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* * *

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: My name is David Victor. I'm chairman of the Community Engagement Panel. On behalf of Dan Stetson, Secretary, and Tim Brown, Vice chairman, I want to welcome all of you to our meeting tonight, which is to look back at the last three, almost three years, of the Community Engagement Panel and see what's happened, what's working, what's not working, and also where we might be headed in the future and how we can make this mechanism as effective as possible.

Just a couple of safety notices before we get started: And if you need to evacuate the building, there are exits, emergency exits, marked with "Exit." There's one right in the back there and, of course, the door that you came through when you entered this room.

We have two officers from the Orange County Sheriffs Department. I want to thank them for their service, for being here for our security this evening.

The Community Engagement Panel, as all of you've now heard me say many times, but it's worth saying every single time we meet, is an institution
set up by Edison, designed to open a conduit, a two-way conduit, between the communities affected by the decommissioning process and the operator of the decommissioning plant, Southern California Edison.

And so there might be a whole range of views that people have about what -- whether the plant was a good idea to build in the first place and what happened in the past and so on and those, I'm sure, we'll talk soon about that tonight.

But the idea is to be as pragmatic as possible to help Edison understand what the communities care about as effects the decommissioning process and to help the communities understand what Edison is doing and its contractors are doing and why, if adjustments are needed, where those adjustments might -- might be needed and so on.

We're not a decision-making body, not a formal decision-making body. There are a lot of those and a lot of regulatory bodies, but we're not one of them.

There's a website, www.SONGScommunity.com, where you can sign up for meeting reminders, reminders about the meeting, such as tonight, and to see all the documents that are circulated to the Community Engagement Panel, all of our correspondence, official correspondence.
The screen has now gone to iTunes, so there is no iTunes connection on that site, as far as I know, but you never know. It's been an unusual week, so we could see anything.

The -- including the draft slide decks, and so we'll put -- we put on your chairs copies of slides that are going to be difficult to see, but circulate the entire deck as it's circulated to the Community Engagement Panel along with other advance materials there, those livestreaming copies of earlier meetings and so on. You can also sign up for walking tours of the plant. The next walking tours are the 7th and the 17th of December, 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

Many of you saw the decommissioning booths. I'd have to say that the booths are becoming more and more informative. They now have models of some of the different pieces of equipment, in particular the dry cask storage system that's being constructed on the site right now. Those will be staffed during the break as well.

If you want to make a comment during the public comment period, please sign up and we'll do as we do every meeting, we'll call the names that are signed up for public comment. Dan and Tim will monitor the comments and help facilitate a dialogue.
And then if you don't want to make a comment, public or in person, you can send an email to nucomm@SONGS.sce.com. You may want to write that one down otherwise it'll be a little hard to memorize.

But you can send an email to that address or to me and it'll become part of the official record and we're organizing comments and responding to them and keeping track of that, and you'll see hopefully continued efforts to improve that tonight.

We're Livestreamed to the world tonight and so -- as with everything meeting. And so, panel members, as you make your comments, please state your names so the folks at home can -- can know who is talking.

I'll call out various action items that we will memorialize so we make sure we get back to people on things that come up, and I really look forward to -- to tonight's discussions.

I got -- I learned, as I walked in, that tonight is also the 244 -- 244th birthday of the Marine Corps and the plant is on Marine Corps property, and I really want to -- happy birthday to the Marine Corps. It's really terrific news.

And I know many of you, in various ways, have relationship with the marines and so if various birthday cakes come out from underneath your seats and
things like that, I now understand why that is.

Congratulations to the -- to the Marine Corps, so.

So, I want to introduce some folks tonight and then we'll get right into the -- to the agenda for the meeting: First, representing SCE, which is the organization that's decommissioning the plant, normally we have Tom Palmisano with us, who is the chief nuclear officer.

Tom is out of the state with a family medical emergency. And we wish Tom and his family well and I've sent him a note on behalf of -- on behalf of us and he's really appreciative of that.

Instead of Tom tonight, we have Jim Madigan, who is Director of Nuclear Oversight, Safety Culture and Regulatory Affairs and Technical Advisor to the CNO, Chief Nuclear Officer, Tom Palmisano.

Jim has been centrally involved in every aspect of decommissioning of this plant, including the work of the Community Engagement Panel. So you may not have seen Jim as much as you've seen Tom, but he's been there at every step of the way.

I also want to acknowledge some invited guests who are going to be on the panel later in our meeting tonight: Sara Kaminske, Chair of the Interjurisdictional Planning Committee for San Onofre
and Assistant Emergency Manager for the Orange County Sheriffs Department.

Representing Organized Labor, we're going to have Dan Domínguez, President of the Utility Workers, Union of America Local 246; and representing civil society and some voices from civil society, we had asked Gary Headrick, who is cofounder of San Clemente Green to speak.

Gary had an unexpected medical emergency and surgery yesterday, and I have sent Gary our wishes, best wishes as well. But I'm really pleased that Charles Langley can step in tonight and -- from Public Watchdogs and make Gary's com -- remarks and also help us in that panel discussion, which we'll get to a little bit later in the agenda tonight.

So we're going to talk tonight about how things look after three years and I want to first give the floor to Jim Madigan to give us these updates, as is custom in each of these meetings, give us an update on what's happening with the plant and lead us through some discussions from the perspective of Southern California Edison of what they've seen over the last three years, what's been important and less so.

And then we're going to have a segment of the meeting where members of the Community Engagement Panel
are going to offer some -- some views from their point
of view and then we're going to hear from this terrific
panel of three different segments of civil society who,
in various ways, have been very engaged in this
process.

So, right now I give the floor to you, Jim
Madigan.

MR. MADIGAN: Thank you, David, and panel
members and ladies and gentlemen. I appreciate the
opportunity to speak tonight. So I'm just going to
work right into the slides.

So with -- along with the theme of where we've
been and where we're headed, the first thing that we
did when we established our plan going forward with
respect to decommissioning the facility was to
establish a set of core principles by which we would
operate under and every decision that we make is placed
within these core principles:

And they are Safety, to safely decommission
San Onofre both from a personnel safety and an
environmental safety aspect, Stewardship, we want to
leave the community better off, we want to take care of
the trust fund; and certainly we want to engage all the
stakeholders involved in what we're doing at
San Onofre.
This is one of the handouts that I think you have on your chairs. This is always very difficult to read, so you should have a copy of this.

So let me just go through and explain. To the left of the bold vertical line is divided up by quarters, starting with the first quarter of 2014.

So as I look back on what we've done since we made the decision to shut down the plant, I look at the planning phase and really that's really the major portion that's on the left-hand side of that bold line, so the planning phase includes all the regulatory interactions that are necessary.

We went through that. We've had presentations in front of the Community Engagement Panel. We've had discussions with the communities on that. So as we move through to get to that bold line right now, that's really bringing us up to the point at which we are today, where we are about to select and award the contract to the decommissioning general contractor and then, once we have all the state approvals, we'll start into the work in earnest.

So to the left of the bold line really all the planning phases and then to the right it goes year-by-year and really the critical path there is continuing to move fuel, getting the decommission --
decommissioning general contractor in place and working through all the state agencies to get the permits to do the work that we need to do.

So a lot of NRC requirements. This is just really some of the submittals that we've had approved to date. We had a lot of interaction for the post-shutdown decommissioning activities report.

I'm not going to go through each one of these. These are all approved through the planning phases all the way up to the defuel quality assurance plan, which is now in place.

The NRC license pending submittals that we have. We've submitted our license amendment request for our cyber security program. It's a regulated program that requires certain aspects of work to be completed, so we're working with the NRC to find out exactly what is necessary at the decommissioned facility. We also have exemption requests in place for off-site and on-site insurance.

So a lot has occurred since 2014 at the site. Certainly, we started with the -- placing the plant in a situation where we could actually begin the decommissioning planning, which was to remove all the fuel from the reactor and get it safely stored in the spent fuel pools.
The next initiative there, Cold and Dark:

We've had many updates on that. That is really what we needed to do in order to put the plant in a safe condition, which means take all the energy, electricity, and all the hazards out of the systems that the decommissioning general contractor will eventually come in and start working on.

So, involved in that is changing systems that are still appropriate to the operating at the station on to a separate electric supply that is safely configured for the demolition work that will happen sometime in the near future.

Islanding the spent fuel pools: We still have the Unit 1 -- or Unit 2 and Unit 3 spent fuel pools that are safely storing the used nuclear fuel. We need to keep those pools cool in accordance with the requirements to safely store the fuel, so we've installed highly redundant safety systems that will maintain the pools' environment so that the fuel is stored in a safe configuration.

We're currently on those islanded spent fuel pool systems and that allowed us to reduce our dependance on the ocean for cooling water.

MR. QUINN: Jim?

MR. MADIGAN: Yes.
MR. QUINN: Jim, do you --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Ted Quinn.

MR. QUINN: Ted Quinn. Do you still -- do you still take water in from the ocean?

MR. MADIGAN: Yes.

MR. QUINN: You do?

MR. MADIGAN: A very small amount.

MR. QUINN: Right. For this? For the spent fuel pool?

MR. MADIGAN: Oh, no, not for the spent fuel pooling. It's still for our permits that we have with the -- the San Diego water permits for releasing --

MR. QUINN: Okay.

MR. MADIGAN: -- like our sewage treatment plant and things like that.

MR. QUINN: Okay.

MR. MADIGAN: So another thing that we've accomplished is the -- we're beginning this construction of the independent spent fuel storage installation.

This picture depicts, in blue there, the location of the final construction of the independent fuel storage pad. Just to the other side of that is the existing storage pad, so we'll have two systems side by side stored there.
Construction has already started; it's well underway. I don't have a picture of the construction. This is a rendition of what it will look like once the construction is complete.

This is -- I don't know if you have a copy of this one, but really this is a project schedule, so you can get some kind of idea of when the construction will be complete. We expect that to complete sometime in the middle of next year. We are continuing to fabricate the canisters that are necessary to store the fuel so that schedule goes on out.

And then, certainly, the security systems that are necessary to support the movement of the fuel over to the new facility and, of course, going all the way out into 2019 is the fuel campaign where we're actually moving the fuel.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Are we still --

Jim, this is David Victor.

To the previous slide, I assume this is -- can we go back there? Thanks. Thank you very much.

This is exactly the same information that's on that giant time line that nobody could read. Are we -- is this plan still on track to begin off-loading of fuel in early 2018, which will be a distal, a little more than a year from today?
MR. MADIGAN: Yes, we are on track. That includes the completion of the spent fuel storage facility and the security facility that goes along with it, so we're still on track with all that.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And then when will the pools -- the pools will be demolished then once that process is complete, which would be the middle of 2019?

MR. MADIGAN: So I'll say the pools will be empty around the middle of 2019 and then the decommissioning general contractor, in accordance with their schedule for demolition, will then begin taking down the plant, so they'll be available to the contractor at that point for removal.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: My impression is, it will be -- because this is a very large contract and will have a large impact on jobs and so on, I think it will be very helpful for the communities to have an opportunity to meet the general contractor, you know, at some appropriate time. Obviously, you've got a lot of contractual things to sort out with that company, but it will great to meet that organization sometime.

MR. MADIGAN: Certainly. And I think as part of today's or tonight's agenda, we're going to talk about what we're going to bring to the Community Engagement Panel in next year's agenda and one of those
items, in early 2017, will be to get the DGC or the
general contractor here.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Are there any other
questions from the CEP about the discussions -- about
the presentation so far? I know you're going to go and
deeper-dive in the three topics in just a moment. But
I want to see if there are any other comments or
questions so far.

Carry on.

MR. MADIGAN: Thank you.

So we have some questions that we wanted to --
to answer as a result of previous meetings and
inquiries and these are the two topics:

The Department of Energy spent fuel
litigation: Cost recovery and ratepayer -- ratepayer
refunds; and the decommissioning finance briefing.

So first let's talk about the litigation.

For years, since the Waste Policy Act in 1982,
the government has been collecting money for the
eventual storage of used nuclear fuel.

Since we have not had a solution provided to
the industry, it came to a point where the industry
decided to go try to recover those funds, and we've
been doing that and that's what the spent fuel
litigation is all about.
So we use litigation to recover the cost as a result of the breach of the Department of Energy contract. So far, you can see the numbers there, 304 million recovered to date by SONGS. The 2016 settlement provides a claim process from 2014 to '16 and then we just kind of circle back and continue to do this for as long as we need to.

Damages recovered by SCE are subject to the California Public Utilities Commission's review and then how those funds are disbursed are all in agreement with the CPUC. So, questions on that?

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Ted.

MR. QUINN: So -- Ted Quinn. About every two years you -- you do this again? Is it two or three years?

MR. MADIGAN: Yes, until we get the full recovery. And we stopped paying, so there'll be some end -- end date that we'll -- we don't have to pay anymore and we don't have to make any recoveries anymore.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Bill Parker.

MR. PARKER: Bill Parker.

Quick question: Is this litigation a confrontational litigation or is it simply the process which you have to go through to recover funds?
MR. MADIGAN: It's simply a process by now. The process really involves how much on the dollar you're going to get recover and it's fairly consistent across the industry.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: So this is a litigation with a smile?

MR. MADIGAN: No, it's never litigation with a smile, but it's -- we don't go in there with guns ablazing.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: But can you -- can you say a couple of words about what's going to happen with all the moneys? For example, is the money used for the longer term stewardship of the casks on site because they're going to be there longer than people expect it? Is it going to be used for consolidated interim storage? We're going to talk about it later. What do you -- is it just given back to the ratepayers?

What -- what are you doing with it though?

MR. MADIGAN: So part -- part of the money will eventually go back to the ratepayers. Like I said, the California Public Utilities Commission manages how that money gets disbursed, including to the trust fund back to expenses to the company or to the ratepayers.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Any other comments or
questions? Okay. I wanted to emphasize something, which is, several meetings people have raised questions about the overall trust fund and its adequacy, and early on in this panel some folks raised the question, a completely legitimate question, about whether this panel should somehow get involved in oversight of these funds; and that's outside our competence and there are lots of other groups doing that oversight.

So the purpose of this segment, of this update, was to give people an update about the money and where you think it's going but not to, you know, reopen this question of some kind of more intensive role by the Community Engagement Panel here.

MR. MADIGAN: So my intent was not to just say "We've got a trust fund and it's divided into three areas and it equals 4.4 billion."

There were really four specific things that were asked and I wanted to address those using this one slide: The first being who -- who really takes care of that trust fund and it's really overseen by a five-member trust committee and it's regulated by the California Public Utilities Commission.

So it's not sitting in our coffers. It's regulated. It's overseen by a group of folks that make sure that it's handled appropriately. The trust funds
are fully funded, so we stopped collecting and we
believe that no additional collections are going to be
necessary at this time.

Some question came about, "Does the 4.4
billion include contingency funds?" I don't know who
asked the question. But, yes, it does, it includes the
25 percent contingency.

And does it include the money for the removal
of the offshore conduit? I think was the specific
question. And, yes, it does, and that also includes
the 25 percent contingency.

So all of the functions that are necessary to
return the land back to the owner are in place.

Tim?

MR. BROWN: Is that a net present value
calculation or is that the amount of money that's going
to be expended over a period of time?

MR. MADIGAN: Now you're getting into this
financial stuff.

MR. BROWN: Oh, sorry.

MR. MADIGAN: I'm going to really give
technical advice from a nuclear perspective.

MR. BROWN: No, sorry about that.

MR. MADIGAN: I can tell you it's 2014
dollars. So I don't -- I don't have the financial
answer to answer that question.

    MR. BROWN: Okay. Just a curiosity.

    CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: But that's the current value of the trust fund in contemporary dollars, which means that is presumably accruing at --

    MR. MADIGAN: It continues to accrue.

    CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Right.

    MR. QUINN: So if you don't use the 25 percent, it goes back to the ratepayers; is that correct?

    MR. MADIGAN: So whatever funds are left over, yes.

    MR. QUINN: Okay.

    MR. MADIGAN: It goes back through the CPUC to --

    MR. QUINN: Okay.

    MR. MADIGAN: -- be refunded in whatever way is determined. Oh, I should ask. Any more questions on the budget?

    CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. So are there any other -- you're going to shift now and talk about your -- SCE's continued priorities around the Community Engagement Panel?

    MR. MADIGAN: That's right.

    CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Are there any other
questions that people have about the update on the
decommissioning process, where we stand there?

        Okay. Go ahead.

        MR. MADIGAN: So our priorities going forward.

        I wanted to present them in terms of our
decommissioning priority. So under the heading of
safety, we are going to continue the development of the
dry fuel storage pad from construction to actually
loading the pad, so one of our goals is to transfer
that fuel from wet to dry in a safe manner all along
the way, making sure that the development of the aging
management programs and the defense-in-depth programs
are in play.

        The stewardship, we're heavily involved in the
California Environmental Quality Act process for
permitting for the work that we're going to do.

        And as I mentioned earlier, we're very close
to awarding the contract to actually start the work
once we have it permitted. And then top priority from
an engagement perspective is making consolidated
interim storage a reality and we'll talk about that
later.

        So SCE supports all the safe and reasonable
solutions for moving used fuel off site and
consolidated interim storage initiative right now
involves two sites, one in New Mexico and one in Texas. Both private companies are trying to license those facilities right now: One, the Waste Control Specialists in Texas. They've already submitted their license and Holtec soon to follow.

The Department of Energy's consent-based siting already had the public meetings all the way across the nation. They're still working to draft their report and, of course, the DOE is continuing -- continuing to work on their next steps to prepare in the eventual use of a consolidated storage site if the approvals come through.

And, of course, the bipartisan policy center really pushing and that's where it really all got started, really pushing for this solution and follow up on the recommendations they made for this step.

Any questions on consolidated interim storage?

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Ted Quinn.

MR. QUINN: Have you -- have you talked to either of the sites, consolidated interim storage sites?

