SCE News Releases

SCE Awards San Onofre Spent Fuel Strategic Plan Contract to North Wind

From: Lorraine Quinn Sandstrom
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2019 12:21 PM
To: David Victor; Daniel T. Stetson; Jerry Kern; Lisa Bartlett; Donna Boston; Garry Brown; Tom Caughlan; John Taylor; Rich Haydon; Jim Desmond; Jim Leach; Val Macedo; Marni Magda; Martha McNicholas; Ted Quinn; Mel Vernon; Paul Wyatt
Cc: Doug Bauder; Joseph M Gabaldon; John Dobken; Juanita Hayes; Julie C Holt; KELLI GALLION; Kevin Walker; Larry Rannals; Liese Mosher; Lindsey Stigall; Manuel Camargo; Marisol Eaton (SD County); Mike Sappingfield; Katelin Scanlan; Steve Carlson; Tanya Flink; Tom Palmisano; Victor Cao; Ian Forrest; Linda Anabtawi
Subject: SCE News Release: SCE Awards San Onofre Spent Fuel Strategic Plan Contract to North Wind

Dear CEP Members,

A news release was distributed, today to announce that SCE has awarded a contract to North Wind to help us develop a strategic plan to assess the feasibility of getting SONGS fuel offsite. The strategic plan will be developed with support from the Experts Team and SCE. This e-mail is being sent for your awareness.

Thank you,
Lorraine Sandstrom
Senior Program Analyst,
Southern California Edison, San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS)

Attachment #1 - **SCE Awards San Onofre Spent Fuel Strategic Plan Contract to North Wind, June 13, 2019**
~~~~~~

SCE, Communities Near San Onofre Removing Long-Retired Emergency Sirens

From: Lorraine Quinn Sandstrom
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 2:03 PM
To: David Victor; Daniel T. Stetson; Jerry Kern; Lisa Bartlett; Victor Cao; Tanya Flink; Donna Boston; Garry Brown; Tom Caughlan; John Taylor; Rich Haydon; Jim Desmond; Marisol Edrozo; Jim Leach; Val Macedo; Marni Magda; Martha McNicholas; Nicole Perez; Ted Quinn; Dan Bane; Ferencz, Veronica; Mel Vernon; Paul Wyatt; Jackie Littler; Ken Schultz; Mike Sappingfield; Juanita Hayes; Debra Lewis; Kathy Ward
Cc: Manuel Camargo; Tom Palmisano; Doug Bauder
Subject: SONGS Sirens Being Removed - SCE News Release

Dear CEP Members,

I write to inform you that SCE distributed the attached news release today regarding the SONGS sirens. You may recall the sirens haven't been needed for SONGS-related purposes since 2015. However, Southern California Edison agreed to maintain the sirens for local community use through June 2019. The sirens were initially deployed for potential use for the two highest levels of emergency, which are a site-area emergency and general emergency. FEMA and the NRC determined years ago the sirens are unnecessary based on accident scenarios that would no longer warrant evacuation or sheltering in place. For your awareness, the sirens were never needed for an actual emergency in the 39 years they were in service.

Thank you,
Lorraine Sandstrom
Senior Program Analyst,
Southern California Edison, San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS)

Attachment #2 - SCE, Communities Near San Onofre Removing Long-Retired Emergency Sirens, June 26, 2019

~~~~~~

OC Register Op-Ed by Doug Bauder Re: SONGS

From: Lorraine Quinn Sandstrom
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 1:26 PM
To: David G. Victor; Daniel T. Stetson; Jerry Kern; Lisa Bartlett; Donna Boston; Garry Brown; Tom Caughlan; John Taylor; Rich Haydon; Jim Desmond; Jim Leach; Val Macedo; Marni Magda; Martha McNicholas; Ted Quinn; Dan Bane; Mel Vernon; Paul Wyatt; Ken Shultz; Mike Sappingfield; Juanita Hayes; Debra Lewis; Kathy Ward
Cc: Manuel Camargo; Doug Bauder; Tom Palmisano; Victor Cao; Tanya Flink; Marisol Edrozo; Nichole Perez; Veronica Ferencz; Jackie Littler
Subject: OC Register Op-Ed by Doug Bauder Re: SONGS

Dear CEP Members,

For your awareness, the Orange County Register ran a recent op-ed by Doug Bauder regarding our response to the Aug. 3 incident and preparations to restart fuel transfer operations. The link is provided below.

https://www.ocregister.com/2019/07/06/the-safe-transfer-of-spent-fuel-at-san-onofre/

Thank you,
Lorraine Sandstrom
Senior Program Analyst,
Southern California Edison, San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS)

