ted Quinn.

I have one, very quick, there are a number of facilities along the California Coast that have been decommissioned that are not nuclear, that are coal or oil or some kind of fire. Do you see precedent in your review, you see precedent cases that can apply on and help this process?

MS. ANABTAWI: As I mentioned, I think we're actually in a very unique situation --

MR. QUINN: Okay.

MS. ANABTAWI: -- in terms of, again, the landowner agencies, so we've got a whole different permitting regime that involves landowner rights and landowner requirement that, I think, will be likely
precedent-setting here, so.

MR. QUINN: Thanks.

MS. ANABTAWI: Can we go to the next slide, please?

So, finally, I wanted to just discuss very briefly a few other SONGS-related environmental initiatives. These are not decommissioning projects, but they are noteworthy environmental projects. First, we have the Large Organism Exclusion Device or the LOED.

This is a barrier that will be placed around the intake structures for the conduits and it is intended to prevent marine organisms from entering the conduits. This is a requirement under California's Once-Through Cooling Policy or OTC Policy.

Once we ceased operations, we actually drastically reduced our withdrawals of ocean water. I think, the number is something to the effect of 96 percent reduction in ocean water intake and discharges.

So we already achieved substantial compliance with the OTC Policy through these reduced discharges, and the LOED, really, is the last step to achieve full compliance with the OTC Policy.

So we've submitted the permits that are required for that project and they are currently under
review by the Coastal Commission and other agencies.

And, then, very importantly, we have the Marine Mitigation Program at SONGS, so these are the mitigation projects that are intended to offset the impacts from the operation of SONGS, and so we have the Wheeler North Reef and the San Dieguito Wetlands.

The reef is 178 acre artificial reef that was constructed by SCE and San Dieguito is a 151 acre wetlands restoration project. These projects are independent from decommissioning, so they will continue on despite the plant's decommissioning status.

And if you're interested in learning more about these projects, the Coastal Commission holds annual public workshops for the reef and for the wetlands, the next workshop will be on April 4th and it's at the Ocean Institute in Dana Point.

And that concludes my presentation. I'm happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Garry Brown.

MR. BROWN: I just have a question on the LOED. And, basically, it's -- you know, with a lot of agencies that have outfall pumps, they're going to wedge wire screens, if they have operational ones.

But I'm curious about the name large organism. I would think that you would want to block it off a
hundred percent. Large organism means that impingement 
entrainment could possibly go on.

    MS. ANABTAWI: So that is the terminology 
that's actually in the policy itself.
    MR. BROWN: Right.
    MS. ANABTAWI: And as you know, the policy 
 requires spacings of no more than 9 inches. I can tell 
 you that we monitor the intakes. Even now, there have 
 not been any marine mammal entrapments at the plant.
    MR. BROWN: But our concern is the larvae and 
everything. I mean, I would assume you would put a 
hundred percent blockage.
    MS. ANABTAWI: It's actually a completely 
different situation now than we were -- when we were 
operating. And, Tom, you can probably step in here, 
but I know our flow rates have changed drastically 
since.

    CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Let's comment on this 
briefly and then I want to see the other comments.
    MR. PALMISANO: Yes, I'll keep it brief, and I 
won't jump into gallons per minute. But with the 
plants off-line permanently, we -- we take only 3 to 4 
percent of the intake we used to take.
    MR. BROWN: Right.
    MR. PALMISANO: And, you know, with the spent
fuel pool cooling islands in place we've reduced that further so, eventually, we'll get to virtually zero intake. This -- this system, the Large Organism Exclusion Device, is not for larvae, for example, it's for marine mammals.

And, operationally, we would've had to do this, and even in decommissioning, we will still do this for the period where these are still active, and we can provide more information off-line.

MR. STETSON: And, Tom, you're working towards a closed system anyway; right?

MR. PALMISANO: We are, yeah. So that's the step to taking the plant Cold and Dark, although, we will get to virtually a zero intake, so.

MS. ANABTAWI: Okay.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Other comments or questions?

Can I suggest that we send a reminder around to this panel and to people who have asked to be kept informed of the community engagement process about these workshops here because I think they'd be helpful?

And the other thing is, I've seen some -- some materials in my inbox, my inbox is very full with a lot things that people have to say about this, but -- about the performance of Wheeler North Reef.
And I think it would be helpful for this panel to understand, you know, what's worked, what hasn't worked, what's been the actual performance of these projects, and how do we make sure that, if it's an ongoing obligation, how is that funded and -- because I think that would be important for the communities to understand and maybe there's some feedback that the communities can give to Edison as to how to -- how to do that well.

MR. PALMISANO: So if it's okay, what I'd like to do, not to get us off track tonight, since we have the April 4th workshop where we'll be talking about the reef performance --

MS. ANABTAWI: Right.

MR. PALMISANO: -- we can bring it into the second quarter meeting following that workshop.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: That would be great.

MR. PALMISANO: Do you think that would be okay?

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And even share the materials.

MR. PALMISANO: I'd be happy to do that.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: To post the materials to those workshops on the SONGScommunity.com.

MR. PALMISANO: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Or .net or whatever we are and -- and then share them with this panel. Thank you.

MR. PALMISANO: So we'll take that action for the next meeting.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you.

MS. ANABTAWI: Okay.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you, Linda.

MS. ANABTAWI: All right. Great.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: That was very helpful.

MS. ANABTAWI: So I'm going to turn it over to Cy Oggins, from the State Lands Commission.

And this is the really interesting part of the presentation.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you.

So, Cy Oggins, who's Chief of the Environmental Planning and Management Group at the California State Lands Commission.

Cy, thank you very much for spending the evening with us and for helping us understand what's about to happen.

MR. OGGINS: I hope I do.

Thank you, Chair Victor and members of the panel and members of the public.

Again, I'm Cy Oggins. And the focus of my
presentation today will really be on public, both on
Public Trust and on CEQA public review.

So in good, old-time journalistic tradition, I
hope to leave you with a quick understanding of who,
what, when, where and why -- who the State Lands
Commission is, what we do, why we're the lead agency,
and Linda mentioned it briefly but I will go into it in
a little bit more depth, and then when, where and how
the public will be involved in the CEQA process.

State Lands Commission was created in 1938.
We manage state lands, as the name implies. We are
comprised of three members, the commission is comprised
of three members:

Two are constitutional officers, they include
the controller, who this year is our Chair; Lieutenant
Governor, Gavin Newsom; and then the Head of the
Department of Finance, appointed by Governor Brown.

(Brief pause) Sorry about that.

The roots of our -- the Commission are really
the Public Trust Doctrine, and I'll go into that in a
second. As the agency, we manage 1110 miles of
coastline, including offshore SONGS, 4 million acres of
land of both offshore and onshore.

The offshore land goes out to 3 nautical
miles, the inshore -- onshore we are to -- we're
managing 120 rivers and sloughs, 40 lakes, including
Lake Tahoe, Owens Lake, which no longer has water, and
thousands of miles of non-coastal shoreline throughout
San Francisco Bay Delta and other areas. Also, the
Colorado River is under our jurisdiction. So it's a
pretty wide range throughout the State.

This essentially is a famous law case that
provides kind of a little bit of background for what
the State Lands Commission does. It means that we
cannot sell our lands, it's managed for the public.

It's vested in health and trust for the People
of the State, for originally navigation, fishing and
commerce, but the courts have expanded that to a number
of other issues.

As I said, court cases often expand our
jurisdiction and mesh with Audubon, which is for
Mono Lake. So we have an affirmative duty to take the
Public Trust into account and to protect the Public
Trust use wherever possible.

Again, traditionally Public Trust uses were
commerce, navigation and fishing, but it also -- also
includes now harbors, marinas, wharves, water-dependent
and water-oriented recreation, ecological preservation
and other issues.

Again, the roots of the Public Trust Doctrine
go all the way back to Roman Law, where it says the
air, rivers and sea are incapable of private ownership.

Now, it's the English Common Law, with the
Sovereigns, holds the land in trust for the public.
So, again, we own the land as a state agency. It's
held in trust for the public.

So the Trust Doctrine is also part of the
California Constitution. So, again, just going back to
the affirmative duty for the State Lands Commission to
any actions it takes must be consistent with the Public
Trust.

So the commission's role in SONGS
decommissioning: As Linda mentioned, we own the land
where the conduits are located. There is an active
lease for those lands. You mentioned Unit 1 and Unit
2 -- I'm sorry -- Unit 1, in 2005, the Commission did
approve the decommissioning of Unit 1, in a certain
manner.

Again, the original proposal was or the
original lease required removal of the full facilities.
The Commission underwent, prepared an Environmental
Impact Report, much like it's going to do for Units 2
and 3, and it made the decision at the time, based on
the information presented in the Environmental Impact
Report, to leave some of the components in place.
That was a decision of the Commission in 2005 when this -- when this Commission reviews the project for Units 2 and 3 and they come to a completely different decision again.

So, what we're going to be doing, as I'll lay out shortly, is preparing an informational document for the members of the public, for the Commission to review that will look at various impacts and alternatives to the project and then the Commission itself, not me, I'm staff, I'm not the Commission, the Commission itself will make the decision on whether to leave, you know, components in place or whether to remove them.

So, hopefully, that answers your quick questions on Unit 1 or I can come back to that later.

Okay. Busy slide; I apologize for that. But you have your handouts for this, and this is on our website. It essentially is what the Commission looks like when it asks for an application for a project. Again, this is a slightly different project than we normally do because we already have a lease with Southern California Edison for Units 2 and 3.

Now, Southern California Edison has come back to us to remove decommissioning Units 2 and 3, so they still fill out an application. And what this is doing -- I don't think I have --
Well, essentially, what this is doing, it's -- it's starting the process for the environmental review. Southern California Edison is filling out a whole number of questions for us that will then be -- start to be incorporated into the environmental review. What are the scenic impacts of your project? What are your impacts to plants and animals?