MR. MADIGAN: Well --

MR. QUINN: At Edison?

MR. MADIGAN: Have we talked to the sites?

We're in contact with the -- the people who
are submitting the license for those facilities.

MR. QUINN: Good.

MR. MADIGAN: We're in constant contact with those guys.

MR. QUINN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Let me just mention that I received, and then we've shared with this group, correspondence from both sites, one of them from the waste in the West Texas site, from the actual operator, AREVA, of the site, and the other one from the government, local government in New Mexico, and I think they're ready to come and meet with us and talk with us whenever the time is right.

Go ahead.

MS. BARTLETT: It's great to have the -- the prospect of the consolidated interim storage for the two locations, but I know we need to work through the process of getting the enabling legislation.

We've got, I believe, Senator Feinstein and Congressman Issa have two pieces of legislation that are pending in DC to allow us to accomplish these goals to these private properties and then also working on the funding; is that correct? Do we have a status report on where the legislation is at this point?

MR. MADIGAN: I can't give you the exact
status. But you're -- you're correct. They are --
you're working towards those solutions. There is a
lot of discussion going on. Of course, it was kind of
delayed through the election process, but we expect it
to gain momentum again.

And, yes, it does require that the Department
of Energy and congress get involved in making the rules
and making this possible.

MS. BARTLETT: Okay. The County of Orange and
certainly myself, representing the 5th District for the
south county cities, we're going to be working very
closely with the county and both Senator Feinstein and
Congressman Issa to -- there are some little flaws in
the legislation, so we're going to try to work on those
items, but making sure that those two pieces of
legislation move forward because we really can't do
anything to get the interim consolidated storage, get
the spent fuel rods off site until the legislation
passes and then we also work on the funding through the
legislation as well.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Great. Well, thank you
very much. And let's have a fuller conversation about
exactly that topic later because we've -- we have put
together a con -- strategic plan to make sure that all
of us know what each other is doing and let's come back
to exactly that topic. I think that is my view; that
is topic number one that we need to keep on working,
and I think we're making a lot progress.

Any other questions about CIS?

Can I ask you one here? Which is, everybody
is focused on these two sites. It seems to me that we
have an interest in as many possible sites coming
forward as -- as imaginable because then that reduces
the risk that any one site will run into trouble and
that'll be problematic.

Have you heard anything about other sites?

MR. MADIGAN: I was at a conference at the
beginning of October. The industry -- the industry is
very interested in this, as you can imagine. There are
other discussions taking place, but none of them have
reached anywhere near the formal progress that I would
say AREVA and Holtec have made with the New Mexico and
Texas facility.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: But it's possible? It
sounds like it's possible other sites.

MR. MADIGAN: It certainly is possible.

There's talk about Tennessee as well.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Okay. Right.

Excellent. Thank you.

MR. MADIGAN: And, of course, one of our main
priorities is to safely manage and store the used fuel until it can be removed from the site and be prepared should we get the permission to be able to move it.

There are safe and reasonable options to remove the nuclear fuel from San Onofre. We're talking about consolidated interim storage. There may be some emphasis now put back on an ultimate repository. We're not just focused on one front. We're focused on all fronts in supporting the entire industry to get there.

Oops. It went forward. I'm sorry.

The important thing is to recognize that this is a high priority for the station. It's a high priority for the communities and we recognize that and we're going to continue to keep focus on it.

Okay. From a California Environmental Quality Act perspective, the lead agency for our CEQA permitting is the State Lands Commission. As you know, they've had their series of public meetings. They've selected a consultant to build their project in their environmental impact analysis or impact survey.

We talked about what the ultimate deposition of the conduits would be, so there is discussion going back and forth there. So really I think the three options that they remove all the vertical risers, leave the intakes in place, that's one of the options.
We believe there's a benefit for doing that because it minimizes the sub -- the sea floor disturbances and maintains an existing habitat that's out there and limits the amount of disruption that we have. A lot of discussion going on with that one right now; no decision made at this point.

And like I said, we will be bringing the decommissioning general contractor information once we are through the process. I believe that, before the end of the year, we'll be able to award a contract and at that point we'll be preparing for the next Community Engagement Panel meeting to bring much more information forward.

It is a competitive bid process and it wasn't done in a vacuum here. We've used several independent parties that have vast experience doing very large projects to come in and provide an independent -- an independent look at what we're doing, including subject matter expert reviews of each step as we've gone along the way. And like I said, we're really close to this.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Can you say a couple of words about the oversight, regulatory oversight, you've had in that process?

I assume the Public Utilities Commission is interested because it's going to cost a lot of money or
somebody is going to be interested in that as a regulator, and I would think that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission would be interested because of nuclear safety issue. Just tell us a little bit about what the regulatory oversight is.

MR. MADIGAN: So -- so from an oversight perspective, of course, the California Public Utilities Commission is going to be interested in it. They are not taking part in the selection process. They're not involved in this at all. They will provide their due diligence as they review the work that gets done and the prudency with respect to how the work is being done.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission, they're also not part of the bid process, but the bid is steeped in regulatory requirements and that is one of the major emphasis that we have with respect to awarding the contract in how these -- the bidders can actually comply with all the regulations going forward.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: But the obligation to comply still rests with Edison?

MR. MADIGAN: The license rest -- rests with Edison and it always will. The important part is providing that oversight to ensure that the requirements are being met and we start with the
contract and having a very firm contract in place that really delineates what those requirements are.

As I mentioned before, we expect to have the contract awarded by the end of the year and then there is a period of time where the general contractor will mobilize and we expect that right after we get the CEQA permitting that they will start the work in earnest and the duration right now and the schedule is 8 to 10 years, but we'll know more or we'll have much more specifics once we get the contractor in place and they mobilize.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Tim?

MR. BROWN: Quick question: We -- we had some challenges. And I know this question probably goes without asking. But we had some challenges during the recession when we had SunCal, who was developing a project in our town who couldn't perform, and we had a period of time where we actually had to fall back on our bonding to finish the improvements and to complete the project.

I'm assuming that whatever GC would have to be fully licensed. I mean, not -- of course licensed, but bonded completely in case of a failure to perform, in case there is a need there, that we've got backups for backups and these schedules we develop will always stay
on task no matter what.

MR. MADIGAN: So without going into great
detail on what's in the contract, there was enough
financial assurance with the final three bidders that
went through to get to this selection, including
letters of credit for just that event of significant
magnitude or sufficient magnitude to be able to cover
the work that they're -- they're performing as they go
through. So, yes, the contract is very specific to
protect us there.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Vermont is going
through, in parallel with us, a similar process and
they're doing it now in a different way.

I don't know, Ted, if you want to ask any
questions about that.

Ted and I have had some back and forth about
that process, because it's just -- it seems like
they're going at a very different route and I'm sure
eventually questions will come up as to why we're not
doing the same thing.

MR. QUINN: So, Jim, Entergy sold the site and
they sold the entire site plus the trust fund and all
about two or three weeks ago to -- I can't remember --
Star Core.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Northstar.
Mr. Quinn: Northstar.

Chairman Dr. Victor: Uh-huh.

Mr. Quinn: Okay. It's a different method of doing. Like Zion I think did. Is that --

Mr. Madigan: So the method that you're talking about is the transfer of the license and all the requirements from an NRC perspective to that contractor. So Energy Solutions at the Zion facility transferred the license from Exelon to Energy Solutions.

Now, ultimately, that transfer goes back because the fuel still stays on the site and Energy Solutions, who owns that, that's an Exelon fuel, so I expect something similar to happen in the State of Vermont. But that's the model that they're following right now, is to transfer the license and have the contractor come in and own all that responsibility.

Mr. Quinn: Okay.

Chairman Dr. Victor: And if somebody asks us why -- why you're doing it this way where you continue owning the site to get a general contractor to doing all the work, what would your answer be?

Mr. Madigan: We did an extensive analysis as to what the -- what the requirements are. Certainly, we saw that it had happened in the past, but it was
really SCE's license and SCE's responsibility and SCE's commitment to the community and we didn't want to do that.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you.

Any other questions about this?

(Brief pause.)

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Do you want to go on?

Thanks.

MR. MADIGAN: This is the last slide. It really talks about some of the aging management and defense-in-depths for the storage of the spent nuclear fuel.

There's a lot of work going on within the industry. We are part of every single one of those users group or industry entities. And then in the last two bullets there, we have the AREVA system, which is currently already loaded and on the -- on the ISFSI pad, the existing pad.

The license renewal for the containers that are being used to store that fuel will include an aging management program. And as Holtec systems are being developed, I'm sure they'll learn a lot from the aging management plan that is being instituted with the AREVA and, of course, all the other aging management plans around the country.
CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Bill Parker.

MR. PARKER: Bill Parker. Let me go back a little bit with a simple question on the decommissioning, what are -- for a few brief comments, could you make a few brief comments on Southern California Edison's plan for the transportation and ultimate dispo -- disposal of low-level waste that come from the dismantling process? What's the impact on the community? How much material are you transporting?

What's the transport mechanisms and so on?

MR. MADIGAN: So let me -- let me talk about that in terms of the bid process because the bids that we received that we're in the process of reviewing and actually making the selection came with different ways of disposing of that waste.

Energy solutions is -- Energy Solutions actually owns the Clive Utah facility which is a licensed burial facility in the State of Utah. One of the vendors that is one of the bidders proposes submitting for an exemption for the very lowest level of waste that would go to like a RCRA facility.

They're talking about a facility that's not a licensed radioactive material facility, but a facility that if we got -- if they got the exemption, they could ship the waste there.
So there's different ways of doing it. Most of the waste will, more than likely, go out on railcars. That's about all I can really tell you about it right now. There are certain mechanisms in the regulations that provide for the disposal of the lowest level of waste all the way up to the high-level waste and then you've got your spent nuclear fuel and other waste that can't be shipped.

MR. PARKER: I don't know how much time you want to spend, but a related question is, what's the regulatory oversight in the community communication associated with the transport of those low-level and medium level waste materials? How do you get community engagement to schedule routes and so on?

MR. MADIGAN: Well, the manifest require that they communicate to the communities through the route. Now, I don't know the level of engagement that the communities want to get involved with that, but the regulations require that to manifest the waste through the -- the communities, you have to make notification.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yes. So this was the source -- one of the sources of my earlier comment about meeting the contractor is, I think we need clearly this panel is going to spend a lot of time on consolidated interim storage, and we're going to get to
that in a moment, and we're going to spend a lot of
time on the aging, what the industry calls the aging
management programs, or other people call it
defense-in-depth.

We need to understand what's being done to
make sure that the canister systems are secured and
monitored and things like that, but then there's going
to be this whole decommissioning process underway, so I
would think to help us understand what -- what's going
to happen with the waste, what the transport
consultation process is going to be, I think there's
just going to be an ongoing process clearly 8 or 10
years where it'll be very important to -- to be fully
engaged with the communities in both directions.

MR. MADIGAN: So each one of the contractors
has a waste management plan and once the selected
contractor comes to the panel, we ought to be asking
those questions.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.

Lisa?

MS. BARTLETT: Tim Brown brought up some good
points with regard to making sure that the contractor
follows through and we have that financial commitment
to do so. So the letters of credit are great.

But do we also have performance bonds for each
of the contractors?

    MR. MADIGAN: No.

    MS. BARTLETT: Are we going to get performance bonds?

    MR. MADIGAN: No. We -- through the contract that we have with the contractor, there are -- it's very clear when they're making their milestones and when they're not making their milestones and how we exit from paying them for non-performance and then ensuring that we're covered with respect to how we recover from a non-performance of a contractor.

    MS. BARTLETT: Okay. Was there a performance bond even under consideration or did they just go straight to letters of credit?

    MR. MADIGAN: I can't answer that question. I don't know the answer to that question.

    MS. BARTLETT: Okay. All right. Thank you.

    MR. MADIGAN: So that's something I can follow up on.

    CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: There may be. It sounds like there is a series of questions, some of which may get into the detail of the bidding process that may be beyond us or public exposure right now. But I think there is a series of questions here that might hopefully result in a letter from Edison back to the
panel that we can help share with the community about what's going on in this process.

MR. MADIGAN: I can certainly take that back, David.

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

MR. MADIGAN: And we'll see what we can present.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I'm just mindful of the time. I want to see if anybody else has comments or questions on this. Okay. I think that was your last slide.

MR. MADIGAN: It was.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And did anyone want to say anything about the aging management or ask Jim any questions about this slide here?

I don't think anybody did.

Okay. So, now we're going to turn to the next segment of the meeting where the Community Engagement Panel is going to talk about what we've done over the last three years, not in detail but in spirit, and kind of what do we think is working, what are our priorities going forward.

We're going to be -- we're going to "Operate" a little bit in Whack-a-Mole mode here where each of us
is going to sit up and say something and then sit down spiritually at least.

I'm first going to talk a little bit about the goals that we've set out and I talked about in the very beginning, which is to set up this two-way conduit of communication.

And when I was asked to chair this process, this is this -- this is the first thing that I insisted on: That the entire process and the culture of this process be bidirectional and not just the operator telling us what's going on, but learning about what the communities care about.

And there are going to places where people disagree. We've seen this in -- in past meetings and that's the normal -- the normal route. But this two-way process, I think has been very important and I think we really have established that.

We need to make sure we are responsive to the topics that the communities care about and so we're going to have discussion a little bit about what are the topics for next year -- we've got a bunch of candidates. We'll have some more detail about that -- and to focus on helping the public understand and learn about what's happening here and also help Edison understand and learn what the public cares about.
Because this is -- you know, we're in this for the long haul. This is a multidecadal process. And if we do not succeed in consolidated interim storage, it could be even longer than that.

I don't think there's much to discuss here. I want to instead get to the main parts of looking back over the last three years, give the floor first to Tim Brown, who is going to talk a little bit about the public dialogue process.

MR. BROWN: Well, I think one of the things that has been very illuminating for all members of the panel as well as those who've attended as members of the public is the broad array of experts that we've brought in here from government agencies, former heads of the NRC, the Department of Energy, folks who actually can make a difference in the policy deliberations.

That's, I think, one of the items that has been the strength of this panel is, you get this wide array of experts from a whole variety of different sources that have been able to weigh on different topics that are germane at that time.

And I think it's the strength of the CEP and I think it's something that absolutely should continue and to -- continue to dip into a large population of
different folks who are going to be part of this, the
general contractor, who is going to be a part of this,
as we look at storage possibilities, as we continue on
CIS route.

And so this dialogue is important. I think
it's something that is obvious -- to the obvious
benefit of the community and to all of us.

And I think the last thing I want to say is,
we have all the answers, we know everything we need to
know because we don't. We rely on others to come in
and to provide information and to help us balance what
we receive. And so I think that has been a strength of
the panel. I'd sure like to see -- I'd love it to see
something that continues into the future.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: So we need -- what we
need help with the communities to understand what other
institutions we should be talking with and involving
here and we'll have a chance to hear from the panel
later and have other discussions.

I want to now focus a little bit on this issue
of consolidated interim storage. And I just want to
share a personal note, which is, three years ago,
almost, when we began this process, the question of
what to do with the spent fuel seemed like a totally
impossible problem, and I think a lot of people were
surprised and really upset to learn that there's really no place for it to go and it seemed like that was the end of the story and that was going to be a really, really, frankly, the worst outcome -- well, not the worst outcome, but that would be a really terrible outcome.

The possibility of moving the fuel to some interim facility while the country engages in a debate that could go on for a long time, if not forever, about what a permanent storage facility looks like, that possibility has really changed the game. And I think this panel has spent a lot of time on that question.

I'm first going to ask Glen Pascall to talk about the big picture here and then what we're going to do is, we're going to zero in on a handful of areas where members of the panel and small groups from the panel have been doing a lot of work, and we're going to talk about strategic plan for what we do going forward and how do we get, in particular, the State of California more mobilized around this because I think there is a big opportunity coming up right now.

So, first, let me give the floor to you --

Oops. Let me back up. It's interesting that there is no opportunity to back up for this. It's only forward. It's like a shark.
Okay. Thank you.

Glen Pascall, the floor is yours.

MR. PASCALL: I'm the Chair of the San Onofre Task Force of the Sierra Club Angeles Chapter, Glen Pascall.

We have focused over three years gradually and at times gropingly toward a unifying goal and a central goal that has emerged for the CEP: Safely removing spent fuel from San Onofre.

And consolidated interim storage is more and more part of this discussion. It is a sort of consensus belief among many of us that CIS can and should advance in tandem with efforts to develop one or more permanent repositories.

This is not only the CEP goal, it's also the Sierra Club position. On April 21st of this year, the National Board of the Sierra Club approved a policy on nuclear plants that concludes with this sentence: "It is imperative for spent fuel from nuclear plants to be moved into safer, temporary storage and for an effective long-term storage strategy to be developed as quickly as possible."

The CEP Strategic Plan, which you all have, has been widely lauded for its excellence and it's going to be explored in just a couple of minutes. The
plan identifies elements related to the three outcomes you see on the current display: Building Support at State and Local Levels. This goal calls for an effective consent-based process supported by host communities on the basis of public benefit and strict standards for operating a facility.

It also suggests the possibility of states developing statewide approaches to off-site storage. Then the second area, Bolstering Support Among Federal Legislators, this has already been touched on and I'm sure we'll be talking about it more, it seeks congressional funding, which does not now exist, for a process to identify sites and to evaluate their environmental safety and storage capacity.

This goal also -- and this is crucial for us -- seeks to add site vulnerability to the priority list for wave removal -- pardon me -- waste removal.

Right now the queue for off-site storage is based solely on the longevity of the waste and has no reference to the vulnerability of the site. That's a priority goal for us with regard to federal legislation.

And, finally, and Bill Parker touched on this, Expedite State Level Transportation Planning: The current discussion of CIS sites in Texas and New Mexico
is welcome. Since they are much closer than Nevada to the bulk of U.S. nuclear sites.