Attachment – none

~~~~~~

Spent Fuel Transfer Operations Resumed at SONGS Today

From: Manuel Camargo
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2019 8:31 PM
To: Captain Mel Vernon; Daniel T. Stetson; David G. Victor; Donna Boston; Garry Brown; Jerry Kern; Jim Desmond (SD County Supervisor); Jim Leach; John Taylor (SJC City Council); Marni Magda; Martha McNicholas; Paul Wyatt; Rich Haydon; Supervisor Lisa Bartlett; Ted Quinn; Tom Caughlan; Val Macedo; , Dan Bane; Kathy Ward
Cc: Doug Bauder; Gabaldon, Joseph M; John Dobken; Juanita Hayes (SD County); Julie C Holt; KELLI GALLION; Kevin Walker; Larry Rannals; Liese Mosher; Lindsey Stigall; Lorraine Quinn Sandstrom; Marisol Eaton (SD County); Mike Sappingfield; Scanlan, Katelin (KScanlan@semprautilities.com); Steve Carlson (UCSD); Tanya Flink; Vincent J Bilovsky; Amy F Pressler
Subject: Spent Fuel Transfer Operations Resumed at SONGS Today

Hello CEP members,

I write to make you aware that earlier today, SONGS resumed fuel transfer operations (FTO). As you will recall, SCE conducted causal analyses and developed and implemented corrective actions to address the event August of last year when a canister became wedged during the downloading process. The NRC has been very engaged via its regulatory oversight and, last month, reached the determination that it is safe for SCE to resume FTO. After rigorous final readiness reviews, we returned to FTO today.

A news release on FTO restart has been posted to the "latest news" area of the website and that news release is available here. We also have built out a new page on the website dedicated to the restart of FTO and the path forward. The new web page includes a brief video that provides an overview of our enhanced fuel handling procedures and technology and the web page and video are available here. Please feel free to share these resources with people in your networks.

Let me know if you have questions.

Best regards,

Manuel

Manuel C. Camargo Jr.
Principal Manager, Strategic Planning
SONGS Decommissioning
Southern California Edison
www.SONGScommunity.com

Attachment – none
~~~~~~
~~~~~~

SPENT FUEL STORAGE

E&E Daily -- NUCLEAR WASTE: Hearing shows disposal stalemate far from over

From: Lorraine Quinn Sandstrom
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2019 8:49 AM
To: Daniel T. Stetson; Jerry Kern; Lisa Bartlett; Donna Boston; Garry Brown; Tom Caughlan; John Taylor; Rich Haydon; Jim Desmond; Jim Leach; Val Macedo; Marni Magda; Martha McNicholas; Ted Quinn; Mel Vernon; Paul Wyatt
Cc: David Victor; Victor Cao; Tanya Flink; Marisol Edrozo; Nichole Perez; Veronica Ferencz;; Jackie Littler; Ken Schultz; Mike Sappingfiel; Juanita Hayes; Debra Lewis; Dan Bane; Manuel Camargo; Steve Carlson
Subject: FW: From E&E Daily -- NUCLEAR WASTE: Hearing shows disposal stalemate far from over

Dear CEP Members,

I am forwarding the following e-mail message and information, per David Victor's request. Please see the e-mail and attachment below.

Thank you,
Lorraine Sandstrom

From: David G. Victor
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2019 8:16 AM
To: Lorraine Quinn Sandstrom
Cc: Manuel Camargo
Subject: (External): FW: From E&E Daily -- NUCLEAR WASTE: Hearing shows disposal stalemate far from over

Dear CEP members,

At our last meeting we had an update on the legislative situation in DC. At that time, I mentioned that there would be hearings this week on three pieces of legislation. Below is an article reporting on that hearing—and on the growing interest in interim storage alongside the political difficulties in passing interim storage legislation. The article is a useful and accurate discussion, but the picture (of a site in west Texas) is highly inaccurate. An interim storage site, if built, would look like the concrete ISFSI structure at SONGS (only much bigger), not an open pit. Please ignore the picture but look at the article for an update on the situation.

All best wishes,

David

From: David Victor

Reply-To: "David G. Victor"
Date: Friday, June 14, 2019 at 4:41 AM
To: "David G. Victor"
Subject: From E&E Daily -- NUCLEAR WASTE: Hearing shows disposal stalemate far from over

This E&E Daily story was sent to you by:

E&E DAILY
AN E&E NEWS PUBLICATION

NUCLEAR WASTE

Hearing shows disposal stalemate far from over

Jeremy Dillon, E&E News reporter

Published: Friday, June 14, 2019



A site in Andrews County, Texas, that could house spent nuclear fuel on an interim basis. Edward Klump/E&E News

Almost everyone on a House Energy and Commerce subcommittee hearing yesterday agreed that something needs to be done to break the nation's nuclear waste disposal logjam.

But the means for achieving that goal remain elusive, as the usual divides about Yucca Mountain, interim storage and everything in between dominated the Environment and Climate Change Subcommittee discussion.

Meanwhile, leading Democrats say they remain open to "all options" for advancing a federal strategy to begin moving the waste, with an emphasis on the three bills at the center of the hearing yesterday.

The common thread connecting those bills may also indicate a growing willingness to embrace interim storage as a more immediate option.

"Consolidated storage will ensure spent nuclear fuel is managed more safely and securely, while allowing communities with decommissioned plants to begin working toward redeveloping those sites," said Energy and Commerce Chairman Frank Pallone (D-N.J.). "Interim storage is the best near-term solution to stop the nuclear waste stalemate," he added.