Issues that, again, as I go through this, you'll see in the environmental document. Lots of questions they have to answer.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Are -- are you expecting they're just going to say yes to every one of these; right?

MR. OGGINS: It's totally up to the applicant. We go through these as staff. The process is simply, we receive an application, we determine whether it's complete or incomplete. It doesn't, in a sense -- I don't want to say it doesn't matter. The environmental review will flesh out all of these questions.

So why is the State Lands Commission the lead agency?

Well, lead agency is the agency with the public. It's a public agency with the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project.

Okay. CEQA is triggered in three reasons:
One, if the agency is -- takes an action on a project, it approves the project; it could also occur if an agency funds a project. When an agency actually does the work itself and carries out, you know, and does the work. CEQA is triggered in all three circumstances.

In this case, the Commission will be taking action on an application received from Southern California Edison to decommission the project. So, CEQA is triggered. We own the land for the offshore components.

As you mentioned, the existing lease conditions say "restore the site." The Commission will look at the environmental information to decide if that's the best alternative, the environmentally superior alternative.

And then the Commission will prepare an EIR that will analyze the whole of the project, as Linda mentioned, not just the offshore component but the whole of the project.

I hate to jump into CEQA because some of you may not know what CEQA is. So this is just a placeholder for that. It goes back to 1970. It was signed by Governor Reagan. And it basically requires us to identify the environmental impacts of a project.
And then if there are significant environmental impacts, it requires mitigation to mitigate for those impacts.

Okay. Some people think the CEQA process or the environmental process in California looks like this. They may be right. My goal that it's a more streamlined process, so at the end of the CEQA review, if it isn't more streamlined and looking like this, come find me and I'm to blame. My job is to make it streamlined.

This is a little bit hard to read, so the next slide is a walk-through of what the different stages are. Our first step is, I've got a small staff of about 10 people, so the Commission's primary process is to hire an outside environmental consultant. We started that process. We've gone out to bid for hiring a contractor to help us with the work, the consulting team that will earn the contract will have a lot of experts, more experts than I have on my staff, and all the issues, environmental issues, that will be reviewed in this document.

I want to be very clear, the contractor works for us. There is no, no -- they do not work for Southern California Edison; they work for the State Lands Commission.
We just went --

(Unintelligible colloquy.)

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Please.

MR. OGGINS: -- out to bid in March, we'll be hiring the contractor in April -- I'm sorry -- so between March and April we'll be receiving bids for the work and then, you know, reviewing the bids through a competency-based selection process, then hiring a contractor.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Let me just remind, folks, that we'll have a public comment period later so we can raise questions --

MR. AGUIRRE: It was a comment, not a question.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: We will have a public question and comment period later. Thank you.

MR. OGGINS: Okay. So the big take-away is number one, again, is the contractor works for the State Lands Commission, who works for the public. They do not work for Southern California Edison.

They are paid by Southern California Edison through a reimbursement agreement with the State but, again, there's a firewall between them.

The next step will be to release a Notice of Intent to prepare an EIR, that's when the CEQA process
begins, not tonight. Tonight is just an information item, so I hope I can, you know, introduce you to what is -- what to expect as we go through.

That Notice of Intent will identify potential impacts, it'll give you a project description, and then through public hearings, which will also be held, public scoping meetings, we'll be back here in the local area of Oceanside or wherever we can find a location.

And we'll be asking for your input as into what should go into that Environmental Impact Report. So you mentioned why was Unit 1 left in place? And why should it not have been removed?

What we will be asking for this public scoping meeting are alternatives to the project. So, again, the application is leave in place, the EIR will look at full removal of all the conduits.

Any other alternatives that you want to look at, come to the scoping meeting and tell us that. Get up and speak or write us comments or whatever you need to do. We'll also be looking at, as I mentioned, potential environmental impacts.

If you feel that there are impacts that we did not address in the scoping document, again, tell us what impacts you -- you feel we should be adding.
Mitigation measures, if there are measures that you want to see in the document, again, come to the scoping meeting, not tonight, come to the scoping meeting and let us know what you would like to do.

We'll lay all of this out in that Notice of Intent, notice of preparation.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Cy, can I just ask?

MR. OGGINS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: This is an item for Edison, I think. We need to make sure that people involved in this process are aware of these meetings.

MR. OGGINS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And so we need to make sure that we get maximal opportunity for public comment in this process, so we ought to find a way to make sure that, in addition to your normal notification process, that Edison lets people know about these meetings and also circulates the -- the Notice of Intent documents and so on.

MR. OGGINS: Yeah, one of the ways we can do that is if you have a mailing list.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yes, we do.

MR. OGGINS: You can give us a mailing list and we'll make sure that everyone in the mailing list gets a notification.
CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: We'll -- we'll make sure we connect those dots.

MR. OGGINS: Right.

MR. PALMISANO: We'll be glad to, since you're the agency responsible, we're fully relieved, but we'll use our community website and our Community Engagement Panel to get that word out.

MR. OGGINS: And then it's on our website, too. It's got our Web address at the very end. You can always go to our website, too. We'll -- whatever we can do to help get the word out to the public because, again, the public is very important to our whole process.

Steps after that, we'll be reviewing the proposed decommissioning operations. We look at public health and safety and environmental concerns in that review. As Linda mentioned, there's a lot of other agencies involved. We'll be doing consultations for those, and tribal governments as well. So Department of the CEQA if there are any applicable tribes, we need to consult with them.

The consulting team in my staff will be preparing the draft EIR. And, then, we think, around spring -- please don't hold me to that -- we think, around spring we'll be releasing that public draft EIR.
And, again, back here in the community to take comments, we'll be holding hearings on the -- on the draft Environmental Impact Report. Our typical process is one in the afternoon, one in the evening so we can get people who were at work, people who can make one but not the other. Again, that we anticipate about spring.

Then we'll be going back, taking all of your public comments. We'll be preparing a final Environmental Impact Report with a full response to comments. So, again, the important thing is, you give us your comments, we will respond to them.

And then, possibly, fall 2017 the Commission will hold its hearing. Okay. So that moves it from staff, me, our staff, to our Commission, to constitutional officers, Governor Brown's appointee.

First thing they will do is, they'll look at the document and they'll look at me and say "Did you do your job? Can I certify this environmental impact report?" If I didn't do my job and they don't certify it, I go back to the drawing board. So I don't want to do that.

My goal is to get a document that can be certified by the Commission and then the Commission will take action on the project. They'll look at what
the Environmental Impact Report says. Again, that's an informational document.

So they'll be looking at the information on the alternatives, the impacts, and they'll be making a decision which, again, it could be for removal, it could be leave in place, that's totally up to our Commission.

Hopefully, the environmental document, if I do my job, gives them the information they can use to make that decision. That doesn't mean you can't come to this hearing. You can also ask for where, you know, tell the Commission whether or not my staff did its job, what they want the Commission to decide. So, again, it's a public hearing.

Typical environmental document covers a lot of issues: Aesthetics, air quality, greenhouse gases, cultural resources, hazardous materials, hazardous operations of, you know, whatever offshore vessels are going to be used to remove components, if that's where it goes, if that's to recreation.

And then this "Other" is very important. It's not necessarily part of CEQA, but the Commission is very proud of its impacts, looking at impacts in environmental justice, if there are any environmental justice impacts.
I mentioned that the State has a -- the Commission has the responsibility to look at the public trust impact -- excuse me -- public trust impacts. So there's some things in CEQA that aren't necessarily public trust related, but the Commission will be looking at those, too, public access.

So if work is going to be occurring on the beach, how will that affect the public's ability to access the beach at the time. And then, of course, sea-level rise, a major concern at the Commission, given the fact that the seas are rising and is affecting our land and --

The Commission isn't just environmental, which is my division. We also have a lot of engineers, who will be looking at this work, too, structural engineers, civil engineers. They'll be looking at the operations in a level that I don't understand, because I'm not an engineer, to make sure that all the activities are conducted in a manner that is safe to both public health and safety and the environment.

They'll be looking at compliance with applicable standards and codes. Again, we'll be documenting this in the Environmental Impact Report. And, then, should the project be approved, there will -- any mitigation measures that the Commission
imposes as part of this project, our staff will be
monitoring to make sure that those measures they're
designed to reduce significant impacts these measures
are followed through with.

This picture, by the way, is during Unit 1, I
believe, decommissioning.

To summarize, if I make it to the end, we're
committed to public engagement and coordination with
agencies, the public, tribes. We pride ourselves on
that.

The Commission will not approve the projects
if the CEQA requirements aren't met. The approval
requires the Commission to certify the EIR and make
findings both pursuant to CEQA and the Public Trust and
we anticipate that that will occur in fall of 2017.

I don't know where that meeting will be. Our
Commission meets approximately every two months. So,
it's likely that they could arrange the meeting in
San Diego but, again, that's not my purview. I'm just
staff at the Commission. But they'll decide that and
the public will be notified of when that is.

So I'm going to end with questions and just --
I didn't put the Commission website, I put that in
after you got your presentations, but if you want to
write that down, that's where you'll find all of our
CEQA documents.

You'll find the Unit 1 Environmental Impact Report on that website, too, just go to our CEQA page and look under San Diego or the Southern part of the State and you'll find the full document, so you can get all the information you need about how long the Unit 1 conduits are and anything else related to why the Commission decided to be that, you know, the facility in place versus removal and like that.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Excellent, Cy.

Thank you very much for your time.

MR. OGGINS: Sure.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And for your insight.

We have time for a few comments and questions.

Can I just flag that if you think there are documents related to this process that you think the public will benefit from seeing, if you could remind us of those, we can also get them up on the SONGScommunity.com site or have crosslines and so on.

Garry Brown, do you want to comment?