Marni Magda has provided me with a map and they are densely concentrated east of the Mississippi, so the closer you get to that, the less miles of transport are required for a national solution.

The private sector, which proposed these two sites, appears focused on time frames that relate realistically to the schedule when spent fuel will be ready for removal from San Onofre; that schedule is timely. The private sector's plans to open these sites is timely. We're more concerned that some of the federal agency benchmarks don't fit as well.

These positive developments of identifying sites and timeliness will be of benefit only if fuel transported through communities satisfy standards of safety and reliability that gain general and widespread public acceptance.

We heard a terrific presentation in June from an expert on this. The problem is more political than technical, but the political problem is huge. It's sort of "not through my backyard."

So that concludes my observations on this crucial topic and I must say I think the process has served us well in coming to a focus on this issue.
CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very much. So I wanted to just emphasize, this is an area where we -- I think a lot of people are willing to spent a lot of time and we can make some progress.

This is obviously not the only thing the Community Engagement Panel is going to be doing over the next few years. I want to talk about how we're going to use the next 10 to 15 minutes.

I want to have a conversation about a strategic plan that we put together on how we can make progress on these many different fronts related to consolidated interim storage and then we're going to have several members of the panel talk about four major areas of priority work in the coming -- that we think should be a priority -- priority areas in the coming three years, so that if you look back three years from now and you say "What does success look like?" it's making serious progress in all four of these areas, and we'll talk about them in just a moment.

Because there have been so many discussions about consolidated interim storage and because there are so many moving parts and, frankly, the politics here are very hard to organize because they're state, they're federal, they're outside a few districts, they're not the highest item on anybody's list of
things to do and so you've got to really work hard on
the problem.

So we put together a two-page document that is
simply a summary of what we've heard and what people
have been doing and what all that means for what we
would do in the coming few months and years.

I don't want to go through this in detail. We
circulated this in advance, but I want to pause for a
moment and see if people have comments on this and then
I want to suggest a couple of concrete actions that we,
as this panel, should take in the coming few weeks or
months. Bill Parker.

MR. PARKER: Quick observation on the
strategies: It seems to me there is one item that
might be missing and that's a technical analysis or
critical path analysis to get from where we are today
in the current stage of decommissioning to the
transportation to a consolidated interim storage
facility.

What are the critical elements along the path?
How much time does it take? What should we be doing
now to prepare us technically? And I think one item
that was mentioned is transportation.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yeah.

MR. PARKER: It might take five years to get
all the appropriate permits for transportation, which means you start the permitting process on transportation well before all the political processes are resolved.

So I think a critical path analysis would identify for us some of the critical steps we should be taking early even though the final solution may not yet be in place. We want to be ready --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yeah.

MR. PARKER: -- when congress makes their final decision. There may be things we should be doing now to prepare ourselves technically for that ultimate success.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: All right. Thank you.

I think that's a good point. And some of that work is being done by other institutions, so one of the first things we should do is stay abreast to that.

I know Ted Quinn is going to talk more about transportation when we talk about the four areas for work in the coming few years.

But any other general comments about strategic plan? Because, this is largely a summary of things we've all been talking about in various ways and so I think it should be relatively uncontroversial.

I want to just identify one thing that I think
concretely needs to be done, which is, with Lisa Bartlett's help, and Jerry Kern and other people, we started conversations inside the state, around what can we do at the state level to help build up a strategy. It's not obvious which institution inside the State of California helps organize that, but it's probably the California Energy Commission.

And so one of the action items here is for the panel, probably for me, not on behalf of the panel because we're not a decision-making body, but for me as someone observing what we've done, to write to the head of the California Energy Commission and the senior staff and say "Here's what we've seen. Here are some of the things we've seen you doing. Let's talk about what a serious game plan will look like."

My guess is that there also would need to be some legislative action or certainly hearings in Sacramento to help put focus on this and that will help be one trigger to make that happen.

So I just want to see if there are any comments about that particular action, which is implied in the strategic plan, but it's reasonably urgent since now the election is behind us.

We need to figure out what to do at the state level. Jerry Kern will talk a little bit -- a little
Okay. We're going to keep everybody informed about this, but I did not want to send a letter without us first -- me having an opportunity to talk about this even though I think what we're talking about is what everybody agrees and has been agreeing on for quite a long time.

MR. BROWN: I will say one thing about that.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Tim Brown.

MR. BROWN: So a few years ago I visited Sacramento to testify before the committee, the energy committee at that time, and it seemed like a body that was interested. It certainly I think would be appropriate to send them an update with, you know, what we've done here and perhaps summary of this conversation.

One thing I will say, part of the CEP and part of our charter is, is that all of the elected officials and those who represent the organizations would be able to take this information back and inform the bodies from which you've come.

In that same sense, we should also continue to not only inform those bodies and make sure they're united in voice about the idea of removing the storage that -- and this is something we've always agreed on,
no matter where we've come through -- come from on San Onofre, I've never heard anyone say the storage belongs here. Right.

I think we can all say, with unanimous voice, that it needs to be removed and very quickly. And so I think that's important that with that consolidated voice we continue to send that message, make sure our newly-elected officials are onboard and those in our communities understand it's -- it's actually a possibility for the first time in a very long time and that we need to be unified behind that concept in our communication to our constituents as well as to those elected who are serving on state and federal levels.
So I'd just like for the CEP to make sure they're doing that.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you.

So let me suggest as an action item that when I write the California Energy Commission that I'll make -- that you send that letter along with our strategic plan back to the folks you testified to.

MR. BROWN: I would do a CC to most of the communities in South Orange County and North San Diego just as a courtesy but also just to keep them informed.

We receive those letters of information all the time and it's completely appropriate that they
CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Great. We'll make sure that happens.

Okay. What does success look like after the next three years? Four members of the CEP are now going to talk about four areas that have emerged from a much longer list of potential topics as places where we've heard you want us to work and where our own knowledge about this problem, which has grown a lot over the last three years, says that there is important work to be done. I want to first talk at the federal legislation and give the floor to Jerry Kern.

MR. KERN: Well, I'm going to back up just a little bit because I've been going up and down the coast, talking to different city councils, different groups, and out of that the kind of a group that's formed, it's kind of the Concerned of Coastal Communities Group, and to write those letters and get that support. So, locally I think we're all getting together.

I've always said that there's been this gap between North San Diego County and Southern Orange County. I always say I'm happy there's 30,000 marines between me and Orange County to protect us but we have all these --
CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: You're in Orange County right now.

MR. KERN: I know. That's why --

MR. BROWN: We can help you when you want to get out of here.

MR. KERN: Well, I'm sure they have the same feeling about San Diego. But we have these communities of interest and we're working at those local levels to give support to what we're doing here.

So as far as the federal legislation goes, there was a big flurry of activity. As you can see, in 2015, the legislate started; in 2016, Washington was distracted for some reason. They didn't -- I think there was a total of 90 legislative days during 2016, so nothing really happened in 2016.

Hopefully, in 2017, everybody gets back to work and we have the opportunity to make things happen. Offline, I inquired to Congressman Issa, who actually represents this area and Oceanside. I talked to Congressman Scott Peters. I talked to Congresswoman Mimi Walters.

And they've agreed to hopefully meet with us sometime before they go back into session because I'd much rather meet with them out here where it's warm. But we do have a kind of plan to go back to DC and talk
to them back in DC, so that's -- so everything's kind
of been on hold on that level.

But like it was stated earlier, everybody is
in support. It's how we get that support converted to
action, so that's hopefully what we can do as the panel
here to put the pressure on with the help of the
community.

So there is nothing really to report on that
other than the fact we've been working very hard behind
the scenes. We did meet with our state legislature,
Supervisor Bartlett, Council Member Brown, David joined
us video-conferencing with Senator Bates's office,
Congressman Issa's office and, actually, Assembly
Member Chavez, who is actually in the room, and we
talked about some of those issues about transportation
and permitting and how we're going to get it out.

Because it always comes down to that, once we
talk about the consolidated interim storage, it's
"Okay. How do you get it there?" So that's one of the
issues we have to deal with.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very
much. And I wanted to flag two items related to this,
one Lisa Bartlett mentioned earlier: These are not --
these bills that were introduced at the last session
are not perfect bills and so when they get
reintroduced, you know, a lot may happen over the next two years.

When they get reintroduced, we need to be ready to think about what revisions might be needed to the bills and, obviously, that's a complicated process.

The other thing I'll say is, look, your politics may be left, your politics may be right. It's very important that we not let our own politics about other things that are going on in the country get in the way of us figuring out what can be done here because this is not a normal left/right issue.

This actually has bipartisan co-sponsorship on the Conway-Issa bill, growing bipartisan interest on the senate side. And so this is really, you know, one of those areas where you could really imagine getting something done.

And so I think it's super-important that we -- as we continue to build this coalition, we just keep our eyes on the ball as to what we're trying to get done here. Okay. Any other comments about this before we go to the next four topics?

So second -- now it doesn't even go forward.

Here we go.

Used Fuel Transportation: This topic has come up many times and, frankly, at the federal level
there's a lot of attention to what to do once the fuel gets to consolidated storage and now how to get it there. FedEx apparently is not an option.

Ted Quinn.

MR. QUINN: Thanks. Very good.

I want to talk to you tonight about what needs to happen in the future and what the status is today. So there is three bullets on the slide, but there is really five points that I want to make.

What occurs today is that there's four regions of the country that are working on this. And these are my inputs to you and recommendation that we need speakers to come to address a number of these subjects in front of the CEP.

The state regional group has four of them, the west, the south, the midwest and the northeast. Have the goal of setting up consultive -- a consultive planning process to -- to establish cooperative agreements for transportation of spent nuclear fuel.

They've been working for a number of years with Department of Energy. They need to come and give us reports. I can't give you reports of what they've done. I can only tell you that they've been working and then that's the first point.

So it's important to remember their goal is to
develop con -- consultive planning process and agreements. Okay. That's point one.

Point two is technical aspects. There are technical aspects of what needs to occur for spent fuel transportation from San Onofre to wherever it's going, that includes an Atlas railcar that is being studied by Department of Energy right now and includes both of our type of vendor casks for transportation.

There are -- there are other parts of the technical aspects one of which is the transportation routing activities, include the development by Department of Energy, a new code. It's a computer code called Start. And they need to come report to us on what that latest activity is this as well as with the Atlas railcars, but. They've been working for the last few years on this.

The next part is, there's state activities that are -- that are occurring and state representatives, including our California representative, need to come and present what has been their aspect with this, discussing this regional group in getting to a cooperative planning agreement.

I don't have a status for you. I can only tell you that in the next year or two we need to have someone come before us and present, not just from the
DOE but from -- but from our state representing us.

And the last part is the last bullet here, the ROW coordination among federal agencies. So which federal agencies? So, obviously, Department of Energy is important, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is important, but also the Federal Railroad Administration is important.

And so there may be other agencies, too. And the issue is, we need to have a presentation on what are those coordinating -- that what agencies need to participate before we actually have a railcar move away from San Onofre to wherever the site is.

So those are -- those are my input. The head of Deputy Assistant Secretary for Department of Energy is Andy Griffith. He is currently a fed, so that means he potentially would stay independent of what happens after January. The recommendation is that he is over -- over spent fuel and waste disposal and that he would -- he would present to us, too.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very much. So there is a lot of moving parts here. I think part of our role is to help everybody understand what the moving parts are, but also to make sure there isn't some failure in these many groups getting together and we're not ready for this.
I just want to call out that Stephen Harris at Pacific Northwest National Lab, has been enormously helpful in keeping us technically informed on what's going on with this. It's unbelievably complex.

And once a week my inbox has a lot of messages from Stephen Harris and I'm grateful for them all.

And, Ted, thank you for helping to manage that relationship and it's just enormously important. So you're going to see more from -- from us on this.

The third of the four topics that'll be very important in the next few years will be Defense-in-Depth, which I mentioned earlier, so I won't say much more about this.

How do we know the aging of the canisters on site? There is a range of views about whether the right decisions or wrong decisions were made about the canisters and so on.

We spent a lot of time on that here. I personally spent a huge amount of time on this. How do we know that they're actually robust? And there is a lot of technologies being developed there and programs being developed.

I have personally visited while I'm doing my day job, personally visited now all the major organizations that are involved in this activity and
told them we want to hear from them. And we want to have -- we want their help translating what it is that they're doing into English because, frankly, a lot of them aren't very good communicators with normal humans and we need to understand what's happening and also how do we have confidence that the new technologies that are essential for making this work are actually being developed in a timely way because there are lots of industries, like this one, where all the technologies are not available on day one. Silicon Valley is another industry like that.

But how do we know that this is actually happening? And what should we be monitoring? What should we be looking for in the communities so that we have confidence in this process? And so that's something we're going to be working on and having meetings around in the coming three years.

And the fourth and last, but certainly not least topic, is something Dan Stetson will talk about.

Dan?

MR. STETSON: Thank you, David.

Well, first of all, I'd like to say I'm so excited that we're having this meeting here in Dana Point. I've worked here in Dana Point at the Ocean
Institute for 23 years and was president for the last 11, so I really appreciate having it here. I'd like to see it here more often.

I know I joined my colleague next to me, Garry Brown, in our deep concerns for the environment, in particular the ocean, and that's going to be one of the major topics that we'd like to continue to bring to you, the community, and certainly to the CEP over this upcoming year.

It's already starting a process right now. You can see up on the board the CEQA process has already started. They've already had, through State Lands, their first series of meetings, entering the process of completing their draft environmental impact report.

A number of us have already had the opportunity to attend the meetings and submit written letters to them. After the first draft will come out -- comes out, it will then be presented and we will, again, have an opportunity to make presentations to hopefully have some impact on that entire process.

There is a lot involved with the CEQA. Most of it is on the water side, but there is also a fair amount that's going to be taking place on the land side as well, so we want to make that a high priority for
this coming year.

Right along with that, working with the Navy, is following the NEPA process. As we all know, the SONGS is on Navy land and so we want to continue to follow that and see what's happening in all the different pieces that are part of that and how the community can become involved in that entire process.

And, of course, all of this really revolves around perhaps some mitigation that's going to be taking place and it's really going to be taking place on a couple of different levels.

First of all, we had -- at our last meeting we had Steve Schroeter here, talking about the Wheeler North Reef and that was a mitigation that took place for the operation of the plant and how the reef is not quite meeting all the standards that were established, so we want to continue to monitor that and see what's going to happen there.

The Coastal Commission will certainly be working with Southern California Edison on coming back with some additional requirements that they're going to have to perform with that.

But, also, that has to do with the construction operation of the plant, but now we're also going to be talking about the dismantling of the plant.
And one of the big topics, of course, the conduits, removing them and there is a potential to save close to 100 million dollars if those conduits are abandoned.

So, many of us on the panel would like to see some sort of mitigation plan with some of the funds that are used for that.

Some of the other issues that we really want to watch from an environmental perspective, as the pools are being emptied, we understand that those are going to be flowing back out through the conduits, that material is going to be filtered.

What does that mean? What is that process? What are the results of that going to be? So there is a lot of environmental pieces that we think should be one of the ongoing topics that we continue and want to bring back this upcoming year. And I know that Garry is there right with me as we go out in the community seeking input on this.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Excellent. Thank you very much. Any comments that people want to make about these four topics that we've just discussed?

We're going to show you a slide just after the break as to exactly what we're going to do with the agenda first quarter next year and some sense of where we're headed after that.
But we thought it would be important to just take a moment and talk about what success might look like after the next three years. I want to see if there are any other comments. Is this flag up? Is that Pam? Pam Patterson?

MS. PATTERSON: Yes. I have some comments with respect to the entire presentation. So it's been said that you've got a two-way conduit of communication going on bidirectional, so if that's the case, why is it that Southern California Edison has a trade show going on every time we, the community, come to these meetings?

Where -- where is the residents' table so that we actually have a voice with respect to this situation? So and, quite frankly, who is the agenda subcommittee? Who is on the agenda subcommittee that's determining what the agenda is for next year?

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Do you want to make your comments and I'll respond?

MS. PATTERSON: Why don't you respond right now?

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: No. Why don't you make your comments and then I'll respond to the comments?

MS. PATTERSON: Okay. So there's nobody actually representing the community with respect to the
agenda subcommittee and, thus, there is nobody representing the community with respect to any of these meetings because the agenda is made for the entire year next year, so no one representing the residents has the ability to get anything on the agenda.

So this is a pre-canned, candy-coating exercise to make it appear that everything is being well-managed, that the power plant is well-managed and that we're all in, you know, good hands, when, in fact, the power plant wouldn't have been closed down in the first place but for the fact that it's been mismanaged, per se. Okay. Radioactive plume escapes from the power plant. That doesn't happen by good management.

And so we've had an issue with the fact that Southern California Edison has been mismanaging this power plant for years and, quite frankly, from the beginning, from the inception, because if it had been well-managed, they would've figured all this stuff out at the beginning when they decided to create this ultra-hazardous activity and they didn't do it.

The fact that we're sitting here how many years later and we're trying to figure out now that they made this unbelievable mess in our community, what are we going to do to try to fix it?

Every single canister sitting there is a
Chernobyl amount of radioactivity -- radioactivity. Okay. And your -- they've been -- so we have improperly stored spent fuel rods, you're dealing with a company that's already been proven to be paying bribes to people so that they don't have to comply with quality assurance standards in making and manufacturing these canisters.

And we've got canisters that are sitting there that are susceptible to cracks right about now and we can't detect those cracks, and when those cracks occur, we have radio activity seeping out. Okay.

You have now turned off the sirens with respect to warning the residents that live around the power plant that there is an issue, you have -- well, I mean, it kind of goes on and on.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. But it can't -- it can't go on and on.

MS. PATTERSON: It's a bad situation. No. No. And quite frankly, I'm not done yet. Okay.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I'm confident you're not done yet, but I do need to bring it to a point.