MR. BROWN: First off, thank you for your presentation.

MR. OGGINS: You're welcome.

MR. BROWN: Thank you for your presentation.

Would you describe -- my understanding, you
have a small staff -- that the applicant fills out the
application to you and then you basically, after the
scoping meeting, then you hire an outside consultant to
prepare the EIR.

Would you describe that process on how you
select an outside consultant to prepare the EIR?

MR. OGGINS: Sure. Actually, you can start by
going -- again, going to our website, in the bottom
right-hand corner of our website. Sorry I don't have
that with you. But it'll include the document that we
released to obtain bids for this project.

Okay. So, basically, it's a lengthy document
that will lay out "Here is the project. This is what
we're looking for in a document. We're looking for a
compny that has certain skills related to
decommissioning." Okay.

So our goal is to get as many bids as possible
from reputable firms, which -- and we've done this
for -- I don't know. I've been with the State Lands
Commission for 10 years myself. We do this on all
types of projects, from liquefied natural gas
terminals, offshore Oxnard to offshore oil drilling
projects.

We're looking for expertise in, ideally,
someone who's -- who's done this type of work before:
Remove, prepare an environmental document that looks at decommissioning, a removals project. But, also, ideally that has experts in nuclear waste contamination so that we can provide information in our document that will address the issues the public is really interested in learning about.

We will collect all the bids we get, which are due at the beginning of April. And, actually, some consultants are here tonight. So when you think about asking questions, the more questions you ask, they'll build that into their bid document, as well, to provide us with a -- their vision of how this Environmental Impact Report will be prepared.

We'll then review their written proposals to us and these consultants can spend five figure of -- you know, five figures, and tens of thousands of dollars in preparing these documents for us.

We will review them and we'll select one of them. We'll, actually, select three, a minimum of three, and then we'll hold interviews with those consultants and then based on the written documentation, talking to their experts at these interviews, we'll select what we feel is the best team.

Then at that time we'll start negotiating the cost of document. And, again, it's totally independent
of Southern California Edison. They do not sit on the panel. They do not sit on the negotiations of cost. We've done this for years, so we have a general sense of what this type of project will cost.

We'll select the con -- the consultant and then we'll prepare our contract, that contract that's got too much detail, will go to our Department of General Services for approval. And once they put the blessing on the project, they can start work on the document.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Let me get Ted Quinn and then Tim Brown.

MR. OGGINS: Did that answer it?

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

MR. OGGINS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Ted?

MR. QUINN: Very good. Cy, you did a great job. Three things or two things, really: The experience base of decommissioning San Onofre Unit 1, which is the only unit in the United States decommissioned at an operating unit site must provide -- in the last 10 years provide you tremendous experience base.

Can you give a percentage of -- related to Unit 2, 3, of your estimate of how much applicability
it is on CEQA? Is Navy land the same -- the same site
that was done for Unit 1 for 2 and 3? High level of
applicability, I assume?

MR. OGGINS: Because we are now at a point
we're reviewing the whole of the project, it's going to
be more complex --

MR. QUINN: Okay.

MR. OGGINS: -- in this project. Units 1 --
Unit 1 is just the offshore conduits alone. Now we're
reviewing the offshore, which is, again, our
jurisdiction, plus an onshore component, which, you
know, the federal agencies own.

There's a lot of preemption issues with NRC
that we're not even allowed to go into because of the
NRC federal preemption on nuclear power plants. So
we're going to try to navigate out, you know, a path
that is -- provides you with the information and
members of the public and the Commission the
information that it needs.

Again, we can't cross lines in our decision.
We can't do things that we're not allowed to do as
state agency, so my challenge is to make that
understandable to you.

MR. QUINN: But it is larger? It's quite --

MR. OGGINS: It is larger because it covers
the whole onshore as well as the offshore.

MR. QUINN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Tim Brown.

MR. BROWN: So one of the items that came up when we were chatting, while we were discussing the Environmental Impact Report previously was that the Environmental Impact Report we did on the plant for decommissioning doesn't assume a green field to build -- to a decommissioned state, it assumes an existing operating plant to a decommission status. Right? And this -- and correct me, so the scope of this document is, assume you've got an operating plant and you're then going from an operating plant to a decommissioned status. Right?

I would assume that's the scope of this environmental document as -- as you outlined it.

MR. OGGINS: That's my belief at this time.

MR. BROWN: Okay.

MR. OGGINS: If I get more information, I'll probably be refining that.

MR. BROWN: The reason why I bring that up is because one of the things that came up, and it was fairly -- it was a little bit controversial in some of the public comments is that one of the comments that was made very often is that there's almost no
environmental impact because you're going from a fully
operating plant to having it removed, meaning dust from
the deconstruction, but effectively you're going from
what's considered to be a more of an impacted
environment to a less impacted environment because the
facilities and everything, all the operations, the
people, are going to removed.

So, really, if that's the case, then, is this
really just a conduit discussion? Is -- is it
primarily focused around that because of the
pre-exemption items you talked about the NRC?

It feels like it really limits to that one
action or, at least, to that issue. Would that be an
accurate representation?

MR. OGGINS: It could be. I'm not quite there
yet.

MR. BROWN: Okay.

MR. OGGINS: I think, once we hire the
consulting team, we'll be sitting down with them to
help figure out what the process will be. But, again,
my goal is to -- whatever that process is, my goal is
to lay that out clearly in that, first of all, the
draft, the Environmental Impact Report that you will
get to review and members of the public will get to
review. So at this time, right now, today, it's a
little bit gray for me.

(Simultaneous colloquy.)

MR. BROWN: It's wide open.

MR. OGGINS: Right.

MR. BROWN: But, eventually, it could end up -- (Simultaneous colloquy.)

MR. OGGINS: Right. Right. I don't know all the preemptions, for example.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yeah, so I'm mindful of time. Is it directly on this point?

MR. PALMISANO: Maybe I can clarify some of this. (Simultaneous colloquy.)

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Linda and then Dan.

MS. ANABTAWI: I just want to clarify, for Unit 1, the environmental review was done a little bit differently because we didn't disposition the conduits at the same time as the onshore portion.

MR. OGGINS: Right.

MS. ANABTAWI: So the onshore portion of decommissioning for Unit 1 was actually reviewed and approved by the Coastal Commission, so we have a CDP that covers Unit 1 decommissioning and that did look at the physical work that would be conducted in connection with the decommissioning of Unit 1 and associated impacts.
MR. OGGINS: I think the parallel here is with the interim storage facility, that was not in the State Lands Commission Jurisdiction, so we were -- we had no role in that decision that the Coastal Commission made because the environmental document is now for the offshore conduits and we're required to do the whole of the project, that's where we'll get involved, in the whole of the project.

So, yeah, there's layers. But, you know, I've worked for the Coastal Commission for 10 years, too, I know the -- the players there. We'll definitely be coordinating with them very, very closely so that our reviews are as close as possible.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Dan Stetson.

MR. STETSON: Cy, thanks. Very interesting and informative.

Linda, you shared with us how the Navy becomes involved in this. Could you share with the audience, you know, kind of a line of demarcation with the Navy in terms of after the Environmental Impact Report is completed what's the impact and how they all would be involved in it?

MS. ANABTAWI: So, Cy, you can clarify here, but --

MR. OGGINS: Sure.
MS. ANABTAWI: The Navy will actually be quite involved in the CEQA process because, as the landowner, the Navy will be the decision-maker as to the end-state for the site, so that includes the substructure removal, so the Navy will determine what we have to remove, what can stay there.

And so from what I understand, State Lands will be consulting with the Navy throughout the CEQA process. The Navy has indicated an interest in being active throughout the CEQA process, but ultimately the NEPA process may reach different conclusions. It's an independent process.

The idea, however, will be that if the Navy has been quite involved in the CEQA process that that would facilitate the subsequent NEPA review.

MR. STETSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Great.

MR. KERN: Just a point of clarification.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Jerry Kern.

MR. KERN: So is there going to be like a parallel NEPA document being prepared along with CEQA? Is that how it's going to run?

MR. OGGINS: Well, actually, for the -- do you want to?

MS. ANABTAWI: Oh, I can address that.
They -- they're not running in parallel and
the reason for that is they're covering different
scopes.

So the State Lands Commission document is
looking at obviously conduit disposition, but also the
D&D work, which is all of the work that's required in
connection with the NRC decontamination effort, whereas
the Navy NEPA document is then looking just at the
land -- landowner-specific requirements.

So that's a whole different scope and they'll
be somewhat -- there might be some overlap, but really
the two processes will be conducted separately.

MR. OGGINS: If I could just conclude,
perhaps, I need these questions that you want
addressed. When we get to the scoping phase, write
them out. Test me on how well I can respond to your
questions.

So, you know, again, the Environmental Impact
Report, the goal is to inform the public.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay.

MR. OGGINS: So, hopefully, I can address all
of those questions in that actual document.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Excellent. Thank you
very much.

So just as we close, I want to, maybe, Tom,
when you give the update every meeting, we could
include an update on where we are in the EIR process
would be helpful to --

   MR. PALMISANO: We certainly will because this
would be one of the dominant activities over the next
18 months, so we'll include this in every quarterly
update.

   CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yes. And, Cy, nobody's
mentioned it, but I'm sure a lot of folks will keen
that when the Commission gets to the stage of holding
its own hearings and meetings on this, I'm mindful that
there are a lot of factors that go into where the
Commission actually meets, but it would be great if
perhaps they could meet in this area so that as many
people could see that process as possible.

   MR. OGGINS: I will definitely pass that on.
The Commission typically has 135 items every meeting,
so, again, the decision is up to the Chair at the time,
but I will definitely -- I'm sure they're very aware of
that right now. I will let them know that.

   CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very
much.

   MR. OGGINS: Yeah.

   CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: We have a 10-minute
break right now and then we'll reconvene at 7:35 with a
few update items related to consolidated storage and then the public comment and question period.

(Break taken from 7:25 p.m. to 7:35 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: So we have a segment of the meeting for updates from the members of the Community Engagement Panel, things that you think will be important for the community to know that we're doing or could be doing.

I wanted to start that process. We committed to every single meeting get an update from panel members concerning Consolidated Interim Storage because there's a general feeling that this could be enormously beneficial to us because the plant is decommissioned and so Yucca Mountain or some other permanent facility opens -- spent fuel needs a place to put it. And even with Yucca Mountain opened, we need some place to put it in the interim. And there's been a lot of activity in that front.

There's a memo that I circulated with the panel a few days ago, it's been posted on the website, as well, that updates, in particular, a picture at the federal level and I just want to make a couple of highlights from that and then ask other members of the panel to add additional comments here.

There's a huge amount of activity at the
Department of Energy on this topic. The office that is
running these meetings, including the one in April in
Sacramento, is now geared up and doing, I think,
whatever they can, within the limits of federal law, to
help promote the siting of two, or possibly more,
interim storage facilities and, also, working with the
Department of Transportation on the transport side of
the equation and Tom Palmisano told us a little bit
about that.

As you know, they were out here last June, a
year ago in June, visiting and we're going to invite
them out here again the next meeting of this panel, in
fact, when we focus on consolidated storage.

I was in Washington a couple of weeks ago on
other business and so I spent some money on Uber and
went up to Capitol Hill and I had a chance to meet with
staff and members of Congress on -- and also staff on
the Senate side.

There are two pieces of legislation, one in
the House, one in the Senate, that are working their
way through. The politics on this are shifting a lot.
This is not just a Harry Reid issue. This is not just
a Republican/Democrat issue, but I think a growing
number of folks recognize that if consolidated storage
is presented as a complement to permanent storage
facilities, that you can do a political deal that would
result in new -- new federal law in this area.

There are some open questions as to whether
federal law is actually necessary and an attachment to
the memo that I circulated included a transcript from a
hearing about two weeks ago with Secretary Moniz, where
he addressed this issue directly in response to
questions from Senator Feinstein.

I don't think anybody is naive in thinking
that Congress is going to get much done this year, but
the idea right now or, maybe, ever, but the idea right
now is to create an echo chamber around the wisdom of
Consolidated Interim Storage so that when Congress gets
back to business of actually passing laws the
probability that something would emerge on -- on both
the House and the Senate and get through conference
that probability goes up.

So, what we're trying to do is -- with a lot
of local support, is push eventually for hearings and
get people focused on this and, crucially, to build the
number of cosponsors notably on the House legislation,
a draft legislation.

And the idea behind that is to demonstrate, in
particular, to the Republican Party that there are
strategies other than just talking about Yucca
Mountain. So that's the idea, and the logic of that is spelled out in the memo in greater detail.

And, I guess, I will just close my comments on this by saying one thing, which is, I think we can see a line of sight to having the Consolidated Interim Storage facilities open to maybe more facilities and there's a range of views about the wisdom of this and there's a range of views about what consent-based siting means and that's what this hearing is going to be about in Sacramento in April 26.

What concerns me much more is the transport and how the transport is organized and making sure there are multiple transport routes so we don't get hung up with one route and then a problem on one route.

And that's something, I think, we need to, as this panel spends more time on this and other people spend more on this, pay close attention to what's happening on the transport side.

So I'm going to stop there and see if Dan and Tim want to comment. I'll ask other members of the panel, as well, to comment. Dan?

MR. STETSON: Thank you.

Well, first of all, I'm really excited that there appears to be progress being made and I want to thank so many of you who have come up and wanted to
work together on this. I've had private homeowners
from Laguna Beach that have offered their home for
public meetings.

   And, Garry Brown, I want to thank you. You've
been -- together we've been reaching out to a number of
non-profits to bring them up to speed so that they're
not caught off guard as these things start to move
forward.

   A number of you, too, I want to have a shout
out for Marni, she's -- she's right there. And she's
been very active, going to meet with some of the
different legislators and even was very successful in
getting Dana Rohrabacher to sign on as a cosponsor for
one of the bills.

   So there's a lot happening now and we're
really trying to do our best just to be that
echo chamber to get things moving and to continue to
increase the volume of this, not only at the local
level, the state level, but also at the federal level.

   Garry, do you have anything you want to add to
that?

MR. BROWN: Yes, I would. I, too. I'm
encouraged that there's kind of a whole sea change
of -- of more support, more awareness for Consolidated
Interim Storage. And I think, though -- you know, I
think everybody in this room will agree, we want to get spent fuel off San Onofre site sooner rather than later and so maybe this is a way to do it.

But, I guess, I always still have a caution that as much effort as we've put into to building support and getting things right and dealing with the transportation issue so we can actually get to Consolidated Interim Storage, we can't ignore fixing the broken federal process for a final biological or geological repository because if we are so successful in getting CIS, Consolidated Interim Storage, the fear is that, by default, will become the long-term permanent storage in a facility that's not designed for that.

And so we have to fix both the broken federal system and go down this road. And I think -- I think we're on the same page, but, you know, what we're trying to do is go out and garner public support and -- and raise some awareness because the -- the public is going to have to weigh in many times going down the road.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yeah. Thank you very much. I think that's an important point.

And I just want to remind people that a year and a half ago, a little more than a year and a half
ago, we had our first workshop on this topic and
Per Peterson, from Berkeley, told us about a variety of
other technologies, in addition to Yucca Mountain, that
are emerging so-called deep borehole technologies, one
of which is plausibly being tested soon. And I think
there's been a lot of movement on that front as well.

The other thing I want to mention is, there's
a very good article in the current EPRI Journal about
all the various technologies that are now being
developed to monitor and inspect the canisters as part
of a long-term aging management program, and that's
crucial.

That's part of this Defense-in-Depth that this
panel has been talking about on a regular basis, we
will be talking about later this year, and that's
crucial that that go forward, so that's part of the
overall program.

Tim Brown, do you want to comment on this?
And I want to see then if others want to comment.

MR. BROWN: My only comment, and it was after
reviewing the memorandum is, one of the items on here
says that among other things we need to signal deep
support for the CIS, Consolidated Interim Storage, and
also articulate why decom -- decommissioning plants
should be the first line to send the fuel.
You know, Jerry, in Oceanside, has done a good job on getting a resolution out in support of this; San Clemente has followed suit as well as other South Orange County cities, and so I would ask that, you know, the other members of this body, whatever entities you represent, may consider similar letters of support or, at least, resolutions from whatever bodies that you happened to be with, you know, from Labor to Parks, and other things, to effectively say this -- we feel like, in our estimation and review, as a member of the CEP, this is a good idea. Frankly, the more the merrier.

There isn't a group that can't agree with this, that shouldn't agree with this idea of removing it and having it to a better place than where it's currently at, and that's how you would show support.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yeah, thank you.

I think one thing that I've learned in looking at these resolutions, which is really encouraging, is we need to remember that, in addition to signaling support for particular pieces of legislation that are working through Congress right now, we know we want to signal support for the underlying idea.

Jerry Kern, do you want to talk about this and what you've done in Oceanside?

MR. KERN: Well, Oceanside, we brought forward
a resolution of support of HR3643 and that actually got a lot of traction. A lot of the cities around Southern California, and even the City of San Luis Obispo, have taken that resolution almost verbatim and crafted their own to show support.

And, also, when I sent the copy of our resolution, when they contact me, I sent up the copy of the committee members that are hearing this. So it does one thing, in isolation you pass a resolution in support, but it doesn't do you any good until you actually get it to people that are actually doing the legislation.

So that's the one thing that I think has gained traction back there, that the local communities are very much in this and support of this Consolidated Interim Storage to move it off of San Onofre.

So the City of Oceanside, City of Carlsbad, Encinitas, and I think Manuel Camargo, back there, he went with me to the City of Encinitas, and they passed their resolution. And I went up to the City of Laguna Woods a couple of weeks ago, and they passed a resolution.

So it is gaining a lot of traction, a lot of notice, but I think that's -- but it can't just stop with cities. I think, Garry Brown kind of said this
too, everybody out there needs to contact their congressman and write them and say "This is a community idea, it's not just a government/city idea, so, to do that."

And then I had a conversation with Senator Pat Bates. She called me a couple of days ago and, at the state level, Senator Bates and Assembly Member Chavez are bring forward the same resolution at the state level.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: All right. And we talked with them last -- I think, late last summer, and -- and I certainly stand ready to do whatever I can to help support that.

Glenn Pascall.

MR. PASCALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Being here on behalf of the Sierra Club, on this issue, I have two assignments: One is -- and I'm gratified that how often this is referenced -- to point out the ultimate goal of long term geologic repository as storage;

And, secondly my role is to report back to the Sierra Club about your discussions of consent-based siting and Consolidated Interim Storage.

And, I think, more informally I will say this, that, well, it's a new concept, and the Sierra Club
does not have a support position on it or, really, any position.

I am gratified by the renewed level of activity on this because it can only usefully uncover valuable ideas. And, then, if there are environmental justice concerns or environmental quality concerns about specific proposals, those can be vetted and corrected.

But I commend you all for, again, opening the spirit of possibility, of discussion, so that the range of approaches can be fully explored and we can zero in on responsible and effective ways to move forward. Hats off.

I also wanted to mention, the panel itself has before you a statement on Sierra Club letterhead and, since I've just spoken on behalf of the Sierra Club, I'm sorry to say that I must report to you that this is a bogus document with a Sierra Club logo.