MS. PATTERSON: So I'm making -- right. And so -- and as usual, you're interrupting me. Okay.

So with respect to -- so, again, we're dealing with a corrupt company. Fabulous idea. You're
definition of a CEP, the Community Engagement Panel, is that you're engaging the community by accessing all of the residents' bank account. So that's our participation in the situation. We're paying for it.

Okay. So when we ask to have an independent third party go in and analyze the situation on behalf of we, the people, here who, we, the people, are paying for this, your response is, "Well, that could cause $300,000, so we don't want to do that" even though you've taken 4.4 billion dollars of our money.

It's not your money. It's not Southern California Edison's money. It's our money. It's our safety. It's our health. So -- and if Southern California Edison was so responsible, I -- you know, what -- again, what's the evacuation plan?

Okay. So I was told by the representative of Orange County Sheriffs Department, which she didn't want to state it here on the record during the meeting, but out in the parking lot she was going to discuss it with me, and she said, "Well, we have signs on the horse trails with arrows showing you what way to go."

So that's basically "You and your four toddlers can, like, hike -- what? -- 30 miles over Saddleback Mountain" and, you know, with little signs. The rest stop, gas, food and water is on the other side
of the mountain where, of course, you've all set up an evacuation. You know, you basically have access to the helicopters that we fund so that you all get to do the -- get to exit this area the easy way.

Okay. Well, what you're telling us that we get to --

MR. BROWN: Are you saying -- are you saying, Pam -- are you saying that we --

MS. PATTERSON: And don't you dare to interrupt me.

MR. BROWN: I'm going to interrupt.

MS. PATTERSON: No. No, you're not.

MR. BROWN: I'm going to interrupt, Pam.

MS. PATTERSON: Well, you can try. You can try to interrupt me because I'm not done.

MR. BROWN: I'm going to interrupt you right now, Pam.

MS. PATTERSON: No, you're not.

MR. BROWN: Because David is far too polite when it comes to the inane ramblings of accusing us of being corrupt and using helicopters for personal use.

MS. PATTERSON: Right.

MR. BROWN: If you have facts --

MS. PATTERSON: Right.

MR. BROWN: -- provide facts.
MS. PATTERSON: Right.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Can we draw this to a close so that I can respond?

MS. PATTERSON: No. I'm almost done. So -- so and quite frankly, I didn't get an invitation to be on the agenda subcommittee. So you got the whole thing canned. You -- it's basically what we're dealing with our lobbyist and PR agents for Southern California Edison and there is no actually honest dialogue that's going on here.

MR. KERN: I have --

((Unintelligible simultaneous colloquy.))

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Please. Please. Please.

MR. KERN: I'm not a lobbyist.

MS. PATTERSON: You can go ahead and take exemption. I'm not a --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Folks, everyone be quiet.

MR. KERN: This whole meeting, all you've done is just write notes to talk and you have not --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Pam? Pam?

MS. PATTERSON: Oh, really? I've written down what's being said.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Folks? Okay.
Would you stop now?

MS. PATTERSON: No, I'm not done.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: How long do you plan to take?

MS. PATTERSON: About another two and a half minutes.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I've got a clock on it. You've got two and a half minutes.

MS. PATTERSON: You go right ahead.

So, anyway, I was talking about with the help of the community which, again, I guess that means access to everybody's wallet so that you got the funding that you want to. Really quite frankly, do whatever the heck you want to do.

So, what we want, again, is we want a third party, independent third party, to do an analysis with respect to this entire situation where we, the people, choose who is going to do that study so that we know exactly -- I mean, because, obviously, we know we're not safe.

So, what we want to know is from somebody that does not have a financial interest or a tie, we get to choose who is going to do that analysis and then they can come and tell us what's the best thing to do to try to, at least, best handle the fiasco of the situation
that Southern California has created in this situation.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you for your remarks.

MS. PATTERSON: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: So I want to -- please.

PUBLIC MEMBER: Thank you, Pam.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Please, folks. Folks, nobody else is making comments and asking for applause from the floor. I do think that it is a matter of respect to let people talk as I have --

MS. PATTERSON: Did I ask for applause? Is that what you're saying?

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I'm not talking -- I'm not talking to you about this. I'm simply asking the -- I'm asking the community to help us be efficient and fair.

Now, I want to say a couple of things about this and then we have a 30-minute panel with three different representatives of the community who we've asked to speak for five minutes, which is less than time that was just consumed.

First thing, this is not a trade show. If organizations from the community want to have a booth -- Gary Headrick wrote me an email and said, "You'd like to have a booth?" I said yes. We said yes.
If other -- nobody else has asked me. If somebody else wants to have a booth, you know, within the limits of the physical space that we can have, let's have booths. That's the idea.

So let's not tar Edison for not giving booths when they're out here telling you about things that are happening. It seems to be that's helpful. And if other people want to have booths, that's great.

The agenda: The agenda process is very clearly laid out in the charter for the Community Engagement Panel, which is on SONGScommunity.com.

A decision was taken at the beginning of this process to make this a panel that was created by Edison. This is different from what's happening in Vermont and dramatically less hostile and much more productive.

Okay. Now, if -- if -- that was the decision taken early on. They work on the agenda with the advice of the leadership of the Community Engagement Panel. There aren't subcommittees and sub-subcommittees. These are 18 volunteers who are just trying to be efficient and help in this process.

I think it is very unhelpful to make the claim that these canisters are Chernobyls in the making.

Okay. Because we generate an emotive response by doing
that that makes it harder for us to focus on what's important, which is getting them out of here.

   Now, if everybody wants to make emotive claims this way and that way about this, then we're just going to be yelling at each other and making emotive claims and not getting anything done.

   The reason people are watching this panel around this country, specially around consolidated interim storage, is because we're working on moving the needle, so let's --

   People have different views about whether the plant should be there in the beginning. They have different views about what they think about Edison. Okay. That's the past. Focus, folks. Focus.

   And so if this is a productive use of our time then, folks, send in letters to me and to your elected representatives, Pam Patterson, among others, and say, "Yeah, I thought that was a very effective use of time in a public setting where we have a lot of people who are spending their evenings with us rather than being at home with their families or doing other things."

   Folks, if we don't focus and we don't do this in a serious bipartisan way, we will screw it up and that will be harmful to our interest. So this is not a game. Okay.
Now, we have a 30-minute panel and I will allow the panel to run 30 minutes and we'll adjust the break because we said to these three folks who came up here today, again, spending their evenings with us, we'd like you to talk each for five minutes about some perspectives, not the whole story, but your perspectives and then make sure that there is time, as much time as talking time, so 30 minutes in total, to have some back and forth with the panel. Okay.

So we have three members and first we're going to hear from Sara Kaminske, from the Interjurisdictional Planning Committee Chair and the Orange County Sheriffs Emergency Management.

Sara, the floor is yours for five minutes.

MS. KAMINSKE: Thank you, Panel, for inviting me to present to you today. I'm just going to talk for a few minutes about looking back and then looking forward.

So, again, I'm Chair of the SONGS Interjurisdictional Planning Committee and I also work for the Orange County Sheriffs Department Emergency Management division as an assistant emergency manager, so I oversee the county's nuclear emergency plan.

So I'll start with looking back: So when I
look back three years ago, when we got the notification
that San Onofre was going to be shut down, it was -- it
basically thrust us into this unknown world of
decommissioning. So we were left with, "Okay, what
now? What do we do now?"

And one of the things -- well, there's certain
things that have changed, but there's some things that
have not. And in the short term, nothing really
changed because in terms of the Nuclear Regulatory
Commission, they were saying, "Hey, San Onofre, you
still have an operating nuclear license, so you have to
fully comply, even though you're not operating right
now, with all of the nuclear regulatory regulations."

That also applied to the off-site
jurisdictions because we were managed by the Federal
Emergency Management Agency and they provide very
strict oversight into what we do that includes robust
emergency preparedness exercises, that includes strict
alert and warning systems, decision-making processes,
and they held us accountable to all of that and all of
our plans and procedures were tested and graded and
made public and we had -- we were held to, you know,
high standards.

So once the Nuclear Regulatory Commission
granted exemptions to Edison's operating license and
they erased that boundary around the emergency planning zone, well, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, they sent us a letter and they said, "Well, now that that no longer applies, you no longer have to -- you no longer fall under our oversight."

And so all of those requirements to exercise and plan and train, all those requirements went away, but our obligation to the community to maintain SONGS specific emergency plans, that didn't go away.

And we take that obligation very, very seriously, and so we continue to work with Southern California Edison in this.

Another requirement that went away was the state government code that regulated the funding stream for our emergency planning. So, working with Southern California Edison, we were able to secure that funding stream so that we can continue our emergency planning efforts.

And then when I think looking forward or moving forward, it's maintaining our relationships, maintaining our partnership with Southern California Edison, maintaining our relationship with members of the community so that they're aware that they are our priority, and we take our commitment very seriously and we will continue to do so. And as long as there is
spent nuclear fuel on site, we will ensure that we have nuclear specific emergency plans in place to deal with that.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Oh, great. Thank you very much. We've got extra time, but I'm not going to allow you to buy and sell the extra time with the panel there. I want to make sure there is time for more questions.

When we get back to the -- to the panel, to the question-and-answer period, I do want to ask you, Sara, at that time to tell us a little more about what you'd like us to do, would you like this panel to do. So, second is -- I think we have a different order on my -- I think, Dan Dominguez, you're speaking second, if I got my order here right, from Utility Workers Union of America, Local 246, representing organized labor at the plant.

Dan, the floor is yours.

MR. DOMINGUEZ: Thank you for inviting me. One of the things I'd like to do, I'd like to correct the record. I think when you introduced me, you called me the president of the local. I'm the vice president of the local.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I apologize for the promotion.
MR. DOMINGUEZ: You know, I worked at the plant 34 years and the local union represents the operations, maintenance, technical and administrative workers that work at the plant, all these people are highly trained, highly qualified. I think the average age of experience is about 28 years, some are higher. And me, specifically, I've been there 34 years.

When the plant was running, our -- our duty was to operate the plant safety -- safely and to protect the health and safety of the public.

Well, the plant shut down now and our duty is -- now has changed to make sure that we decommission the plant safely. And the duty to protect the health and safety of the public, that hasn't changed; that still remains our -- our primary duty.

The -- I will say that all our -- all our members, the workers at the plant, they all live in the surrounding communities and they all have a vested interest to make sure that whatever we do out in that plant, that it is always with a mindset that we protect the health and safety of the public, that we do not do anything that would endanger or put the local communities in jeopardy, and we've done that, you know. I mean, like I said, that's our primary goal.

Looking at -- back at what the CEP has done,
you know, I've participated in mostly -- most of the
CEP meetings with exception of a few where I had other
prior conflicts. But one of the things that I've
gathered from it is that it is providing a transparency
that never was there when the plant was operating.

I look at the elected officials and the
representatives of the community, and I'm sure some of
you now have become very knowledgeable in the -- in the
nuclear technology and decommissioning and so that I
view as a really good thing.

You know, during the discussions of the CEP,
and I think Mr. Madigan, Jim Madigan, touched on it,
you know, all the equipment that we installed and all
the equipment that we decommissioned, you know, the
discussions have been on equipment.

But, you know, I'd like to remind the panel
that there's two equations to safety: The equipment
and the people that operate the equipment. Because if
you don't have the qualified workforce to operate the
equipment, then your level of safety is not what I
would call optimal.

You know, we've had lots of discussions about
the decommissioning of SONGS and you touched on it,
Dr. Victor, is that everyone is -- is in agreement,
including the people I represent, to move the fuel to a
longer-term repository.

The -- right now, it's in what they call wet storage, which has active cleaning systems and the goal is to move it to a dry storage, which is a passive system and it's a what I would call a much more robust storage methodology for keeping the fuel.

Our goal, you know, we -- me as -- I was started off as a reactor operator. I started off as an operator and became a reactor operator. I was a reactor operator for 25 years; now I'm a certified fuel handler and part of my job, too, is to write work plans for the decommissioning of the plant and -- and the building of some of the systems that Jim touched on.

But the other piece is to monitor the fuel and make sure that it remains safely stored both in the dry cask storage where some of the existing fuel, there is some fuel in there already in the -- in the prior horizontal storage modules and the ones that exist in both the pools.

You know, going forward, I touched on, you know, maybe, the focus on making sure that the people that are there, that are still operating the systems until we get the fuel into dry storage, that you have qualified workers to operate some of the systems, the cooling systems.
And even part of the refueling process requires people, like me, to make sure that the people that are doing the refueling are doing it safely and that they're not putting themselves or the public in jeopardy.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay.

MR. DOMINGUEZ: The --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: If you can wrap it up, I think that would be great. Thanks.

MR. DOMINGUEZ: We have a couple of more bullet items and then I'm done. The other piece, too, we touched on some of the meetings and that's the economic benefit of SONGS. I think you touched about it, talking to the DGC. I think that should be a good focus for the panel to discuss the economic benefit with the decommissioning contractor about sourcing for local jobs.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Excellent.

Great.

MR. DOMINGUEZ: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much for your -- for your comments. Third in the panel of three, Charles Langley, who is going to speak on behalf of Gary Headrick and San Clemente Green.

Charles, the floor is yours.
MR. LANGLEY: Thank you.

My name is Charles Langley. I'm the Executive Director of Public Watchdogs and I'm here to speak on behalf of Gary Headrick of San Clemente Green. Gary had emergency eye surgery yesterday, had an additional procedure this morning. He's doing great and seems to be in good spirits, but he can't see. Although he has vowed, if I do not do this correctly, he will be calling in to correct me and he's going to go on speakerphone.

So if no further ado, these are Gary's comments: "Looking back, it is important to remember that Edison had a terrible safety record."

By the way, could we show slide one, please, highlighting? Okay. Close enough.

"Looking back, it is important to remember that Edison had a terrible safety record and the worst work environment in the nation when they were still operating. An astonishing NRC survey found that 25 percent of SONGS employees feared retaliation for reporting safety concerns to management. Just imagine how many did not want to admit that in the survey."

Could we see the next slide, please?

This is the San Onofre safety record. All you really need to understand is that big red line shows
that San Onofre has the worst safety record in the nation among nuclear power plants.

"This caused employees to reach out to San Clemente Green in 2010, but their explicit warnings were ignored by Edison and the NRC as well as their own city council, who opted to, quote, leave it to the experts, unquote."

"The prediction: That a failed steam generator might leak radiation into the environment actually took place two years later."

Now, there should be "leaked memo," if you could. Thank you.

"We were fortunate that Unit 3 was shut down before the situation could escalate into a major disaster. For that, we are deeply grateful to those heroic employees who managed to control that emergency situation as well as they did. We got lucky the same way those at Three Mile Island did years before. Edison and Three Mile and the NRC, Nuclear Regulatory Commission --"

Could we see the next slide, please?

"-- still choose to ignore recent warnings from someone working there now. This person claims that 80 millions dollars has changed hands in negotiations between dry cask makers, Holtec and AREVA,
for no apparent reason. But far more important is the fact that damaged fuel assemblies may have been loaded into dry casks without, quote, canning them, unquote, first with an extra layer of protection as required by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission."

We should have an NRC email.

Okay. Thank you.

"However, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission quickly dismissed this by responding, "In summary, the NRC has determined that the information does not describe an impropriety or inadequacy associated with NRC-regulated activities. Therefore, the NRC plans no further action regarding that information.""

"Our greatest fear is that we are on a path leading to a situation that has no way of escaping or protecting our property and loved ones from contamination. Adding to our anxiety is the realization that we can't rely on any of the organizations that are supposed to be looking out for us."

"Dry cask containers may become untouchable as they begin leaking millions of curies just from the first of many microscopic -- microscopic cracks to come. An earthquake might drain an overcrowded spent fuel pool and spew out clouds of radiation in a
zirconium fire that can't be extinguish by water."

"Terrorists might cause even worst damage, if you can imagine that. And yet the CEP, the Community Engagement Panel, is going along with a plan that even ordinary folks can see doesn't hold water let alone radiation."

"The NRC has arbitrarily determined that temporary nuclear waste storage systems are now capable of handling this volatile material, not just for 20 years, but 60 years, maybe 100 years or more, if that is what it takes to find a better place to take it."

"They've also approved dismantling the safety net, protecting our communities simply because the plant is no longer operational. The on-site fire department, specializing in nuclear facilities, has been discharged. Spent fuel pools that offer the only remediation for unloading a damaged container will be destroyed after the last fuel assembly has been removed from the pools."

"The Coastal Commission has conditionally approved bearing nuclear waste 100 feet from the rising ocean, allowing a 20-year grace period to prove that it is actually safe to do so."

"They were somehow convinced that new technology would become available in the future just
like the promise that a permanent nuclear waste
repository would be available long before now."

"And Edison has the perfect out if something
goes terribly wrong. They can always turn around and
blame the Department of Energy for not picking up the
waste when they should have. Edison has selected
Holtec as the contractor, with the Nuclear Regulatory
Commission's blessings, even after their CEO admitted
that their containers can be expected to crack but
can't be repaired."

"He lied to the Community Engagement Panel and
the public when he vehemently denied being fined and
disbarred for bribery charges. But Edison is still
going with Holtec anyway while the CEP remains silently
compliant."

"Are these really the standards that we should
be willing to accept when we are dealing with more than
89 times the radiation than was released in the
Chernobyl accident? So where has the CEP, the
Community Engagement Panel, gone wrong?"

"To put it bluntly, you have been doing a lot
of talking but not much listening to anyone else but
Edison or their vendors and consultants. The big
questions that are often ignored are: What if they are
wrong -- "they" being Edison -- again?"
"What would the consequences be and how will they react in the worst case scenario? The plan that the CEP is going along with only works if Edison can predict the future accurately?"

"The most recent proof of that, not being the case, is the failed steam generator replacement project, which led to the shutdown. How can this body, whose primary guiding principle is public safety, even consider a plan that relies on technology that is yet to be invented, tested or proven?"