The best indication is that, if you turn to the signature page, it's from Susan Corbett, who is Chair of the Nuclear Free Team, which is a national antinuclear affinity group; it does not come from a person at the level in the Sierra Club that would normally be required to send a message to the Chair of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
And, in fact, today, the Angeles Chapter, which I represent, filed a formal notice with Senior Sierra Club National Staff of a process violation. This document is dated March 18th. We learned of it only today. National assumed we were involved in developing a statement and they were surprised we were not.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay.

MR. PASCALL: It's doubtful that the final Sierra Club position on Nuclear Waste Management will be what you see here, so please treat the document accordingly.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you for that update. Any other comments from the panel on the issue of consolidated storage?

Ted Quinn. And then I want to see if there are any other updates from the panel before we move to the public comment period.

Ted Quinn.

MR. QUINN: Just very quick. I wanted to reinforce the benefit of going to this consent-based sitting meetings. The public meetings are to be held in a schedule, you saw, this spring and summer. The head of these meetings is John Kotek, the Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy.
He is a wonderful person. He's been in office about six months, but he's got 40 years of experience in -- in nuclear energy. He is the speaker, opening speaker, at each of these. His intent is to get as wide a range of public comment and input to carry into the next administration.

It's very important because this is the new program that we all want to look at and define that this is a success criteria for all of us. So I just wanted to bring that up.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much. I'm going to ask John Kotek if he wouldn't mind coming to our next meeting.

MR. QUINN: Good.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: It may be that, for protocol reasons, the DOE is not in a state to talk publicly about this, but I know that they have now all agreed to do consent-based siting and then they've got to figure out what that actually means.

MR. QUINN: Good idea.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: So that's what these hearings are about.

Let me just see if there are other comments on the Consolidated Interim Storage.

Let me see if there are any other updates from
(Brief pause.)

Okay. Excellent.

So we have public comment period now.

MR. MACEDO: I have a comment.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yeah, please. Val.

MR. MACEDO: I just want to address the panel and the audience here, that we engaged in a -- we took a trip out to Chicago to Zion ourselves and viewed the site out there.

We were very pleased with how good they treated us out there, and we wanted to stay ahead of the curve, as far as training goes, in preparing for the decommissioning and we brought back -- we were actually surprised on -- we met with the other trades out there and we were told that they wish that they would've been as far ahead of the game as us and they appreciated where we're at today.

So I wanted to share that with everybody. And it was -- the contractor that's out there doing the work got us on site. We looked at all the activities going on and we engaged in some good dialogue and it was good. I just wanted to share that with everybody.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Excellent. Thank you
very much. I want to thank you, also, and your organization for sharing a letter with me a while ago on other organized labor groups concerning the role of organized labor in the decommissioning process and we've shared that, obviously, with the full panel and it's posted on the website. Thank you very much for that continued engagement.

Any other comments?

Okay. So we have a public comment period. And, as always, we allow three minutes per comment and the idea is to be as constructive as possible and to help --

MR. AGUIRRE: You're dictating how we have to talk?

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: No, I'm not dict --

MR. AGUIRRE: Please don't do that. Don't talk about content of speech.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Sir, I'm not talking about content of speech.

MR. AGUIRRE: Yes, you're already saying constructive.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: We have three minutes per comment and the first on our list is Gary Headrick and then Marilyn Fuss.

Gary Headrick, the floor is yours.
MR. HEADRICK: Good evening. I'm Gary Headrick, San Clemente Green founder and representing about 5,000 concerned citizens living in the proximity of San Onofre.

And, first, I'd like to start on a positive note, but I'm afraid it has to go elsewhere because I feel the obligation to represent the other side of the story here.

I have to remind you that everyone on this Board has a lot of integrity. The more I get to know this Board, the more I appreciate it. I think we're all in the same boat and we're trying to find commonalities so we can work together towards the same ultimate goal.

But I also have to remind you that we have different priorities and I have concerns about being overly optimistic about what we can achieve when the industry has a reputation in the history that we shouldn't forget.

When I first got involved in 2010, San Onofre was the worst safety record in the state by 20 times, 25 percent in the nation. 25 percent of the employees feared retaliation if they reported safety violations.

And as we tried to promote, within our own community, concerns that whistle blowers brought to our
attention about the steam generator issue, we were not
listened to until finally the steam generators failed.
And the problem with that is, we're still -- we're
dealing with the same entities.

And, although, I have tremendous respect for
everyone here, including you, Tom, I think, Edison, as
an industry, has -- has a lot of catching up to do in
terms of our trust.

And what I'm concerned with, really, is what
Garry Brown brought up, but in another, like, one step
before that, he was saying how important is to have the
permanent storage site and interim is part of that
step.

But if we end up in a situation where we're
delaying the process inadvertently because of the
review process and CEQA and all those reviews, we're
sitting on 80-plus storage containers that have
questionable integrity and they have -- they were
intended as short-term storage solution because the DOE
has let us all down in this.

And I feel bad for all of us in this
situation. And I'm not sure how we'd get out of this,
but by sitting on containers that could fail and leave
us in a situation where we've become the default
nuclear storage site, then we're all out of luck
because once the cracks could appear or even a question
because we can't inspect these things, we may never be
able to move these.

So I plead with you to respect our position a
little more, give us a little more credit for the
documentation we found that says these storage devices
are not reliable and we'll all work together as long as
we can, you know, have this cooperative atmosphere and
discussion ongoing because --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Excellent.

MR. HEADRICK: -- right now, I feel like we're
agreeing on things, but the things that we disagree on
get ignored.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much for
you comment.

Marilyn Fuss and then Marni Mag -- "Magna."

MS. FUSS: I'm Marilyn Fuss. This is the
third time that I've been coming -- that I've come down
here from L.A. for this meeting and each time I'm
amazed that half the State of California isn't here.

Flimsy drums of nuclear waste, shells
proportionate to a cigarette paper, right by the
roaring, unpredictable sea are terrifying. We're
gambling every day with tens of millions of lives of
all ambience species.
Can't we find a place to move the 33 ready canisters inland soon within a year? Put it at first priority with Governor Brown, the Assembly, the Senate, the President. Because if an accident occurred, this is what we'd have to do. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much for your comment. Next is Marni Magda and then Donna Gilmore.

MS. MAGDA: Thank you so much for all of your hard work. I did want to begin thanking Cy Oggins -- Oggins from the State Lands Commission for being here, and ask everyone on the CEP panel to stay very, very vigilant.

I've been to all the meetings about those pipes. I'm very concerned on the outtake side that one is a mile and a half and another is a mile into the ocean. They're 18 feet of cement. They've been having radiation dumped into our ocean on only as -- it's called ALARA, As Little As Reasonably Achievable, and that means that we have had radiation for 53 years going out into the oceans from those pipes.

Tom has even talked about that the spent fuel pool water would go into the ocean when they're finally emptied.

So, please, let's have part of that looked in
the environment, go in and find out what that cement is doing, find out. Yes, it'll be awfully disruptive to take a 6-foot buried pipe that big out of the ocean, but we have had the ocean go to an odd-look from a long time now, 18 years ago. And we need to make sure that this isn't because of radiation.

So, with that, I'll turn to the real thing that I wanted to talk about. Thank you.

Interim storage: We really have a chance. We've got to go after the DOE to not let them -- Senator Feinstein said that we have -- right now, it could go after the West Texas and the New Mexico, it's AREVA and Holtec, we could have them by 2021 and 2025.

And we don't even need legislation. We just need to get the DOE to do it. And I heard Moniz is kind of hedging on it. We've got to get everybody on this panel to push for that and push it at every city level.

We could have this fuel out of here, by 2025, moving and then, finally, out of there within the years that it takes to get the train moving. If we can have five at a time moving. Tom has talked -- I'd like to have, Tom, if you would get the information that I've been getting out to the public, we can do this together.
Because, it is -- it can't stay where it is and it can't be here for 20 decades. It's got to be out of here immediately. So let us work together.

And, Tom, I hope you'll continue getting the Navy to help us along with this too because the interim storage in Texas and New Mexico is the right place for a hundred years while we watch these canisters.

Find out what they do, really, test them with the nuclear, not just non-radiation testings, which is they're wasting 27 million dollars on the non-radiation. We need real data and we need to really go after it and we need to have these canisters safely away from environment that is hazardous while we find out what's going on.

It's a new -- it's an industry, that a man that was 91 years old, Dr. Alvin Weinberg said, "had I known --" and he's at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, "Had I known that we wouldn't have national waste, the spent fuel, figured out, I would've rethought commercial reactors."

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very much.

MS. MAGDA: So, thank you. Sorry.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you for your comment.
Donna Gilmore and then Daryl Gale.

MS. GILMORE: I have some new news: There's a Sandia lab report that shows, because these canisters are hotter, they could actually have, once they start cracking, through-wall cracks in five years; that's after the crack starts. This is Sandia Lab.

It was -- the Department of Energy have this. And I've given you all a handout. And I can give it -- give it to others.

We're going to have -- it's likely we're going to have problems with canisters before they get out of here and we really need to focus on what we have and take this serious.

The canisters cannot be inspected now, and there's all these hopes that you might. We have the vendor that makes the Holtec canisters, the president of the company tell you, even if you could find the cracks, you can't -- it's not practical to repair them.

In the face of millions of curies of radiation, that if you try and repair them, you introduce another cracking condition.

So we've got an inferior product here, that we're going to buy more of, and nobody's dealing with that. And these are -- these are facts. These are -- these are not hope, opinions. These are facts. And if
we don't deal with them, we're going to freaking lose Southern California.

And pretending that we're going to get this out of here soon, there's not a single community that wants them. Yeah, everybody wants it out of here. Yeah, I'd love to have it out of here, but no community wants it. And, in the meantime, we don't have time.

And if the canisters even have partial cracks, which since Edison can't inspect them, we have no idea how many have been corroded from the ocean environment or anything else.

Cracked canisters, partially cracked canisters, cannot be transported by NRC regulations, and there's no approved solution to take a leaking canister and put it in a transfer or transport cask as -- as Tom has said.

I've checked with Mark Lombard at the NRC. Nobody's even requested it. There needs to be a full analysis, if that is a temporary position. And they should not destroy the spent fuel pools when they're empty. That is the only approved, NRC approved, method to deal with a failed canister is those pools, and Edison's plan is to destroy them.

So, hopefully, maybe, the State Lands could have some influence in stopping that from being
destroyed or it can, at least, talk to somebody about
this issue. And I'm more than happy to share my data.

All the data I have is scientific and
government documentation. This is not opinion. This
is real. And we -- and we need to focus on this as the
highest priority before we do anything else.

And if anybody would like a handout, let me
know. I have more handouts.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very
much for your comment.

Next is Daryl Gale and then Bob Belhumer.

MS. GALE: Good evening. I'm Daryl Gale. I
came down here from L.A. on Amtrak and it took me eight
hours because we had a bomb scare at the Norwalk Amtrak
Station. And the second largest city in the country
doesn't know how to handle a bomb scare, so. But it
was very important for me to come down here.

It appears to me that the only viable solution
to this nuclear waste is a safe, immediate interim
storage. I would really ask the esteemed panel up here
to use their clout, to use their influence, and beseech
the NRC, the DOE, the President, the EPA, the
Governate -- Governor, our senators, the Congress,
whomever, to please hurry up and give us an inland
militarily secured safe-ish, and I repeat, safe-ish
space to move this waste to, not the beach.

This way the people in Southern California, the plants, the animals can then continue to just worry about mundane things, the usual things, you know, like earthquakes, riots, fires, climate change, drought, and our governor letting oil companies frack our aquifers.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much for your comment and for navigating Amtrak to get here.

Next is Bob Belhumer and then Mike Aguirre.

MR. BELHUMER: Bob is going to pass.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: He's going to pass?

Okay. Mike Aguirre and then after that is Maria, I believe, Severson.

MR. AGUIRRE: Yeah, Maria Severson has given me her time.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Oh, we don't trade time.

MR. AGUIRRE: Okay. Well, you've already started here, so.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Why don't you make your comment?

MR. AGUIRRE: There were two waste products generated by Southern California Edison:

One was the nuclear waste at San Onofre and the other is the waste product of political corruption,
insidious political corruption.

Two state court judges have concluded that Edison has engaged probable cause to believe that they've engaged in criminal behavior. I believe that criminal behavior is carrying on here today.

I believe that your involvement to mislead the public about the options that Edison has to dispose of the nuclear waste is part of that criminal conspiracy.

Edison should take responsibility for the nuclear waste that it produced, from which it derived billions of dollars of income, like every other business, every other business, they should have been required to obtain a license from the NRC and they should've had the obligation to find the site because they profited.

What you're doing is misleading all the good people here into thinking that somehow the federal government is responsible.

Now, I see these really tough corporate leaders talking about their individuality and how they don't want government regulators. But how come we now see them going to the federal government pleading for the federal government to come in and bail them out from the consequences of their own behavior?

If there is an ounce, an ounce of integrity
that any of you can find your way back to, especially
people that are state officials with badges on, you
should not be seated here. The State Lands Commission
representative should not be here.

This is Southern California Edison. This is a
company that has been found to have had probable cause
that they engage in criminal behavior. This is a
company that spreads money in gifts, campaign
contributions and -- and charitable contributions in
order to completely compromise.

And what are you playing with? You're playing
with the future of our state. You're playing with the
lives of our people.

In Fukushima, the Diet concluded, the same
conclusion that they would conclude about us if this
happens, is that it was a pro -- it was a manmade
problem based on corruption. We need to stop it.

Even the idea of, "Oh, we don't trade time."
You are -- I want her three minutes. You
don't have a right to do that.

(Simultaneous colloquy.)
CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: You don't have it.
MR. AGUIRRE: Where is that a rule?
CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Sir, finish your
comment, please.
MR. AGUIRRE: Wait a minute. Where's the rule that says that?

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: The rule has been established from the very first meeting.

MR. AGUIRRE: Where? No. No. Where is that written -- is there a written rule?

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you, sir, for your comment.

MR. AGUIRRE: Hold on. Excuse me.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Our next --

MR. AGUIRRE: Is there a written rule?

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you, sir, for your comment.

MR. AGUIRRE: No. No. I'm not done.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Everybody -- Gary Headrick. At the last --

MR. AGUIRRE: I'm not done. I'm asking you --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Sir, please sit down now.

MR. AGUIRRE: I'm asking you, where is the rule?

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Please sit down now, sir.

MR. AGUIRRE: No. I'm asking you, where's the rule?
CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Everybody else has been able to follow the rules.

MR. AGUIRRE: Where's the rule?

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: What is complicated about this?

MR. AGUIRRE: No, where's the rule?

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Please sit down, sir.

MR. AGUIRRE: Where is that rule?

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Sir? Sir?

MR. AGUIRRE: No, you don't tell me, no.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Sir, sit down.

MR. AGUIRRE: No, I will not. You tell me where the rule is.

PUBLIC MEMBER: Can you please, I have my name in?

MR. AGUIRRE: Where is --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Other people would like to speak, sir. You can sit down, please.

And if you have additional comments, please send them in by email.

MR. AGUIRRE: Okay. I will --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Next.

MR. AGUIRRE: Okay. I will be taking it up with the Chancellor tomorrow. You should not be sitting here. You're embarrassing the University of
California.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: That's fine. It's all being videotaped and I'm sure that our counsel will view that, as well.

MR. AGUIRRE: Yeah, it's being videotaped as you make ridiculous comments about how you're concerned about the public welfare.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Next on our list.

MR. AGUIRRE: Let me just say this, in our society --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Next. Sir, please sit down.

MR. AGUIRRE: In our society, due process requires --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Sir, this is not a due process issue.

MR. AGUIRRE: -- no notice of a rule that says --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Richard Gardner has the floor. Sir, is that you? Richard Gardner?

MR. GARDNER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much.

I thought -- I thought you had been -- your time had been ceded, so please. You have the floor.

MS. SEVERSON: You prevented it.
MR. AGUIRRE: He prevented it.

MS. SEVERSON: Is this even on?

You prevented my partner from taking my time under no rule you can establish. I'd like you, in the three minutes on my period, to identify what rule that is.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: This is the time when you can make comments, if you want to. Please, go ahead.

MR. AGUIRRE: Well, he said you can ask questions.

MS. SEVERSON: Yeah, you said there would be time for questions and comments later.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: There will be questions and, as we do at every single meeting, the questions are collected and we answer them at the end of the meeting.

MS. SEVERSON: No, because I don't see on here anything that says is a question period related.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Please.

MS. SEVERSON: Now you're going to -- now you're going to restrict the content of what I'm saying?

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: No, I'm not restricting the content. Please say whatever you want to say.
MS. SEVERSON: Yeah, and what I'm saying is, I would like -- there's 2 -- 27 minutes left and I would you or anyone on this panel to identify where the rule is that says that you cannot give time to the next person.

MR. PASCALL: Excuse me. Can I comment on that?

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: No.

MS. SEVERSON: Yes, if you have an answer, I would love it.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: No. No.

MR. PASCALL: You know, we're almost always run out of time.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Please.

MR. PASCALL: I just wanted to say that.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Please.

MS. SEVERSON: Run out of time. What is it? Six minutes, three minutes.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: There will be no back and forth right now. We will answer questions at the end of the public comment period.

MS. SEVERSON: Three minutes. I'm speaking, sir. This is my time.

There's three minutes for him and three minutes for me, that's six minutes, so there's no issue
of running late. Six minutes is six minutes no matter who's talking. You just didn't want to hear what he had to say.

Now, let me say this. This is called the Community Engagement Panel. This the community dis-engagement panel. You should all be ashamed of yourself for picking this location. That poor woman, who had to travel six hours on Amtrak to get here, I don't know where she might have gotten off or how she got here because you could not find a more tucked away location away from public transit.

We had to go miles inland through trees and, you know, hills and whatnot to get here, through traffic at this time. This is not a public place.

Who even owns this facility?

Is this a public facility? No, this was meant to dissuade the public from being here, that's why there's so few people here.

Now, funny, when San Onofre and Edison would plan its meetings at other places and it used to hire its buses to have its labor workers coming there, standing in support, that was always at a place people could get to, but not here. This is shameful.

Now, what I hear here is some sales job, some spin job. You're saying to the other members of the
panel "Go and ask for letters and tell them how great this is. And go on and tell them that there's support, and your support, your support." This isn't -- that's not your job. This isn't a PR.

And then we have a lawsuit that is challenging the Coastal Commission and then Southern California is distributing, right as you go in, comments about it. They don't even mention it. I've heard nothing about safety here.

You've just had an attack over in Belgium, where they found out that there are terrorist attacks where they are trying to target nuclear facilities. There has not been word one mentioned here about safety today, nothing. You should all be ashamed of yourself.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you for your comment. Next is Richard Gardner.

MR. GARDNER: Well, I won't say that I want to use his three minutes because -- excuse me. Sorry. I'm coming up here to offer, again, my suggestion that, personally, I believe that the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station provided a -- a lot of electricity. I don't think we calculated the gigawatt over the period of 30 years, but a lot of electricity.
And the facilities are very valuable. Just the cost to demo the turbine buildings was listed as over 137 million dollars. So when I suggest that it may be possible to use those intake and outfalls as a source for ocean desalination, I think it should be, at least, considered.

Now, the first thing that the environmental community jumps up and says, and I'm speaking for Surf Rider and Coast Keeper and others, "Well, you'll just be sucking in those -- those plankton and the larvae and the small fish."

And I said, "Well, that 14-foot diameter pipe that they put in, I would need 2-, 3-foot diameter well casings and I could bury them in sand and I would have us completely contained," sand-filtered intake structure that would have no negative impact on the -- on the ocean. Really, an excellent environmental solution.