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Are you just about done? You're at seven minutes. Are you about done?

MR. LANGLEY: Yes, I am. I have one more -- one more paragraph. I will.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay.

MR. LANGLEY: Thank you for the warning.

"While the Community Engagement Panel is not a decision-making body, Edison likes to say that the Community Engagement Panel and a number of community stakeholders have aligned to support their proposals; that is because engagement has largely been a one-way street and you don't seem to be listening to our legitimate concerns."

"There could be far better options that may not favor Edison's objections, but need to be
considered for the sake of all. Our request is to allow independent, unbiased experts to critique Edison’s plan by making presentations and taking questions from the panel and the community at large."

"There are some very well qualified professionals in this field who might think it’s a bad idea to bury nuclear waste inches above the rising water table 100 feet from the waves, in an earthquake and tsunami zone, is in containers that are known to develop cracks in a marine environment."

"It is incumbent on all of us to keep this nuclear waste under the safest condition possible as long as it takes to be moved in a better location. We can and must do better than this with so much at stake."

There is more from Gary. We have published it on our website at publicwatchdogs, with an "S," plural, .org in recognition of the fact that Gary can’t probably publish it at sanclementegreen.org.

Thank you for allowing us to speak.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you.

So I want to have a chance for folks to ask questions of all three of the panelists. I want to start with a question for you, Dan, which is, tell us more about what you would like, what organized labor
would like to see the CEP talk about in the coming three years.

   MR. DOMINGUEZ: Obviously, the -- going through all the regulatory processes of moving the fuel to the consolidated interim storage, but up until the fuel has been moved into dry cask or into dry storage or to the consolidated storage facility, there's still needs to be systems operating, as I touched on during my discussion.

   The issue of making sure qualified workers are still there to operate the systems and monitor the fuel because, you know, the place has shut down but there are still a lot of interconnected systems that need to operate so that the fuel maintains -- stays cool and stays shut down.

   CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very much. So I want to ask Charles. It's just possibly unfair to ask you to speak on behalf Gary, but -- so there are a lot of misstatements there.

   And, by the way, let me invite all three of the panelists if you have notes or other things you'd like to make as part of the official record in addition to the streaming, please do send those to me.

   I think I'd like -- just if I can talk personally, I think I take some exception to the claim
that we've not been hearing from other voices. There is an appendix to the slide deck the day that just, by chance, lists 32 people we've had to come talk from a lot of different points of view.

And so I think I just want to push back on that, on that point and a number of other points. But I want to ask you a very specific question, which is, the tenor of the argument, as far as I can tell, is partly that we can't trust any of the organizations.

I don't know what to do with that because that's a recipe for just having nobody in charge. That doesn't seem like a very effective program. So, but Gary's comments and your remarks tonight tell us that we should invite other kinds of experts. So tell us a few more sentences about how you think about identifying experts who are actually talking factual information that we would invite.

MR. LANGLEY: I'm glad you asked, David.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: But please, please do respect the need for us to have some brevity on this. Okay.

MR. LANGLEY: And that's why I'm going to read from the prepared notes.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: That's not necessarily the same thing as brevity though.
MR. LANGLEY: I'll be very brief.

"Potential candidates for independent experts are representatives from the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board; gregory Jaczko, former Head of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission during the Fukushima accident; Peter Bradford, former NRC commissioner during the Three Mile Island crisis; Arnie Gundersen, Nuclear Engineering Consultant for the past 40 years; Daniel Hirsch, Director of Nuclear Policy Program at UC Santa Cruz." And I know of many other local people who I think could be very helpful.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. So I just -- the reason I mention this, and I think we should exchange some letters on this question is, we have, for example, Marvin Resnikoff comes speak at one of the panels. There was actually a problem funding him, so I wrote a personal check out of my family's checkbook to help pay half the cost of that and Gene Stone and some others contributed because I thought it was very important to have Marvin here.

But when Marvin talked about the work that he was doing, it was not out of any of the peer review literature. And the normal standard for expertise is engagement with actual technical information that is then scrutinized by one's expert peers and that's how
we know what's right and wrong, for better or for worst, in the technical literature.

And this is what I do in my day job. I'm a professor, I write papers and things like that. So I was a little concerned that we don't have a process to identify who is an expert.

I'm sure we can all develop a list of names, but I'd like to exchange some letters between you and Gary and me and other people who want to be involved in this process as to how we would actually identify people who would round out our perspectives on these things and yet remain tethered to technical reality.

So, I think, maybe offline we can -- we can do that.

Are there other questions people would like to ask? I just want to make sure that there is a chance for other people to ask questions here. Other questions folks would like to ask of the panelists?

MR. BROWN: I have a question.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Tim Brown.

MR. BROWN: Charles, one of the things that's been really challenging for me to understand is that a lot of the time, specially with folks who have deep concerns about the storage facilities, it primarily has to do with finding solutions that have no path to approval that's outside of a decade: Meaning, a German
cask storage company, which has no presence or infrastructure in the United States, to be our choice vendor here because of the type of cask they use, that's used in the uranium reprocess in Germany.

This would mean that our communities would have wet storage for at least another 10 years while we engage and vet out whether or not they could even perform to the standards we expect.

They'd have to build up infrastructure. We'd have to even -- we'd have to explore whether or not that dry -- and we'd have to put a hold on all the decommissioning work that could be done until that happens. Every path that involves choosing an untested vendor means our communities are subject to, right, the waste in pools that you allege, right, are -- could dry up, release millions of curies of radiation.

Every path --

MR. LANGLEY: I don't know how much is --

MR. BROWN: Right. Every path has this having the waste in even a worst position than they would be in. And it never makes any sense to me that in the purposes of finding a vendor that we have no idea could perform to the standards we expect, we would explore that for who knows, 10, 15 years, leaving everything it is, leaving the plan -- the plant the way it is
because -- why?

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Can you answer very briefly? Because then I want to make sure there's also time for questions that go to Sara.

MR. LANGLEY: Yes, I know a select answer -- comment. There's no reason for anybody to be buying tickets. The annual budget for these four meetings is public money. It's 3.4 million dollars. We'll put the documents up on our website if you'd like to review them.

MR. BROWN: I don't understand what you're saying.

MR. LANGLEY: Send the bill to Edison.

MR. BROWN: I don't understand what you were saying about --

MR. LANGLEY: It shouldn't be coming out of your pocket.

MR. BROWN: -- tickets to meetings.

MR. LANGLEY: That's for you, sir, yes.

MR. BROWN: I don't understand what you're saying about tickets to meetings.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: What's that? What is that?

MR. BROWN: I have no idea what you're talking about.
MR. LANGLEY: Well, you had mentioned that you had spent money out of your own pocket, David, in order to bring someone in to one of these meetings.

MR. BROWN: Sir, you're engaging on a non sequitur that has --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Was asking --

MR. BROWN: -- zero to do with the question I just asked you.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Can I -- I just want to make sure. Ted, is your question for Sara?

MR. QUINN: It is.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Great. Ted Quinn.

MR. BROWN: I'd like an answer.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Can you --

MR. BROWN: Sir? If you could answer, Charles. You made a lot of allegations and you made a lot of factual statements. I'm asking, why is it that the path for safety in our communities is to leave the storage in wet facilities while we explore other storage possibilities that we have no idea whether or not would be any safer than our current storage possibilities?

PUBLIC MEMBER: They're not here --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: No.

MR. BROWN: Why is that a good outcome? I'm
asking Charles.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: No, you may not, not
from the floor, please.

Charles, very briefly. And then I do want to
get -- Sara, this is a panel of three and I'd like to
get the third member of the panel involved.

MR. LANGLEY: Well, I can't speak for Gary.

What I can say is that there's deep suspicion
of Southern California Edison and it's justified. It's
under two criminal investigations right now. We've got
a 16-page sworn criminal affidavit on our website.

MR. BROWN: If you can't answer the question,
that's fine.

MR. LANGLEY: You can look at it.

MR. BROWN: Just say, "I can't answer that
question." But to point to criminality --

MR. LANGLEY: I want to answer the question.

MR. BROWN: To point to criminality again is
-- is to distract from the real question.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. I'd like to --

MR. LANGLEY: No, it's not.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I'd like to have Ted ask
a question to Sara because I do want to get Sara's
input on this and then we're going to --

MR. QUINN: Sara, I would like to understand
what your discussion with NRC has been related to the safety case. We changed the safety case from an operating to a shutdown unit.

The NRC safety analysis, that is public documentation, says the safety case -- the safety risk to the public ends at the fence and I'd like to understand if you have had briefings, discussion such that you can recognize the change in -- in your evacuation plan relative to the change in the safety risk to the public.

MS. KAMINSKE: Yes, absolutely.

So we actually had a meeting with NRC; several members came down and actually met with Interjurisdictional Planning Committee and they talked about the reduction in risk and the reduction of the emergency planning zone.

And we respect that and, from Orange County's perspective, is we understand that there is a reduced risk and less chance for this, you know, plume of radiation to go out to the public.

However, we still need to maintain our emergency response capabilities, including that independent ability to conduct off-site close assessment. So, while there may be an emergency at the plant, if there is some sort of release, even though,
you know, Edison will say, "Nope, it's not going to go beyond the fence," we want to be able to prove to the public that, "You know what, we're taking readings and -- and you're safe."

MR. QUINN: Okay. So Edison funded that and not -- Edison funded the continuation of that and not -- not NRC or --

MS. KAMINSKE: Correct.

MR. QUINN: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. I'm going to these last three very brief comments or questions and then we're going to put it back to the panel briefly. Jerry and then Pam and then Lisa.

MR. KERN: Just quickly for Dan. The idea of holding onto the qualified people that work there as long as possible: In your discussions with Edison, do you have a time line of that?

You know, we start moving the fuel out -- out of the wet storage into dry cask, you know, to have, you know, people with 28 years of experience doing it, I feel much better doing that. So have you had any discussions with them about what that time line may be?

MR. DOMINGUEZ: Well, the -- I think in the handout, the expected time frame where the fuel is all in dry storage, I think, my recollection was like
mid-2019. The -- currently, the collective bargain agreement we have is, there will be no layoffs or reductions of the represented employees until January 1st of 2018. After that, there is potential for reductions.

And while we understand the reductions, we've always looked at it from the perspective of, "Okay, the reductions, but how does that impact the safety of the plant?" And so we've had discussions with Edison regarding that -- that issue specifically.

There is -- when I was the chief officer for the local union, there was some pretty spirited correspondence between us and Edison, me and Edison, regarding the ability to operate the plant safely.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Clearly that issue of the ongoing workforce is something we need to pay attention to in addition to the other topics.

MR. KERN: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: So Pam Patterson, very briefly, Lisa Bartlett, very briefly, and we've got to go to a break. We're only 20 minutes late.

MS. PATTERSON: Okay. Two questions: The first question is for Charles Langley. Do you feel that the community is being adequately engaged when you have been allotted five minutes for the first
presentation I've seen in the 18 months that I've been serving on this panel by -- by a member that's representing the community when at every meeting people basically up here are given, at least, 20 minutes to give a presentation and, also, in light of the comment "No comments from the floor, please," when, quite frankly, the majority of the people sitting on what we're referring to as "the floor" are the community? Do you feel that we're being adequately represented?

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I think those are probably comments.

MS. PATTERSON: Excuse me. Don't interrupt. And the thing is -- or is CEP just a misnomer to make it appear that the community is engaged other than the fact that we're paying for everything?

MR. LANGLEY: No, I do not.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much.

MEMBER OF PUBLIC: Talking --

MS. PATTERSON: Okay. And then the next question is for the --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Pam, other people would like the floor.

MS. PATTERSON: -- for Sara Kaminske.

I said I had two questions.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: There are people who
have lots of questions.

MS. PATTERSON: This next one is, you stated that you have -- that the sheriffs department is in -- has ensured that we have a nuclear emergency plan in place, but you've given no details, no specifics.

Can you be specific with respect to what that emergency plan is and what is the evacuation plan since we've got 3 million people in Orange County and we know that on any given Saturday we've got gridlock on the freeway? So what's -- I'd like some specifics, please.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Yeah. If there are -- and if there are documents that you want to share with us, which actually many of those documents have already been shared. But if you want to point us to those, we will make sure that those get circulated.

MS. KAMINSKE: Sure, absolutely.

So to be brief about it, our nuclear emergency plans are very specific because San Onofre has a very specific emergency classification level schematic and it's based on unusual event, alert, and what used to be site area emergency and general emergency; now they just have unusual event and alert, and an alert is a full activation of our emergency operation center.

So our emergency plans align with the emergency classification level schematic at San Onofre.
We have a number of interjurisdictional SONGS specific interjurisdictional policies in place, including decision-making, coordination of public information.

We know that that's going to a huge important thing to maintain during any kind of emergency at SONGS, so we have very specific nuclear related activities that we do that's different than all our has -- hazards plan.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you.

MS. KAMINSKE: And it includes that ongoing dialogue with them.

MS. PATTERSON: And the evacuation --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: If you could -- if you could -- all right.

MS. PATTERSON: What's the -- what are the evacuation plans?

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Pam, I'm going to ask you to please stop talking.

MS. PATTERSON: That's specifically what I asked.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: You know what, this information has actually been circulated multiple times to this panel and I will have it circulated again.

And I'm a Chair and if -- I will say this right now, I will not continue to do this. Okay. If
you would like me --

MS. PATTERSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- this panel would like me to be a Chair, then I need to be able to exercise the responsibility, which is on behalf of you, to try and keep our meetings efficient. Okay? I'm just trying to do that job. We're all volunteers up here doing this. So, come on.

Now, Lisa Bartlett, you have the last word and then we're going to go to a break. I'm going to ask a couple of minutes just before the break.

MS. BARTLETT: Well, I don't want to hold us off from the break, so I'll be brief.

I have a question for Sara: So we have a -- a glide path downward on the funding right now for the emergency planning. I think in year 6, it goes to 75 percent, and you're 50 percent, and in your -- after year 7, I'm not sure what happens.

And I know with the funding mechanism, that's the sort of question -- any question at this place -- at this point. But the cities in the 10-mile zone radius in the County of Orange, we've been receiving funds for emergency planning, which has been great.

But what happens after the funding stops?

Because there's going to be a big gap between when the
funding stops and when we're actually going to get the interim consolidated storage, you know, and get every off site. So, what are your thoughts?

MS. KAMINSKE: A couple of things come to mind: As long as there is spent nuclear fuel on site, regardless of if it's 10 years or 15 years from now, we're going to need to maintain our emergency plans.

Now, what will happen is, if the funding mechanism does go away and we know that that's a possibility, then we're going to have to absorb those costs because we're not going to stop our emergency planning for that.

MS. BARTLETT: Is there any way to renegotiate the MOU?

MS. KAMINSKE: Yes.

MS. BARTLETT: To extend the time out?

MS. KAMINSKE: Yes, absolutely.

MS. BARTLETT: Okay. All right.

MS. KAMINSKE: Absolutely.

MS. BARTLETT: All right. Well, then let's work on that.

MS. KAMINSKE: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much.

And I know this topic was first alerted to us through the panel earlier and a lot of people have done
a lot of work on this issue and so thank you very much
because that's very important for our first responders.

I want to say one thing before you go to
break. We'll have our normal 5-minute break and then
we're going to come back for public -- some updates and
public comment.

Some claims were made tonight that are in some
settings libelous, claims about lying, claims about
bribery, and a variety of other claims. And I know
this is a very emotive topic and specially for people
who have been working on this for a long time.

One of the items at our last meeting was I had
asked a member of this panel to send me the information
about the lying and the bribery claims and things like
that, some of those claims have been raised in earlier
meetings or in public comment period by Rita Conn.

We had a whole extensive email exchange about
that, all of which is part of the public record, and I
wanted to share that email exchange again. There was
no response to that request for additional information.

Another member of the public raised a comment
at our last meeting about this imminent cracking risk
of the canisters, pointing to a canister -- a cooling
water tank made out of a different material, operating
for a different purpose at a power plant in South
Africa.

So I said, "Send me that information about, you know, what's the textual technical analysis so we can get some responses to this." That information has not been sent to me.

If people actually want to ask questions and get technical answers and political answers and have a discussion, then we've got to be responsive to each other. Okay? It's really, really important.

And I was very serious about what I said earlier, which is, we're all volunteers here and I'm a volunteer here and I can tell you I've spent an awful lot of time on this and I know a lot of other people do.

If you will not, you, as a community, will not allow me to be Chair by which I mean I'm just trying to run a meeting so that we have as many voices as possible, and I'm embarrassed I'm having to take time right now to explain this because it strikes me as obvious, but if you will not allow me to be Chair, then I can't do this role and I will resign and I'm fine with that.

So, really think about what is it that you want to do. Do you want to continue to have pissing matches against each other about things, much of which
is in the past, or do we want to actually work on some
things that we can fix?

I'm about trying to fix some things and we're
making some progress on that and we will undermine our
efforts. So we're going to have a five-minute break.

MR. BROWN: David, may I -- let me just make
one comment.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Please. Tim Brown.

MR. BROWN: So, you know, I'm an elected
official and fairly new. I've been at it for about six
years. It's important to remember that everyone you
see up here is also a resident in these communities.
We live here. I live in San Clemente, which happens to
be one of the proximate areas, the most proximate area
to San Onofre, and I am deeply passionate about making
sure this works right because I have a personal
experiences with the dangers and the deaths associated
with radiation and how the federal government has been
irresponsible in the past with their resources.

Nobody has a greater stake in this than the
people in this room, including the members of this
panel. I'm deeply sensitive to the fact that we're
being held to this idea that we don't care or that
we're not stakeholders.

And let me tell you something, I'm raising
four daughters in a community I deeply love and I think that members of this panel, including Dr. Victor, deserve some respect for that. 