I only wanted to come up with 50 million gallons a day or, say, 50,000 acre-feet a year, about the size of the plant down in Carlsbad. The Carlsbad plant cost a billion dollars.

The ones, if we were to use the turbine buildings, and there's actually four levels, so one turbine building would be more than adequate. We could
generate 50 -- 50,000 acre-feet, which would be enough water to provide 50 percent of all the drinking water needed in South Orange County and that's at in 30 -- in 20 years from now, say, in the year 2035.

So I have a unique position here, having been a start-up engineer at San Onofre for so long, having watch them bring in those 14-foot diameter pipes and doing the initial start-up on the circ-water pumps, worked in the turbine buildings, and I've also been a water director for 20 years. So I'm saying this is an opportunity we need to look at.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Great. Thank you very much for your comment.

Now, we're going to have Den Stetson is going to read out various questions that have come up.

Is there another -- one more? Okay. The podium awaits the last comment, which is from --

MS. GILMORE: While we're waiting --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Please. Please.

MS. GILMORE: Glenn, Glenn, this is legitimate a Sierra Club document.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Please. The next speaker please come to the floor. The floor is yours, ma'am.
MS. GILMORE: You may not have been kept in the loop -- (Simultaneous colloquy.)

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Donna, please, this is an internal Sierra Club issue. Maybe you could take this up --

The floor -- the floor is yours.

MS. GILMORE: But this does not -- yes.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Ma'am, thank you very much for coming. Over here is the microphone. Thank you very much. And if you could just state your name for the record because I don't have your name in front of me.

MS. MUNZER: I just got here so I hope I'm not redundant. My name is Xan Munzer.

And, then, I ask my question?

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Or make your comment or say whatever you want to say in three minutes and then we'll respond.

MS. MUNZER: Oh, okay. I just wanted to know if the -- if Mr. Peevey from the PUC is here.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I don't see him here.

MS. MUNZER: Okay. And is he supposed to be protecting the ratepayers? Because of what I read that he did in Poland I was just wondering, is there anyone else from the Public Utilities Commission that's
supposed to be protecting the ratepayers, making these
decisions about us paying for the mistakes that have
been made? So, that is all.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very
much for your comment.

I don't see any staff from Public Utilities
Commission here, nor any of the commissioners.

MS. MUNZER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And the panel here was
set up originally -- I think, you came in late. The
panel here was set up originally to help promote flow
of information related to the decommissioning process
and there are other oversight mechanisms, including the
Public Utilities Commission related to that.

MS. MUNZER: Oh, okay.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much for
your comment.

MS. MUNZER: Oh, okay.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: We're going to ask --
I'm going to ask Dan Stetson, as is our normal practice
here, to read out the comments and questions for reply.
And all of this will end up in the public record, as
well. So, Dan?

MR. STETSON: Thank you.

Tom, a good number of these will come to you
and some have been answered at previous meetings. But the first question was, we've got 33 units right now, why can't we move them?

    MR. PALMISANO: Well, the question is, number 1, there's no location to move them to, fundamentally; that's the really the issue. And then the additional thing is getting the transportation process infrastructure and protocol ready.

    MR. STETSON: Okay. Another question came up and it related to radiation possibly going into the ocean through the conduits. So, I guess, the question is, has any radioactive material been going through the conduits into the ocean?

    MR. PALMISANO: The plant is licensed and permitted for low-level radioactive release that's monitored by the NRC and we report that annually.

    So, before the conduits are ultimately dispositioned and decommissioned, they would have to be sampled as was done on Unit 1 when they were ultimately released.

    So we need to assure that the state of the conduits is known and there is no residual radioactivity that would pose a hazard.

    MR. STETSON: Okay. Thank you, Tom.

    David, a question came up with reference to
legislation. Would you like to --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yes. So, I think this
is a very important point. Nobody really knows if
additional federal legislation is necessary in order to
make Consolidated Interim Storage actually happen.

This is why Senator Feinstein asked this
question of Secretary Moniz at the hearing a couple of
weeks ago and why I circulated that transcript. You
may recall that almost exactly a year ago we held a
meeting jointly with the Bipartisan Policy Commission,
which has been doing the staff work for the Blue Ribbon
Commission panel, and we talked about this issue and
there was no clear answer, and their own legal advice
has pointed in different directions.

I'd like to, though, point out something that
is embedded in the comment that Secretary Moniz made in
response to this question, which is, that when you get
to actual firms taking delivery of canisters and taking
title of them and baring legal liability and
uncertainty around how that gets funded, firms are
going to be wary about doing that unless there's a
clearer legal basis for this, because the law was
originally set up with the vision that the fuel will go
from a site, like San Onofre, to Yucca Mountain and not
get stopped along the way.
And so this is why I think most people believe that some change in federal law, not immediately but in the next couple of years, will be necessary in order to keep on track the track that Marni Magda made in her comments.

MR. STETSON: Okay. A couple of other questions -- and I'll come back to you, David -- one of them, Tom, the question came up, and I think the question came up too when Unit 1 was decommissioned, is there a possibility that the conduits could be used potentially for a desalinization plant?

MR. PALMISANO: Well, you know, the previous speaker had some good comments. I guess, theoretically anything's possible. Whether somebody would be interested in that equipment, it was designed for the intake and outlet for power generation cooling.

I guess, potentially, it could be used. I think the real issue is the land is owned by the Department of the Navy. As we heard in the NEPA discussion, they're going to determine the end-use.

So if somebody was interested in the site for the desalinization, whether to use the intake, the current piping or not, it's really up to the Navy. It's their land.

MR. STETSON: So then the contact should be to
the Navy to see if this is -- that'll be the first step?

MR. PALMISANO: Yes, that's what I would think. We -- we lease the land or have an easement for the land. We don't have the authority to determine what to do with the end-state; that rests with the Navy, and that will be dealt with through the review processes.

MR. STETSON: Okay. Thank you.

A question came up --

MR. OGGINS: And --

MR. STETSON: I'm sorry. Yes?

MR. OGGINS: Can I jump in on this one?

MR. STETSON: Absolutely.

MR. OGGINS: The conduits themselves are in State Lands Commission land, so the State Lands Commission will have to make the decision. You're correct that any onshore component associated with the desalinization facility, if the Navy says no to that, there's -- that will weigh into the Commission's decision.

But right now the Commission's lease says everything should be removed, the environmental impact report will evaluate leaving in place, which SCE has applied for, and other alternatives.
MR. PALMISANO: Yeah.

MR. OGGINS: So I just wanted to be very clear, the conduits themselves are on States land.

MR. PALMISANO: And I appreciate that because that points out the complexity if I had a new piece of land and wanted to build such a facility, I'm dealing with the landowner, whether it's me or somebody else, I'm dealing with the State Lands Commission, the Coastal Commission. So it's not just as simple as saying we ought to use it for that.

MR. STETSON: Right. So one of the steps would be come of your -- to come to one of your scoping meetings and address this to State Lands as well as additionally addressing it with the Navy.

Is that accurate, then?

MR. OGGINS: That's correct, yes.

MR. PALMISANO: Okay.

MR. STETSON: A question came up with reference to the location selection.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yes. So I just want to remind folks that our first meeting was in San Clemente and we've had several meetings in San Juan Capistrano. I believe we met twice in San Clemente.

And the point was made at the first meeting, I believe, by Jerry Kern asking us to have some meetings
in San Diego County --

MR. PALMISANO: Right.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- and, in particular, in Oceanside since Oceanside has really been affected by the closure of this plant and, in particular, on the labor front. And so that was the logic.

And so, I'm sorry that every meeting is not equally easy to attend, but the idea was to move the meetings around and then within that process of moving meetings -- meetings around, we had to find a site that's available --

MR. PALMISANO: Right.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- that is capable of handling the size crowd that may or may not attend and which has facilities that allow us to do AV and, also, frankly assure security to the public.

And within those constraints, very quickly, you don't have an unlimited number of sites.

Jerry Kern.

MR. KERN: Just to add on to that, you know, when I first thought of doing that, I offered Oceanside City Hall, but we have had meetings where our city hall has been way too small to accommodate the number of people that were coming in.

So this is probably one of the larger
facilities that we have in Oceanside that can accommodate the number of people that actually attended. Because, I know the last time we had a packed house.

MR. PALMISANO: Correct.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you.

Dan?

MR. STETSON: Thank you.

I know that all of us up here are volunteers, and I know, when we were told that we were being involved in criminal activity, that that kind of was like a stake in our hearts. I wondered if, Tom, or, David, if you'd like to --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Oh, I'd like --

MR. STETSON: -- make a comment.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: As chairman, I'd like to comment on this. People are free to say whatever they want and there's no effort to try and control content.

And Exhibit A is every single one of these meetings has a public comment period where people say things that nobody -- not everybody can agree with and that's the idea, so there is no effort to control content.

If someone honestly believes that there is --

And I see that Mr. Aguirre doesn't seem to be
here, nor is his colleague, Mrs. Severson, although,
they have left and the television cameras left, so that
maybe that that was a question not seeking an answer.

But if people actually believe that folks are
engaged in a criminal conspiracy, which is a very
special term, it has a very special legal meaning, then
I will welcome that information and I will welcome
those claims in writing, and if they don't actually
believe that and that the purpose of that claim is to
generate television time, and I'm not trying to control
content, but that is quite an accusation, if they don't
believe that, then folks should cease and desist from
such claims.

MR. PALMISANO: Right.

MR. STETSON: I do have --

MEMBER OF PUBLIC: Well, why haven't you
responded to the PRA Request, sir?

MR. STETSON: I do have a --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: My Public Records Act
request?