You may not agree, but we do deserve the respect that should be afforded to someone who is passionate about this, who is volunteering their time, never taking a dime from any organization related to Southern California Edison.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you. We have a 5-minute break and we'll be back here right on time. If you would like to make a public comment, please do sign up so we can keep that organized.

(5-minute break taken.)

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. My goal is to have everybody angry at me for keeping us to time, so I'm going to cut the break off. Please have your seats here. Please have your seats here. We're going to get started here. We're going to start with some general updates.

PUBLIC MEMBER: I'm not going to sit here long enough.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: No. No. No. Please. No. No. You're first, first on the list. Put this slot up on eBay, then. It's a valuable slot.

Okay. So, first, not many updates tonight
because much of the meeting has been really thinking about where we have been and where we're going.

I just wanted though recognize the incapacity of this to work.

I want to recognize the terrific service of John Alpay and Carlos Olvera, neither whom decided to stand for reelection in the last elections, and their time with the CEP will end because we bring in different elected officials as those roles turn over.

And I just -- John and Carlos, I want to thank you very much for everything you've done and worked with us. Thank you very much. (Applause).

And I know Jim Madigan wanted to say a couple of words as well on behalf of -- of Edison because this is an important function that you helped them perform.

Jim.

MR. MADIGAN: Thank you, David.

Yes, I did want to express -- extend my appreciation for all the work that's been done. This Community Engagement Panel is extremely important and, as it's been said several times tonight, this is a voluntary activity and we really appreciate it.

So, thank you both.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much.

We, as you know, through the public comment
period, in particular, keep track of ideas that people
raise, not just from the panel and not just from
Edison, but from the public and we keep a long list of
topics for potential future meetings and so the
evergreen list is much longer than this.

I wanted to ask Dan Stetson, do you have a
couple of words about this list here? And give us a
sense of where we're headed early -- in early next
year. The script seismic study was something we've
been promised and was delayed. So I think it's now
almost ready.

Dan, do you want to say a couple of words?

MR. STETSON: Just a couple of things, David.

So we're putting together different activities
I mean, for this upcoming year and there's been a lot
of input from members of the panel, input to Edison on
what should be on that, and so some of these are -- the
first quarter of many of these that we were hoping to
do this year but because of some other odd topics that
came up and some other things of importance, they've
been pushed on, too.

So we really want to tackle the seismic -- as
you can see up here, the first quarter issues that are
up there are the ones we really want to tackle and then
the ones throughout the rest of them through the rest
of the year. But, of course, some of those that are --
will be at almost every panel and that'll be safety and
also recurring issue of the environmental things as
well.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very
much. And the supersecret, classified agenda
subcommittee will be meeting to have a secret vote
about this. That's a joke.

If anyone has any questions about how we
operate, it's in our charter and the agenda. It's not
a complicated document. It's a four-page document.

And the agenda makes the -- the charter makes
it very clear. This is a panel set up by Edison to
help Edison do its job effectively and to understand
what the communities want and vice versa, and so Edison
is crucial for that to be effective. They set the
agenda with consultation from us; that's the process.

But we get input from you. And so in the
public comment period, tell us if you want something on
the agenda that's not on the list that we've been
talking about tonight and not on the documents that
have been circulated as part of this.

So don't -- please don't make some claim that
there is some vast conspiracy out there to keep
important agenda items off the list and so on unless
you have some documentation that that's actually true.

Okay. Any other updates from the CEP before
we go to the public comment period?

MR. KERN: Mr. Chairman, I just got to make
one statement that, obviously, I kind of lost my temper
there for --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Well, luckily I didn't.

MR. KERN: Because there was a statement made
to the people I represented. You know, I've been
representing about 180,000 people for 10 years in the
City of Oceanside. And Tim can probably bear this out
and the other elected officials, people aren't shy
about telling their local elected officials what they
think.

I have people stop me in the grocery store, I
have people stop me at different events and talk about
this specific issue because it's a very hot topic. So
the idea that -- one of the reasons that we have local
elected officials up here because we do represent the
people. So for somebody come up and make a statement
that people aren't represented is absolutely false.

So I took exemption to that. I'm sorry I lost
my temper, but I just had to make sure that that
statement was out there. Thank you.

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

MR. BROWN: David, I have a question on -- on the topics going forward and the subjects and the strategic plan. You know, one of the things that we've discussed is that with the consolidated interim storage, it's still interim and those facilities, whether -- whether they're in New Mexico or Hobbs, you know, are going to designed for an interim storage.

You know, and I don't want to dilute our effort in what we're doing to try to, to put it in your words, move the needle to try to get this material into interim storage at a better location than where it is now, I think everybody in this room wants that.

The fear I have -- and it's not a fear, is that the federal process is broken, you know. They failed to produce a repository and that's what the whole nuclear industry planned to be there today so we can plan to get our materials there. Well, it didn't happen.

And so, you know, there is a lingering fear that if we -- and we should, we focus on consolidated interim storage, getting it into that facility, but if -- if the federal process to do a permanent repository is not also worked if we don't try to, in a parallel track, try to find senators who want to take on that
challenge, if we don't find something like that, if we just purely ignore it, I think we may regret it because I think nobody wants to see the facilities in Texas or New Mexico become the default inter -- long-term interim storage in a facility they weren't designed to be.

And so I don't want to dilute what we're doing and it'll be a miracle if we are suc -- well, maybe not. I'm not going to say a miracle.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Referring to the miracles as a high standard.

MR. BROWN: But it's going to be -- it's a high bar and a big challenge. But I don't want to see us totally ignore, trying any effort to do something to fix the federal long-term repository process.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yeah, well said. I'm going to have a couple of words on that.

But briefly, Glen Pascall.

MR. PASCALL: The Sierra Club is sort of permanent repository central in terms of policy, that's where we've been since 1983. So now why are we front and center supporting consolidated interim storage?

And I quoted our April policy statement that explicitly calls for transfer to an interim site.

That's a pretty bold move for the Sierra Club.
And I think there are two reasons for that:

One is -- and this is more speculative. I'm not an expert on this. But it is my understanding that the characteristics of the waste to be stored are such that it is optimal to have both interim and permanent facilities on an ongoing basis.

Secondly, this panel, the CEP, has been absolutely wonderful in a way that's deeply gratifying to me in acknowledging permanent storage as the end game, as the ultimate goal that gives me meaning to the word interim.

You have been wonderful and I have reported back to the Sierra Club that you have heard our concern that CIS not be a substitute but part of an integrated waste management plan.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: So I think -- let me just add, first of all, I think Garry very well articulated it. We also have a moral obligation to these communities that are going to be the interim facilities that they go into this with their eyes open and they -- I'm impressed that they are.

But they go into this and the transport as well with their eyes open, but that this be done in a serious, sophisticated way with long-term vision, and I think it's crucial that have a permanent repository.
I would also say that that's crucial for the politics of this topic. If we -- if we pursue this just as consolidated interim storage because that's what we want, we'll lose a huge fraction of the political coalition that's central.

MR. BROWN: That was going to be my point.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: So I think that's exactly spot on. Any other general updates before we go to the public comment period?

Okay. So we're going to have public comments now. A reminder: It's three minutes, which is in our charter. And if you don't want to -- first on the list, Rob Howard.

You're not going to -- you can talk? Awesome. Thank you. Rob Howard first and then Nina Babiarz.

MR. HOWARD: Yeah, Rob Howard. I'm the business manager for the Utility Workers Union Local 246. We represent -- actually, Dan is my colleague at the site. I had some prepared statements, but based on the meeting, of course, that kind of changed.

One of the things I would just say is that I think it's really important we have -- our organization has been open with Edison about our questions, our concerns. We challenge them at any time we believe
there was a reason to be challenged.

    Our members are trained in order to protect
the health and safety of the public and we actually
wear that as a badge of honor that we are willing to
challenge.

    One of the things I learned -- actually, my
dad taught me this was that in order to make progress,
sometimes you have to decide what you have in common.

    And I do believe with regard to interim and
permanent storage, we have to decide if we want to
operate out of fear or to operate through collaborative
efforts. You can disagree. You can be willing to
challenge at every level, but if we're not willing to
decide where our common interests are, it makes it very
difficult to make progress.

    What may happen is, operating out of fear,
decisions will be made that won't be in the best
interest of what our original goals were. We are
dealing with a situation where I have watched a number
of people be laid off, have to move, and a number of
other things. This has been difficult for our members.
And I personally tried to help as much as I can with
each one.

    But I also know we still have a responsibility
to that public, which we are a part of. We live in the
community. I live in Oceanside and I have no problem calling my city council member. And I don't just call him. I call him particularly around the CEP because I know that he is on this panel and I ask questions. I challenge him.

I will call Southern California Edison leadership and challenge them. But I try to do it in a manner where my concerns can be heard. I try to be respectful because I want them to hear me.

So I would just say when we're looking at working on these issues do not believe because we're not screaming and yelling that we don't challenge them, but I also want them to hear what we're trying to say because we have a goal to move the fuel. We want to get it off the beach and we do care about the health and safety of this public.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very much for your comment. Next is Nina Babiarz and then Laura Lafoia Ava-Tesmale.

MS. BABIARZ: Good evening.

My name is actually Nina Babiarz.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: My apologies.

MS. BABIARZ: I'm a board member of Public Watchdogs and I'm here to support a comment made by
Gary and Charles Langley earlier in the program.

Just a bit of background on myself is that I was at one point an engineering construction News reporter for McGraw-Hill, living in Pennsylvania in 1979 during Three Mile Island. So I do have a little bit, a personal experience in witnessing what happens to a community when you have a radiation leak.

I'm only going to speak on three topics of a factual nature unemotional. And I want to talk about some of those things that weren't presented here tonight because I believe, in Mr. Madigan's slides, you had a picture of where the spent fuel was going to be buried, but what you didn't show is that immediately below that bluff, a third of that parking lot was wiped away by the king tides in January.

The other thing that we're not talking about tonight are the sea level rise studies that were just recently complete -- completed in Del Mar that are so significant, they're suggesting relocating a rail line, Carlsbad, Oceanside. Jerry, you know it's currently underway.

And so I don't know how else to put this, Dr. Victor. And I don't mean any disrespect, but it seems a little half-assed to me that a sea level rise study would be done after a permit was granted by the
same agency, the California Coastal commission, that
gave Edison a permit to bury the waste.

The other thing that we didn't see tonight is
with regard to your slide on the aging management
system. If you look at the California Coastal
Commission application that Edison filed, you will see
that that permit was granted under special conditions;
and those special conditions contain that an aging
management system was to be developed and delivered in
order for those special conditions to be met, and those
-- that special condition alone has not been met, and
for that reason alone, that permit should be revoked
until that aging management technology that you
promised is developed and delivered and that we know
what's going to happen to those casks when they're put
under ground and we can see the structural integrity or
not of those casks in the ground.

The third point -- and I know I'm bound to 30
seconds -- is a thank you to Sara for talking about the
emergency planning exemptions. Those -- that
application by Edison was put into the NRC under the
auspices that because the plant was closed, the risk
was low. Well, that's apples and oranges. You know,
there was never a proper risk assessment.

And, Dr. Victor, I know you indicated that you
wanted to talk to the California Energy Commission. I implore you to contact Chair Weisenmiller, who submitted a 23-page vehement opposition to that emergency planning exemption. And I'd be happy to give you a copy of that. And just briefly --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Wait. We're overtime, but please do share.

MS. BABIARZ: I realize that. And so I appreciate your patience because --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Please do share that with me.

MS. BABIARZ: Dr. Stetson indicated --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Laura Lafoia Ava-Tesmale.

MS. LAFOIA: I'll wait until she's done here.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: We don't trade time. Come on, please.

MS. BABIARZ: I just want to give what you asked for and that was a factual information that Tom Palmisano at the last Community Engagement Panel answered the question that you asked me, Mr. Stetson.

MR. STETSON: You can't --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Come on.

MS. BABIARZ: And that's, "What are we going to do with the water?" And he indicated "dilute and
discharge." And with Mr. Quinn --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: No, please. Please okay.

MS. BABIARZ: The FRA and the FDA.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Please. Please.

MR. BROWN: Call the next person.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: The floor is yours.

MS. BABIARZ: I'll be happy to share it with you later.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Please do share it. Just share it with us later, that'd be great.

MS. BABIARZ: That's what you asked.

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

MR. HEADRICK: Do you mind if I just interject and answer some of the questions? I wasn't able to speak to.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Well, we're in the public comment period, so you're going to have three minutes. Sure.

MR. HEADRICK: Thank you. I'm sorry to interrupt.

MS. LAFOIA: That's okay.

MR. HEADRICK: The questions about the bribery and the kinds of casks, we don't make unvalidated
claims and I'm pretty sure you got the information, but we can back up everything we said.

The thing about the bribery was semantics. You know, they had to pay an administrative fee and they were disbarred. And, you know, when you ignore things like that or you ignore things like the recent real whistle blower and nobody talks about damage fuel may have been loaded in dry casks, it undermines the process.

And we have to have an ability to trust each other in this process in order to create the model that the rest of the industry is going to use from now on.

And it's a shame that we can't look back and be self-critical and invite other people that are -- that are independent contrasting views that the public would like to ask questions, too.

And, honestly, if you can't make that happen in the next meeting or so, I think you should consider resigning because that's such an important part of this whole process. Honesty, open dialogue, communication, that's just not happening.

We've got to get the truth out there, so we don't end up not being able to do interim storage because casks are failing and the industry has a terrible record and I've tried to demonstrate that
here, and there's several other examples.

But until we hear from both sides, this is going to be a pissing match, like you said. It's not going to be productive and we've got to open up the discussion to people that have important technical sound reasons.

And we're just citizens. We're not experts. We've done our homework, but if you hear from the experts, very qualified people, I think we can make a difference and we can live safely with this waste until we can move it to interim storage.

So, please do that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very much, Gary, for your comment. Next comment from Laura Lafoia. Help me understand how you pronounce your last name.

MS. LAFOIA: I'll say it. I'm Laura Lafoia Ava-Tesmale. I come from the Pacific Islands, the Island of Samoa, Tutuila. It's in the Heart of the Pacific. And I am here to represent my Pacific island nations of Polynesian, Melanesia, Micronesia. We're also known as the Blue Liquid Continent Oceania.

Our islands have been so impacted in many ways: Colonization, militarization, nuclearization. Our islands have been used as target practice for
missiles that have been launched from Los Angeles.

The disaster of Fukushima has impacted because of water, the air flows right through our islands. So, becoming aware of this SONGS, the nuclear waste and how it's going to be managed to be put into 80 canisters that are about 20 feet tall, about 5 inches -- I mean, 5 feet wide, five 8ths of an inch of stainless steel rather than cast iron; then those would be buried into, perhaps, the coast along our beach, along our water.

I think it's going to be buried into public areas. So I've heard that the intention is to bury them so that Edison can step away from being responsible because it's now going to be in public -- public area. I hope that that's not the case.

But I am here on behalf of my foundation, which is One Global Family Foundation and also the Councils of Interfaith and Indigenous Women and Youth and we also have a Council of Interfaith and Indigenous Men and Youth that's now being launched.

My background is managing operational divisions for multi-million dollar real estate lending firms and now multi-billion dollar real estate lending firms and I do consulting on the side to help finances staying global, humanitarian projects locally and globally as well as building peace.
As a mother, this is why I'm here today, because I want to be heard, not just for my children and grandchildren and future generations but for all of the families that live here in Orange County and even outside of Orange County that would be devastatingly impacted if they are not even aware.

It's not even in the mainstream media. I don't know who is doing the media outreach, but certainly it's not working. It's not effective.

If we've got 3.5 million Orange County residents and we're being represented by less than 100 here, something it's not right. I have started a daily teleconference call. It's One Global Family. You can find us on Facebook: One Global Family Call to Sacred Activism.

And every day we're bringing together indigenous leaders, interfaith leaders, activists, advocates, musicians, so that we can raise awareness, so that we can strategize and how we're going to be able to disseminate this information to our families that need to be aware so that their voices can be heard.

You have asked how the community can help you to raise awareness. I am presenting you with this teleconference. I invite all of you to please come and
speak. We want to hear from you as well.

Furthermore, we're bringing together indigenous elders locally and globally to share their wisdom because in many of these areas around the world this type of -- not allowing the people to be heard or give input, decisions are being made in -- under -- under --

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

MS. LAFOIA: Without their input.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Torgen Johnson is next.

MS. LAFOIA: And so I just want to say --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And then Marni Magda.

MS. LAFOIA: I just want to say --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Please, you're --

MS. LAFOIA: -- this is going to become our standing rock and I want you all to hear me when I say that we want to do this very prayerfully, very honoring, with the spirit of love and oneness with all of you. But hear me when I say that we will be calling in our elders and our protectors of the sacred land and waters for all of generations to come.

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

MS. LAFOIA: Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Torgen Johnson is next
and then Marni Magda.

Torgen Johnson, the floor is yours.

MR. JOHNSON: My name is Torgen Johnson.

My background is urban planning. I'm Harvard-trained. Back in 2013, my family invited the former Prime Minister of Japan, Naoto Kan, who dealt with the Fukushima disaster while he was prime minister.

We invited him to San Diego to speak to the public about what a nuclear accident is like because I think what happened was that there was a lot of condescension in these types of meetings with the NRC and the CPUC and some of the elected officials at the local level really discounted the concerns of the public who -- the public, you know, is a very broad range of expertise.

I think it's terribly condescending to ask the public to credential themselves on a nuclear level, on nuclear expertise in order to speak at a public hearing. And I also think it's unprofessional for a panel to attack the public that they're supposed to be engaging.