MEMBER OF PUBLIC: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: My university has, in
fact, and our legal counsel reviewed it and responded
to you. We have also responded to the inquiry that was
made with the Chancellor of my -- my university, asking
the Chancellor to remove me from this panel and that
has been reviewed by counsel, as well.

Our internal counsel discussions do not need
to be revealed to you, sir.

And I think it's pretty incredible that for a
panel of volunteers to come in and say that you're
going to go back and talk to the guy's boss because
he's somehow engaged in a criminal conspiracy is quite
extraordinary.

Tim Brown, do you want to comment?

MR. BROWN: Yeah, I do. I actually have our
charter here; it's something we take very seriously as
part of our being volunteer here, one of the pieces of
the charter has been renumerated for any of our
activity here on any level.

Within the charter, under Meetings, there's a
public comment period in each that says, "Regular
meetings shall include a public comment period in
accordance to procedures determined at the discretion
of the chairperson; in general, comments are limited to
approximately three minutes per person and the comment
period will not exceed one hour, subject to the
discretion of the chairperson."

I've been attending these meetings, it's been
two years since we've been in existence, and there's a
lot of familiar faces here, people that I know and that
we've agreed and not agreed with on certain things over
the past.

As matter of fact, in San Clemente, I think me
and The Headricks spend more time together than some of
my family members in some of these meetings.

And there's a lot of familiar faces, a lot of
people have passion about this issue, and I certainly
can't question your motives. I think they're very
pure. I can't say that about all the attendees tonight
because I've never seen them before. They've never
bothered to attend a single meeting in San Clemente or
one of the CEP meetings until tonight and for only a
extremely limited period of time.

So, from my part, one of the things I've
learned to appreciate in my tenure in political office
is sincerity. You know, no matter where you're coming
from, if you're sincere, I can respect that.

One of the things I also do really respect is
the rule or law and also some semblance of order;
without it, we end up in very heated discussions, but
no light.

And so one of the things I do commend to those
who are making public comments is to adhere to what
would be the rules of decorum that allow us to operate
without having to digress in screaming matches.

And so, you know, the rules, the charter, all these things is for a purpose. We're doing our best. Frankly, we're not professional CEP members, we're all volunteers, and we'll be rotating at some point up here, and there will be other people up here, trying to do the best they can.

But I think, in a very small period of time, I think we've communicated a lot of information and, frankly, I'm more encouraged by our path than I ever thought I could ever be sitting on this panel because I really thought it would be an exercise in frustration.

And I actually see some progress, heaven forbid, we actually do something positive with our tenure on this. And so I think the Consolidated Interim Storage -- the Consolidated Interim Storage solutions a lot of things we have going are positive.

I do think there's still concern that exist, which is why our meetings are focused on Defense-in-Depth, security, and the canister issue, which continues to surface, that we're working to address.

But I do appreciate those who adhere to the decorum. I know we don't always share the same opinions, but at least we share the same respect.
CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you.

Dan Stetson, other comments or questions that come up?

MR. STETSON: Yes. I'm sorry. There was one that came up that, Tom, I think that maybe you could address. There was a new study that came out, that Donna brought up, that said cracks could take place in five years. Are you familiar with that study at all?

MR. PALMISANO: Just briefly. We received a copy of it. It's a fairly recent study, I believe.

MS. GILMORE: Actually, it's March 2015. I just haven't sent it.

MR. PALMISANO: Yeah. And I know Donna has posed the question to the NRC in terms of what this means and they -- they committed to respond to you. You copied me on the email you sent to the spent fuel office, which I think is appropriate.

MS. GILMORE: Right. To clarify, it's five years after the cracks start.

MR. PALMISANO: Yeah.

MS. GILMORE: It's five years.

MR. PALMISANO: Yeah, so --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Well, maybe we can take it as an action item. We need to have --

(Unintelligible simultaneous colloquy.)
MR. PALMISANO: And --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- to look at that and respond.

MR. PALMISANO: We can discuss it at the next meeting. We've been in touch actually with the authors, so we've got some insights. So rather than give it a sound bite, I think it works in a more appropriate discussion, so I'll be glad to do that.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Right. I think these are important issues.

MR. PALMISANO: Right.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And they need to be analyzed.

MR. PALMISANO: Right. Yeah. So, thank you.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Can you talk -- I just want to add to Dan's notes here. The question has also been raised and has appeared at many other meetings about whether cracks can be detected, and the issue of whether the canisters can be repaired.

I personally reviewed the video from the workshop where the CEO of Holtec made this comment and he made this comment on the context of favoring a different option from repair, namely --

MR. PALMISANO: Right.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- favoring replacement
of the canister. Can you just talk about where we stand and what's likely to happen? Because the technology and -- (Simultaneous colloquy.)

MR. PALMISANO: Yeah, let me give you a short update. And if we can load this into the next meeting because there's a lot of activity going on and this is one where Donna and I might agree on some things in terms of there is no tooling today that can effectively inspect and repair.

You know, in my view, there's technology, but not tooling developed. Donna may characterize it differently, but I think the operative point is, tooling needs to be developed and deployed.

The industry and EPRI and the NRC is working on that. We have tested robotic instruments at Palo Verde that go into the vents on the canisters and can traverse up and down the outside of the canisters, inside the overpacks or in the UMAX system.

So that techn -- that tooling has been developed. Now they're testing the transducers to actually examine the canisters. So that work is underway. It's a high priority for the industry. It's a high priority for us.

It will be part of the renewed license for the current system and it's been part of, you know,
inspection techniques and requirements are part of the renewed licenses that have already been issued, for example, at requests and others.

So it's a topic we need to bring in with, quite frankly, a good 30-minute discussion, not just a sound bite.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yeah, this is the major part of the Defense-in-Depth that this panel asked for as part of the review.

MR. PALMISANO: And the EPRI article that you referenced talks about some of the EPRI-related activities, it was part of that.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay.

MR. PALMISANO: So I think it's important to come back and talk about that.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Yeah. Thank you.

MS. GILMORE: David mentioned the repair part. Can you address that part of the question?

MR. PALMISANO: Well, I'm thinking the same thing. You know, the next step past inspection will be repair capability. I have talked to the president of Holtec to clarify.

And his thinking is, as you look at it, if you detect a crack, you could repair. His thinking would be you simply put it in an overpack and not spend the
effort to repair when an overpack would be as effective, and I'll be glad to talk about that further in a session.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yeah, I think when we have the session that's on Defense-in-Depth --

MR. PALMISANO: Right.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- we need to talk about this in-depth.

Is that the full list, Dan?

MR. STETSON: Yes. And there was the one question about the PUC.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I think I addressed that.

MR. STETSON: I think you did already. Thank you.

MR. PALMISANO: Can I mention one thing? One of the commentors mentioned the attacks in Belgium, the terrorist attacks, you know, just to tell people what happens at a commercial nuclear plant, even a decommissioned plant, when something like that happens, we immediately go to a heightened awareness in terms of just if there's any threat, we check with the NRC, which we have done, we check with the FBI, no credible threats to nuclear facility in the U.S.

So the individual licensees and the -- the
industry through our NEI organization respond
immediately to collaborate with the NRC, Homeland
Security, and the FBI to see if there are any credible
intelligence and then to step up heightened levels of
security, should it be necessary. So it's not ignored
by any means, quite frankly.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very
much.

I want to see if there are any other members
of the panel who -- I've called out Dan. Dan has
called out a number of items to follow up, I believe
we've answered the major questions raised.

Anything that we're missing? Jerry Kern.

MR. KERN: Well, just one quick thing, you
know, we talked about the location and public
transportation, there's a Sprinter stop, probably,
within about a 10-minute walk of here, which is our --
the east-west line.

So if you rode the Coaster down, you can
transfer from the Coaster or Amtrak to the Sprinter
Line and the Sprinter Line runs parallel to Oceanside
Boulevard, so there's a stop.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I think that's an
important point. We should -- as these meetings are
announced, we should make sure there's a footnote on
the announcement page, a conspicuous footnote or something, that tells people how to get here by public transportation.

MR. PALMISANO: We'll take that action since we do the administrative support.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yeah, I know that's --

MR. PALMISANO: To identify public transportation options for the venue.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: That would be great.

Thank you very much.

Let me see if there are other comments.

Ted Quinn?

MR. QUINN: Yeah, very quick. I wanted to just -- if Mr. Aguirre was here, I wanted to offer to give him a copy of the Waste Policy Act of 1982 that documents actually who owns the fuel at the different stages and I would've liked to have provided, but he left too early.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. The reason, I think, you're referring to that because the reason that people are going to the federal government asking for help here is that the law of the land, whether you like it or not, it is the law of the land, that the federal government ultimately owns the fuel and, in fact, the operators of all these facilities have paid the federal
government to take the fuel, so a contract has been signed and honored on the utility side and not on the government side.

But, look, I think what's so interesting, to echo something that Tim Brown said, what's so interesting about the consolidated storage topic is, while there's a range of views, this looked like an impossible problem two years ago and now it's not trivial by any means and it could have all kinds of problems, it will have all kinds of problems along the way, but you can start to see how you make progress.

And I think that's a contribution that this community has made in an organized way in more than any other community in this country, so we should be proud of that.

I want to see if there are any other comments. I checked on that side.

Any other comments here?

(Brief pause.)

Okay. Well, thank you very much.

I want to remind everybody to submit any additional comments you may have to the Web -- to the email address, that just disappeared from the screen, so that's not a conspiracy, it's just a technical error. It's back. No conspiracies.
And I want to thank all of you for participating here, especially mindful of the difficulties of getting here in public transport. I want to thank Edison and the Edison staff and the police officers here with us tonight.

And I particularly want to thank members of the Community Engagement Panel. You are volunteers. You have come to many meetings and you have done service and I am grateful for that. Thank you.

We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, the Community Engagement Panel meeting concluded at 8:34 p.m.)
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