So with that said, he had some things to say at the County Government Center. He had some key points and one of them was the greatest danger that he
faced during the opening days of that disaster in 2011 was the spent fuel. It wasn't the reactors. It was the spent fuel. And it had to do with the -- the amount of radiological material in the pools and loss of the cooling of those pools. But the second thing that he said was, his experts, and U.S. experts were also advising him, told him that the evacuation wasn't 5 miles or 10 miles or 20 miles or even 50 miles, it was 160 miles. And he said that was permanent evacuation. He said if they lost control of the spent fuel and they had an accident, it meant the permanent evacuation of the Tokyo metropolitan area, which is 50 million people.

So I think, when I look at this crowd, and I think the last speaker was correct, I've run public meetings and I think when your public engagement panel representing several counties around here pulls in about 50 people, the engagement panel is failing because you're not communicating to the public what this fuel really means in the worst case scenario. And we have the 78 Corridor that has billion-dollar industries, high-tech industries along there that are downwind of this fuel. If you can
engage the public in a truthful manner, you'll have a lot more people show up and you'll have a lot more expertise come in from various people that may be not nuclear experts but may be people that are experts in wanting to protect their property, real estate experts, insurance experts. And I think that's where this panel has failed.

And I want to say that there are a number of issues, but the key one is, what I identify along with others based on NRC documents, is the first step in handling the fuel is to canister it properly in the right canister that are transportable, that are monitorable and that don't have a risk of leakage because once you close those pools off, destroy those spent fuel pools, you have no way of re-casking the fuel.

So in answer to Tim's question, why we shouldn't rush to put the fuel in a -- in the deficient canisters is because the fuel may be in it for a very long time without the ability to monitor, correct or re-cask the fuel, which is a disaster for the region; that's why.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much for your comment. Marni Magda and then Daryl Gale.

MS. MAGDA: Thank you very much. I'm Marni
Magda from the Sierra Club. And I speak for myself when I come up here at public comments, so just as a member of the public.

I want to say to Torgen why blame the CEP. Gary Headrick, wonderful man that I admire so much and he shouldn't have been standing up here. He is in favor of con -- consolidated interim storage and he did send this message out to 5,000 people to come here tonight.

And he really implored everyone with all of -- to show up and this is who showed up. So it's not anyone's fault. It's a hard subject and no one wants to face it.

So I'm going to ask everyone of the environmentalists that I care for so much, we have the spent nuclear fuel. We've got to get it off of our coasts, so let's get together and work to get consolidated interim storage to work.

The ISFSI is going to be ready in 2017. The pools can be emptied by 2019, that makes us so much safer than we are today. We can't wait. We must push forward with the technology we already have.

And we've got to make sure that while we're doing this when our union, in 2018, if it has -- if they have to be reduced, do not replace them with
workers that are not of our local people. Make sure that our workers are not replaced by Holtec from a foreign country. Keep it here; keep our workers here.

I would agree that one thing I would wish that Edison would look at is making sure the cranes are here until the fuel is moved, the cranes that could move them if something is damaged and there's an emergency.

I would also ask all the environmentalists to continue to ask that the cooling pools not be dismantled until all the fuel is gone because we do want it out of here in 2021, but it's going to take everyone in this room getting another 1,000 people to work together to get it out of here.

And I thank Jerry Kern for creating the concerned coastal community. That's how it's going to get done, by people working together with our legislators, people that are using the motto of everyone working together.

Lisa Bartlett, being willing, thank you to get the community together, to get legislators together. Pat Bates working for a resolution for California. That's how it will get done. Good news.

Consolidated interim storage does not hurt the California 1976 moratorium that would allow any more nuclear reactors in California because it's interim
storage, it would only change it if it were final storage. So we're safe to go after it hard, hard, hard.

So, right now, let's move to move this fuel because we don't want the default. What we have right now for 300 years, according to the NRC, is to leave it here at San Onofre for 300 years. So let's get it out by 2021 and all work together to do it.

And please, all of you and environmentalists, work with us. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Great. Thank you very much for your comments. Daryl -- Daryl Gale. And may be mispronouncing your first name.

MS. GALE: No, your fine.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And then next it's Marilyn Fuss.

MS. GALE: Hi. I'm very grateful for the opportunity to express myself to the CEP even though I'm an outsider albeit a very concerned one.

I try to come down here as frequent as possible. I'm not paid, nor am I a staff person for an environmental group. I'm just a retired paralegal. I take Amtrak down here and then I Uber to the various meeting sites.

The situation here is like the -- you know,
the California version of the Dakota pipelines; the indigenous people are being forced to confront toxic nuclear waste from an antiquated energy source.

Over the years, we have asked, we have begged and we have submitted proof, we have informed the media and we have testified and besieged all levels of government, trying to appeal to reason, but still our government and, most notably, the Coastal Commission has basically, you know, potentially doomed this area unless we can take some kind of evasive correct -- corrective action soon.

Before, we want to take action before there's an earthquake, before there's a terrorist attack and before there is sea level encroachment. So I'd like the idea of everybody being concerned and enlivened about, you know, the interim storage.

I want to also add to the fact that we need to use thicker casks even if we have to wait to get them approved. We need the thicker casks and we all need to figure out a way to talk to our state and our federal representatives to get everything moving.

So I think we can do it if we all put our heads together and figure out some ways to do it together and maybe for a future meeting, we could have a whole hour of just community input, you know, even
people for me -- like me who are coming all the way from Los Angeles. So, thank you.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much for your comment and for coming here tonight.

Marilyn Fuss and then Adelia Sandoval.

MS. FUSS: Yeah, I'm Marilyn Fuss. And I signed up to read a statement for somebody else, which is no longer necessary. But I just thought I would emphasize too that I've been -- this is about the sixth time that I've been down here fresh -- fresh out of work from L.A. and it's because this is a primary safety matter, not just for these two counties but for the whole state, for the whole Western Coast, for the Whole Pacific Rim and the rest of the world.

And I think that this decommissioning process should be a world news story. The enormity of each one of these -- each one of these nuclear reactors is a -- is a potential threat and I think each one is a world News story. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much for your comments. Adelia Sandoval and then Ron Rodarte.

MS. SANDOVAL: Good evening. My name is -- well, you just told everyone my name -- Adelia Sandoval, and I am a representative from The Juaneno Band of Mission Indians, the Acjachemen People, and
this is our homeland.

And I've been thinking, what am I going to say to you all? I mean, this is a very interesting evening. I'm tired. I'm hungry. But I'm here.

And what I want to say is, I'm not going to chastise anyone or -- but what I think -- I'm going to speak on behalf of my tribal council, is that we want to be included in all of this because this is our homeland.

This is -- we're stewards of this land and we take the ancestral call very seriously. You know, the story goes that our ancestors were called here and to take care of the land, and what they did is cer -- many ceremonies and songs and dances and they worked out the balance of the land and that whole thing has all gone astray.

We work really diligently to continue that balance and it's very difficult. And so, what I'm offering you is -- is, actually, our ability to keep that balance and we do it in a very non-political way, and how we do it is spiritual and so I'm offering you that. I'm offering that care and consideration and I hope that you -- you will include that in -- in all the things that you do.

Because this whole dismantling of this energy
plant was through spiritual work and we do believe
that. We've been working on it for quite a long time
and it was a joy to hear that it was decommissioned.
But we have that ability to continue to work and to
help you.

And I don't hope you don't think that's an odd
thing to say, but we can help you and we know that we
are actually the stewards of this land, so we're
responsible for the safety of all the people who live
here in Orange County and around the parameter area.

So I just want you to know that to include us
in everything that you do, please. Maybe even have one
of our council people be on the panel.

And there are tremendous amount of people that
are here to help you and give you wisdom as well. And
I hope that you, instead of getting, like, you know,
defensive, but say, "Okay. Thank you. Thank you for
sharing that with me," because they -- there is a lot
of wisdom here and so don't -- don't be afraid to hear
what they have to say.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Excellent. Thank you.
PUBLIC MEMBER: (Inaudible.)
MS. SANDOVAL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much.
And when we get to the report time, I want to
have a -- explore something further with you, but we'll do that when --

MS. SANDOVAL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- at the end of the public comment period. Thank you very much for your comment. Ron Rodarte and then Ace Hoffman.

MR. RODARTE: My name is Ron Rodarte. I'm a resident of San Clemente with the Orange County Green Party but speaking as a resident of Orange County as well.

There is a tremendous validation of what this woman just said and the other indigenous in the room in that the events of the last couple of days proved a point that the underlying structure validation in our society is no longer valid.

It has been upset by the use of funding, huge amounts of funding, that have shifted the validation and scientific realm into those chairs or departments that are owned outright by corporations, therefore, denying the ability of scientists to come up with other kinds of results in their experimentation and rendering their efforts null and void by the expulsion of their -- of their presence because of different views. That's something going on globally.

The spirit is really taking form now and
that's why you have to listen to the people. We are
volunteers as well.

I'm shifting a little bit because I really
feel for you, David, and the rest of them and the
panel, you are volunteers. You're here on your own
dime as we are, too. But we don't have the millions of
dollars of research facility or the city ability to get
into the archives, deliver papers, have the time to be
delivering information as requested because we work our
jobs.

I own four companies. I just came in from
L.A. I worked today from 4:30 until about two hours
ago and drove back. I'm here because it is important.
Having the time to participate for us is not the same
as having the time for you to participate, but we value
our -- our participation as a team.

Please, remember that the view of the
corporation at this point of social development or the
evolvement is not good because of the hubris that's
been shown. I believe that the best stance that this
panel can take along with the people in this room would
be step back and consider that this is a matter that
requires extreme patience, care, which you've shown,
but it does not mean that we keep people out of the
discussion because they have something to say that
isn't proven by a study, that may be proven by other means.

We have a problem in the structure of validity and we have to recognize that. It was proven two days ago in our election, nobody expected that to happen. Nobody expects an earthquake to happen, but it will.

So, thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Great. Thank you. And thank you for your comment. Ace Hoffman and then Jeff Steinmetz.

MR. HOFFMAN: Good evening.

I distributed thousands, well over a thousand copies of this book, including to all of the members of the panel at some point.

And, Ted Quinn, you're an expert in nuclear -- nuclear information, so you have no right to say this isn't peer reviewed. I've given the weight the scores of San Onofre employees, not one, nobody, has give -- has made a correction to that document.

Recently, about a year ago, I interviewed at the atomic testing facility a man named Peter Livingstone. He was a re -- a nuclear effects researcher doing several bomb tests, has 42 tons in the aerospace industry and has a plan for neutralizing nuclear waste.
Uranium 235 and plutonium 239 are fissile and there's an awful lot of that stuff in the spent fuel, therefore, the last -- at the last meeting, Tom Palmisano talked about the dangers or criticality events.

Criticality events can occur today, they can occur during transport, they can occur if an airplane crashes into it, if a terrorist attacks the waste, they can occur at the consolidated interim storage site, they can even occur in a permanent storage site.

But uranium 235 and plutonium 239 can be fissioned. Now, that's going to create fission products, but they can be fissioned. It's been proven in a linear accelerator that that can be happen.

And what we can do is, we can take those nice straight rods that are illustrated over in the back room there and fire a laser down -- down the beam, fire the laser beam down those rods and fission those two products, that eliminates the criticality danger.

And by eliminating the plutonium 239, you'll eliminate the 600,000-year storage problems, you're down to a 600-year storage problem from the fission products, most of them. They are what I call the noble 7, which lasts a lot longer, but there's not nearly as many of them.
So the storage problem has now become something that it is only two or three times the length of the -- that this country has existed instead of 10 times, 100 times the length that the pyramids have existed.

I asked you, David Victor, if you would let Peter Livingstone, who is in his late 80s and had a heart bypass surgery this year, come and talk to you for maybe 10 or 15 minutes. I didn't get any answer.

I would like you to let him come talk as soon as possible, preferably at the next meeting and explain this idea in more depth. It's his idea, not mine.

And I can't find a nuclear scientist that can explain why it's not a good idea to neutralize the waste and eliminate those dangers.

It makes the waste far safer, safer to transport and -- and just much more manageable problem that is within the realm of human life spans instead of being beyond our ability to even know what could possibly happen, volcanically, earthquakes, tsunamis, asteroids, all those dangers. We only have to look 600 years if we neutralize the waste.

Thank you very much. And I didn't take any extra time.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you for comment
and for your attention to the timing. I'll have a
comment back on that during the -- later.

But Jeff Steinmetz and then Roger Johnson.

MR. STEINMETZ: Hi. Thank you for having us
here tonight. The first thing I'd like to do is I'd
like to offer sincere apology to Pam on the panel
there. At a previous time at a public meeting I said
that the entire CEP panel was not interested in what
the -- the community actually had to think or had to
say about how things are done at nuclear -- at SONGS
nuclear power plant.

So, Pam, my sincere apologies. You should
never have been included in that statement.

Now, I'm glad that a couple of people brought
up peer review and I'm glad Victor brought up Donna
Gilmore's questions concerning the tank in
South Africa.

It's funny that Victor should mention that he
never got a follow-up email because he's been told
about this issue time and time again. He actually has
content in his safety of long-term storage and cask
issues for San Onofre regarding this. This is his
paper. This is paper that was peer-reviewed.

By the way, has anybody on this panel read the
peer reviews that were provided for his paper?
CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Please continue with your comment and we'll --

MR. STEINMETZ: It was a bloodbath.

So when he comes up here and says that our experts don't measure up, you've got to look at what he wrote and what the experts wrote about him.

Now, on security: I found it interesting that they mentioned repeatedly that everybody at San Onofre is completely committed to safety. Well, that might be true for the most part at the plant. The community does not agree at all as far as Southern California Edison is concerned.

The history at that plant is very dismal. One of the things that was actually forgotten was the November 29th and 30th article in the Huffington Post and later picked up by the AP about sabotage at the plant. Everybody's forgotten about that.

There was an FBI investigation about it and there was never any public statement as to what had occurred. I would like an answer to that. I would like the FBI to come and talk about the investigation.

I tried to mention it with your security agent. All he did was to try to intimidate me by asking, "Well, who is your source?" And then he asked me my name. Well, guess what, my name is Jeff
Steinmetz. I live in San Clemente.

Give it your best shot. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you for your comment. Next is Roger Johnson and then Leah -- I'm sorry -- I can't read it. I think it may be Vasquez. But Roger Johnson is next and Leah is after that.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

In the spirit of trying to make suggestions for the CEP for the future, I could identify three avenues of progress: One is the top-down approach, another is the bottom-up approach, and a third I call the sideways approach or behind-the-scenes one.

It seems the CEP has done way too much of the top-down approach. And I think you -- you have great confidence in the mechanism of government and agencies and bureaucracies.

Take the two bills in congress, they're both flawed, they're both going nowhere. Look at the Department of Energy, look at all these agencies. If we have a century, we might be able to go through -- check all the boxes and go through all this. It's not going to happen.

We have a window of opportunity of maybe 10 years, maybe 20 years. The casks are going to
deteriorate and then we're going to reach the point where they can't be moved because they're too fragile and too dangerous.

So, what I see lacking in the -- in the group here is the sense of urgency and we have -- there should be a huge sense of urgency and you should do more than this top-down approach.

You're unrealistic about the mechanisms of government. You're unrealistic about some of the dangers. I consider terrorism our number one danger. It's hardly ever discussed.

The Sandia National Laboratory says one truck bomb on a periphery of a nuclear power plant could send plumes of radiation.

The second approach I call a sideways approach, give you one example: The secretary of the Navy was in Camp Pendleton about a month ago. Not a word on the public record was discussed about the number one issue there and so I wrote them a letter.

And I said, "You realize you have almost 2,000 tons of plutonium on your base? And what are you going to do about it? And one accident and the whole base is history. Evacuate the whole base forever and that's it." No answer.

I don't see why we can't communicate, work
more -- work more closely with the Department of Navy.
I know Dan mentioned this. The military moves nuclear
waste all the time. They move all kinds of stuff.

They have a lot of capabilities and there's a
lot they could do and I don't know whether you're
communicating behind the scenes with them. But why
can't we get the Department of the Navy and the whole
military involved in this?

The bottom-up approach is what's lacking, I
think. And we heard a lot about that tonight, but we
need more of a way-two effort.

An example, this is a recent election. I
looked at all this, I saw almost no mention in any
newspaper for any candidate about this problem, the
number one problem in this area.

And I asked the editor of San Clemente Times,
"When you ask about traffic light problems and this,
why don't you ask about this?" Because their
positioned so in San Onofre. And they don't do it.

I wrote to the reporters at the UT San Diego,
the Orange County Registers, they don't ask the
candidates. Issa says very little. Applegate has said
things behind the scenes, but didn't go public with it.

This should be a major issue and so I think we
need more pressure from the public so we can all work
toward the common goal that Tim mentions. We all want this waste out of here and so I think the public can help with this effort. We need to create pressure. They don't feel any pressure. Politicians don't feel the pressure.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay.

MR. JOHNSON: And so we need to get together to -- to do this.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much for your comment. Next is Leah Vasquez.

MR. JOHNSON: So I'm suggesting this: Lower the top half of the program and make it five minutes for the public.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you for your comment, Roger. Leah Vasquez and then Barry and I don't -- Leah, are you here? Am I -- oh, yeah. Thank you. What is your last name?

MS. VASQUEZ: You're correct, Leah Vasquez. Thank you very much.

I have been here before. I have worked with secured nuclear waste. I am a daughter of an actress who with the entire crew all died from cancer in the nuclear test over St. George, Utah, in that area.

And I remember very well testimonies and the Native-Americans and how things were covered up. I
don’t feel that way with this group. I think you’re working very diligently and very hard and I commend all of you. I also respect the differences of opinion and the strong passions.

One of the things that is very obvious is that the public is not engaged. And for those of us who have children, who surf, go down to the beach along San Onofre area along trestles, one of the things -- and I’m going to give a couple of suggestions and this is really serious: We need to know what kind of outfall on a daily basis, if it isn't monitored, it should be and it should be posted in these areas along the beach.

And I know the business won't like it, I know people don't want to recognize it, but we have both the sand and we also have the ocean and we need to see those numbers just like we do rainfall.

We need to see it to remind the public this is a serious, serious issue and it's not going to go away. The other thing that is very apparent, because I asked today, where can we see the exit route.

Well, I know that every community has this plan and we have hundreds of miles. We need to see that exit plan on public broadcast stations constantly and in every city.
We have -- and I'm from Laguna Beach and we have an emergency manager, but we don't get -- we have all kinds of information, but I don't see it. In other words, I'm in my home, if it happened today, if we had a disaster, what do we do?

We had a fire and we ended up going down the highway, one way, and when we got down near San Clemente, there was no other way. I mean, it was -- it's just a log jam. So we need a very coordinated system regardless of when this might happen or if it ever does or doesn't.

So I'm besieging you to -- to not only move forward and I commend you for wanting to get -- to get on with it. I know there's disparity about the thickness of the casks, but I'm hoping that you'll be able to -- my time is up -- you'll be able to do some of these things about public posting.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very much for your -- for your comment, which resonates with some of the points that Sara made earlier.

Last is Barry. And Barry, I don't have your last name here, so --

MR. PAULOSIER: Paulosier.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Paulosier. Thank you.
MR. PAULOSIER: So just to -- I guess quick question and probably best for Madigan or Quinn, has the dry cask storage been -- you know, what kind of success we had with that historically?

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Why don't you make your comments and questions and then we'll answer? We do it all at the end.

MR. PAULOSIER: My concern is, you know, we've had a history of trusting in engineering until it fails. And the schematics are create, what have you. My dad grew up in Baldwin Hills. His dad's friend bought the lot right below the dam. He trusted the American engineering.

And then the dam engineer forgot to factor like, you know, there's a bunch of oil mining there and it sank and the dam ripped and took out a bunch of houses and that was a huge debacle in L.A. County a couple of decades ago. Right?

I'd like to trust the monopoly. Mine is in the solar industry, seeks the backbone of our power plants that we engineer and design and built. But, you know, San Bruno, a lot people died, the wildfires out on the East STG and Torrey, a lot of people died and money was not -- that was set aside for safety wasn't even used.
I'm glad you guys have a 25 percent contingency on 4 million dollars, that's a lot of extra money to, like, get more than a five 8th inch cask. I can -- I know the coast from Big Sur to Baja every inch, spent 90 miles along the coast yesterday on my way to Runner Huts.

My exit plan, if something goes down, I had two bars left on the fuel. But, basically, it's really plastic zone. Family and friend in Encinitas, he's got -- he's used to have an 80-foot deep backyard. He's got a 20-foot deep backyard. And the coast is plastic, it's moving.

Just this last year we lost a lot of the road on, you know, right there where the church is right down Beach Road. It's like -- it's a very sensitive spot and with the way the climate is going, if things aren't engineered to last well past anyone's grandkids' lives here, typically, things don't last as long unless they're planned for, specially when they're a one-off single-time engineering.

So if this dry cask thing doesn't have a real big success record, which I doubt it has just based on the history of nuclear power and how long it has been around, I hope you guys, like, really engineer 10-X or 50-X, not like a multiple of three or five or something
because it's -- like they're saying, things take a long time.

I've talked to people in Montana about how great the gold mining was or what the concept was during the fallout that they've had for the last decades, you know. It really needs to be thought out well past worst-case. And just some facts.

We've had so many disasters in your local grid in the last couple of decades from the best engineers that these guys are buying and it's a bit concerning, so, you know --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay.

MR. PAULOSIER: I'm just curious what that record has been.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much for your comment. So we have -- we're overtime, but I do want to make sure we take some time for Dan and Tim to tee up some of the major questions we think we can get answered tonight. I want to answer a couple that have been pointed in various ways to me.

So Dan and Tim, how do you want to organize our time?

MR. BROWN: Why don't you first, Dan, and I'll just go right after you.

MR. STETSON: Thank you, Tim. Because, I
don't know about you, but I'm exhausted.

MR. BROWN: Yeah, there was a lot of comments.

MR. STETSON: And we just want to touch on a couple of questions. But I think it's important to realize a lot opinions have been expressed tonight on both sides of it, but we all agree on one thing and that's the thing we want to continue to focus on and that we all want to get the spent fuel out of here as quickly as possible.

So, moving into the questions, even though our Newly Elected President doesn't believe in climate change and thus the oceans aren't -- must not be rising. Many of us in this room think that the oceans are rising.

If I might ask you, Jim, the question came up about what cities have you done that relate to the ocean rising as related to the storage of the casks, and then also the same person asked the question about the special conditions from the Coastal Commission that are requirements and meetings those.

So if you could answer those two questions.

MR. MADIGAN: Sure. I'll start with -- I'll start with the Coastal Commission's request for aging management plans, that is part of the permitting process. We are not overdue in providing that
information to them. There is a schedule and we will meet the schedule to provide that information to them.

With respect to studies for ocean tides and rising waters, that was part of the State Lands Commission study. I don't have all the details on that. That's something that we can bring those details back to you, but that was part of the State Lands Commission study to approve the CDP for that.

MR. STETSON: Will that be in the environmental impact report that they're working on?

MR. MADIGAN: Yes.

MR. STETSON: Okay.

MR. MADIGAN: Well, hang on. Let me make sure -- the environmental impact report they're working on for the current CEQA analysis?

MR. STETSON: Yes.

MR. MADIGAN: No, it's in the environmental impact report for the permit, for the spent fuel pool -- or the spent fuel pad.

MR. STETSON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: It seems to me that there's a series of questions around the conditions and what we should think about this conditional approval, the 20-year approval, and maybe we could put those together and put a -- put together a single answer to
those because I think the aging management part of that is what something that this panel is committed to spend sometime on, understanding what that is, so that would be real helpful.

MR. BROWN: Okay. That was -- Dan, right, I had that same question. There were a couple of -- Gary raised the issue about failure of dry casks -- as well as Barry also asked the question about the reliability and engineering in dry casks. There was one other question about the casks.

I think it's worth giving some perspective on dry cask storage to date and the success rate as well as what, you know, the plans are in the transition and then ultimately the reliability or, at least, confidence in that technology going forward.

MR. MADIGAN: So, thank you.

That's a great question and one that we will be exploring in great details as we move forward in the next year and talk about the defense-in-depth and aging management. The safety record for storage of spent fuel is 100 percent. And as part of the licensing for the spent fuel canisters, it requires for re-licensing to bring forward aging management programs. So it's not just the one and done engineering analysis, it's a continuous process.
MR. BROWN: Okay. And how -- how long have we had casks? Because I remember that we had casks on site since -- '06? What was the date that we first put casks into service?

MR. MADIGAN: I think it was 2003.

MR. BROWN: Oh.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: But in the industry, the oldest cask -- I just have this in my brain because I worked very heavily on this white paper that was supposedly a bloodbath. The first industry experience with this -- these stainless steel kinds of casks is now more than 20 years old because the first series of sites that had those casks have already been through the re-licensing process.

MR. BROWN: Oh, I see.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And that license lasts for 20 years.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Dan.

MR. STETSON: Thank you.

Again, Jim, Gary brought up a question about or actually a statement that there was some damaged fuel rods that were loaded when -- into dry cask when they should've been canned.

Would you like to comment on that, please?

MR. MADIGAN: I don't know what he's talking
about, so I don't have any data that would show we have
any damaged fuel that's been put into canisters that
weren't stored properly.

    MR. STETSON: If you'd --
    MR. MADIGAN: So I --
    MR. STETSON: Okay.
    MR. MADIGAN: I can't respond.
    MR. STETSON: But kind of going along a little
bit along the same line, if there are damaged rods,
what is the process to handle those?
    MR. MADIGAN: So all the fuel is inspected and
fuel assemblies that have damaged rods are stored in a
specially designed canister. They're -- the term is
"canned" and it's part of the license and the
certificate of compliance for the fuel canister itself.
    MR. BROWN: Okay. There was a concern that --
that the Edison would bury the waste and then walk away
so they're not responsible for it anymore. I know that
that was addressed earlier.

I just want to confirm exactly how Edison is
approaching ownership of the site and long term what
their plans are.

    MR. MADIGAN: Well, we own the license and as
long as there is fuel there, we'll be responsible for
that fuel.
MR. BROWN: Okay. It's definitive.

MR. STETSON: Okay. Actually, this is for Tom, who is on the panel. And, Tom, the question came up is, why can't the Navy be more involved? Could you tell us a little bit about what the involvement currently is and what we expect it to be?

MR. CAUGHLAN: Yeah, the way the real estate operates in the Department of the Navy is that the Marine Corps owns the installation and operates the installation for the purpose for which the installation was created, in this case, training Marines.

The Department of the Navy's real estate manager and their engineering department is the Naval Facilities Engineering Command. So the ownership process of, say, the NEPA process, is owned by the Naval Facilities Engineering Command.

I -- I parenthetically say the reason that the Vermont solution doesn't apply out here is because the Department of the Navy owns the land and you can't sell what you don't own. So Southern California Edison couldn't sell this to anybody. It's Navy property.

And the Navy -- the Marine Corps agenda here is to get it back into useful training land as quickly as possible, which we're doing incrementally. The Mesa Site or the site that is on the inland side of the
freeway is -- there have been some demolitions already, a lot of the sampling of soil, some cleanup actions.

It's moving well down the way to return that to military training land. The prospect of returning the actual SONGS generation site to military training land, because of that closure time line of 60-something years, is very less likely to happen in living life times.

But the process of -- of returning the land to the Navy involves the restoration of the property to the acceptable level, according to existing science and our -- our reuse, that is a subject of ongoing discussion.

I believe the standard is 25 millirems. Look, I'm an out-of-work helicopter pilot, I'm not a nuclear engineer. Okay. So I believe the standard was -- was quoted at .25 millirems and I believe the cleanup contract is at 15, so it's about three 5ths of what would be acceptable. But we don't really know what we want it to be because we have to define the reuse.

Now, I'm the guy that closed Tustin Air Station on my active duty job and when we closed up there, the standard we used was local reuse authority, what's your intention for the land we're going to give back to you, and we then had the obligation to clean it
up to that level, which is what we did.

We were -- because of the contamination that was almost entirely aviation gas and jet fuel, we could use other simple process of cooking it out of the ground and then using the hydrocarbons to continue to fuel the cooking process and then turn sterile soil back into the ground; worked pretty well.

But that's the process that we used when we were going to turn the land back over to the community and that's the process that we will use to set the standard for what we want the land to come back to because we plan to use it for military training without any negative impact to the marines or their families.

Because, remember, the first place that gets contaminated is military family housing. Before it even gets to San Clemente, it goes through well where our kids live, so we have a vested interest here, too.

And we're going to train Marines over the land for as long as we have it and that means we want to be able to train them there without any negative consequence for casual exposure walking across the ground.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Excellent.

MR. CAUGHLAN: So that -- does that answer the process -- the question? I'm sorry. I'm long-winded.
CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: No, that's very helpful. And I just want to report that Tom and I talk periodically about getting the folks from the Navy Lands Department here in whatever the right way is. That has not yet been possible to organize, but I know the communities are interested in hearing more from the Navy about what their internal process is once that's possible for them to come and visit us.

MR. BROWN: Okay. David, this is actually a question for you. There was a few comments that because there are so few people here that this panel is failing in its objectives. I just wonder if you had a comment about that.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I think -- I certainly would hope that we get more people involved in these meetings. And one of the purposes of this meeting was to have an honest conversation, not with a bunch of people just saying yes, about what's working, what's not working.

And we're not always going to agree on this, but I do want to say that what's happened over the last two years or so is the work of this panel has increasingly been out in the communities doing lots of other things in addition to these meetings.

So, Marni mentioned these various efforts to
engage our environmental community; many of us are active in that: Jerry Kern, Lisa have been very heavily involved in the legislative side, Glen Pascall and Garry and Dan, others, in mobilizing the environmental community.

So I think the standard to hold success or failure of this panel against over the next few years is around these major topics that we talked about tonight and that's not all going to get resolved in these meetings.

But I do think these meetings are very important. And if people have ideas about how we can get more of the diverse communities involved in this and here, whether it's a different time, a different format and so on, I'm all ears and I know other folks are as well.

MR. BROWN: If you got any more, go ahead.

MR. STETSON: David, another question for you or comment, if you'd like, Ace brought up some questions about the plant to -- or capability of being able to neutralize the spent nuclear fuel.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yes.

So let me just say, I'm technically very interested in this and I'm very -- I've been very interested in people who are excited about breeder
reactors and a whole variety of other things that can take what is spent fuel that's underutilized and make the fuel -- spent fuel management problem easier.

So my resistance on this is not the lack of technical interest. My resistance on this is, I can't see a scenario by which a regulated utility that has a set of regulatory obligation for its existing site would actually allow or be allowed to allow its fuel to be used in this way and so that's my concern.

So I am -- I'd be happy to sit down and meet and learn more about this and I'd love to listen and learn more. I will say the time horizons remain a huge problem because whether it's 600 years for the fission products or many times that for the original spent fuel, that's still certainly beyond my lifetime.

And my goal is actually, by the time the casks come up for re-licensing, which is the 20-year time horizon, for us to have it all out of here; that's the time horizon. So that's, I think, where we should be focusing, but I'd be happy to meet with that person.

MR. QUINN: I would, too.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yes. Then, please, I will make sure that Ted and I are in the room.

MR. BROWN: There was -- there was one comment that I'll answer to Ms. Gale, came from L.A., that this
is doomness, that the plant has doomed this entire area. One of the things I will say is, the plant was built in 1960 when San Clemente had less than 10,000 people in it. Since then we've grown 65,000 people and the homes have exponentially -- worth vastly amount than they were back in that time.

I would say that the idea that our communities are doomed, I think it's a little bit of hyperbole. It's a beautiful place to live. I think all the residents here could say that. I love living in San Clemente.

And although we have concerns and I want the waste removed, I certainly would not characterize San Juan, Dana Point, San Clemente as doomed areas by any stretch of the imagination. So I just had to say that because it's a great place to visit.

Come to our beaches. It's wonderful.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Other comments?

MR. STETSON: Last one for Jim.

Jim, there were some questions about the public post -- perhaps some public postings on the outfall on a daily basis. Are there any outfalls that you might be able to inform us about? Because I don't really --

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: The question was about
the monitoring of the outfall, the content of the
outfall, which I assume is for fissile materials.

MR. MADIGAN: Okay. The comment of we're
still going to have to release the pools I think was
the comment.

MR. BROWN: No, it's the daily outfall.

MR. STETSON: The daily outfall. I'm assuming
the daily -- only daily outfall is the 5 percent of
water still going --

MR. MADIGAN: Oh, you're talking about the --
the pipe, the outfall, the conduits?

MR. CAUGHLAN: The conduits.

MR. MADIGAN: The conduits. Okay. Thank you.

MR. STETSON: I'm --

MR. MADIGAN: I guess we're still using them
for about 4 percent of the original usage of water.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: But is that for --
that's not -- that's all non-nuclear.

MR. QUINN: Not radioactive.

MR. BROWN: That's not radioactive.

MR. MADIGAN: No, it's used for the permits
that we have from the -- that's from San Diego and just
like we would clean up the water and then release the
water. There may be some residual but well within the
limits of the permit.
CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Did you want to say something about this, Ted?

MR. QUINN: It's non-nuclear.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Did you want to say something for the record?

MR. QUINN: No, he answered.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay.

MR. QUINN: He answered.

MR. BROWN: That's it.

MR. STETSON: That's it.

CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I just want to raise two -- three last things very quickly: Someone raised the issue of terrorism risk. It was Roger. I am very keen that we have a meeting on terrorism risk because I think it's on people's minds. It comes and goes. It's constantly on people's minds. I'm not actually sure -- I'm not convinced it's the number one risk, but I'm convinced that people are concerned about it and we should have a meeting on it. What I don't know how to do, and this is what I'm struggling with, is how to have a meeting that's serious about actual analysis and remedy in a non-classified format; that's my problem. Because you can't talk about most of these things and the remedies in -- without tipping off the
terrorists, and so that's -- it's not for lack of interest in this, it's for struggling for how you have a meeting that's serious about terrorism that's not classified and I don't know how to do that.

And so if members of the community and others have views about this that we can have an effective meeting in that kind of environment, I'm all -- I'm all ears and I'm sure other people will as well.

I just want to commend the comment from Adelia Sandoval about the Band of Mission Indians.

And if you'd invite me to come and listen and learn, I am -- would be delighted to do that. So, please let's talk about that off -- offline.

I think Eric -- no, correction -- Jeff Steinmetz raised some comments. Clearly, we're going to disagree on a lot things, about the peer review that was done on that white paper.

Precise -- I raised the question again with Donna Gilmore at our last meeting about the Koeberg tank precisely because I and others spent a lot of time researching that tank to understand what the actual risks are and whether the tank is a relevant analogy to the casks that are here.

And the clear answer to that, from lots of different sources, was no, and so then -- but then
claim -- it's very clear what the data showed and then
people keep saying the same thing over and over again.

And so I asked, "Send that information back to
me because maybe there's some new information that we
didn't see," and that's why I asked about it.

It's not that we were ignorant of the
existence of a tank that had cracked in South Africa.
That's not being used for this purpose at all. It's
cooling and heating because it's a cooling tank. It's
that this claim keeps getting made and made in the
press that's scaring people in ways that are not
legitimate.

And if there's some legitimate basis there,
then -- then let's talk about it. So that's -- it's a
factual question, that was the reason for it.

And so I would love to have an additional
input as to how the peer review was a bloodbath. I --
in my day job, as an academic, run lots of peer
reviews.

And that was certainly not a bloodbath. But,
please, please show me that information. I'd be very
interested to see it.

Any -- any other comments from the panel?

And we've gone way over time and I apologize
for that. So, thank you all very much. Please drive
safely tonight, and thanks for joining us. I really appreciate it and I know many others -- all the others do as well.

(CEP meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.)
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