Among the bills under consideration was Rep. Doris Matsui's (D-Calif.) **H.R. 3136** to authorize the Department of Energy to site and locate an interim storage facility, with an eye to using private sites to save costs.

Another bill discussed yesterday was **H.R. 2699**, Reps. Jerry McNerney (D-Calif.) and John Shimkus' (R-Ill.) effort to authorize interim storage while jump-starting the Yucca Mountain licensing review.

Shimkus is the subcommittee's ranking member and has become perhaps the loudest Republican voice for Yucca. Yesterday he showed two tall stacks of documents, which he said were permitting and review documents papers to the Nevada site.

That bill represents a redo of last year's House-passed, bipartisan nuclear waste legislation that earned 340 votes on the House floor but never saw Senate action.

Pushing Pelosi

Speaker Nancy Pelosi's (D-Calif.) opposition, though, may dampen its prospects to see a floor vote, although E&C members are already thinking of ways to get her behind the bill.

"She has her interest that we have to be aware of, to put it in diplomatic terms," McNerney told reporters after the hearing. "I'm gonna sit down with her and see what she thinks would work, and I'll let her know what I think works, and we'll see if we can come up with something."

Democrats included $25 million in their fiscal 2020 Energy-Water title of the spending minibus currently on the House floor. That bill does not include any new money for Yucca Mountain, and the Rules Committee blocked consideration of an amendment to attach Yucca funding to the bill.

"I doubt any piece of legislation alone will solve our waste challenges, but I do believe we need to be considering all options for disposal in an effort to find the safest and indeed the most cost-effective way to move forward," said Rep. Paul Tonko (D-N.Y.), the chairman of the subcommittee.

House Republicans remained skeptical of an interim storage approach that did not attach some type of process to finding a permanent repository or an answer about the suitability of the Yucca Mountain site.

"It seems to me that diverting funds from the waste fund for interim storage that is not linked to Yucca risks increasing the financial burden on ratepayers to pay for a permanent repository," said Rep. Greg Walden (R-Ore.), the committee's ranking member.

Even with some differences between Democrats and Republicans on the issue, Walden promised to work across the aisle to find a solution that could work for both sides.

"We got to solve this for the safety and security of this country, for the environment, for the ratepayers," Walden said. "This is nuts."

An olive branch for states?

One issue that garnered some consensus from the panel of experts and industry representatives before the subcommittee was a new repository siting approach that could serve as an olive branch to entice states into willing disposal partnerships with the federal government.

But questions remain over whether the current DOE process could get states on board with taking some of the waste without introducing broader changes to how states are allowed to oversee the disposal process.

The bills before the panel, which represent a retread of previous proposals over the past decade, would not solve those questions, said Geoffrey Fettus, a senior attorney with the Natural Resources Defense Council.

"The drafts before us today, however well-intentioned, will not solve the current stalemate and won't lead to workable solutions," Fettus said.

Those issues are already on display with the private-sector sites that are looking to host the waste in southeastern New Mexico and Texas.

New Mexico voiced its opposition last week to hosting any waste on an interim basis, especially without a long-term disposal site determined for the near future. And Nevada has remained steadfast in its opposition to the Yucca Mountain site.

Nevada Democratic Gov. Steve Sisolak wrote Energy and Commerce leaders last week to renew his opposition to any bill that would revive the Yucca Mountain project.

"My position, and that of the State of Nevada, remains identical to the position of Nevada's past five governors: The State of Nevada opposes the project based on scientific, technical, and legal merits," he wrote in the letter.

But for Capitol Hill lawmakers, the hearing may have served more importantly as another sign of Congress' appetite to see some type of legislative fix for nuclear waste sooner rather than later.

"I don't think it'll make much of a difference," McNerney told reporters after the hearing. "But we still have to keep the issue going. This is an important issue. I mean, there are 39 states that have nuclear waste sitting in very vulnerable spots, and it needs to be dealt with."

Reporter George Cahlink contributed.

Want to read more stories like this?

Click here to start a free trial to E&E -- the best way to track policy and markets.

ABOUT E&E DAILY – CONGRESS. LEGISLATION. POLITICS.

E&E Daily is written and produced by the staff of E&E News. Designed for policy players who need to know what's happening to their issues on Capitol Hill, from federal agency appropriations to comprehensive energy legislation, E&E Daily is the place insiders go to track their environmental and energy issues in Congress. E&E Daily publishes daily by 7:30 a.m. while Congress is in session.

E&E NEWS

E&E News
122 C Street NW 7th Floor Washington, DC 20001
Phone: 202-628-6500 Fax: 202-737-5299
www.eenews.net

All content is copyrighted and may not be reproduced or retransmitted without the express consent of Environment & Energy Publishing, LLC. Click here to view our privacy policy.

Attachment - none
~~~~~~

Congressional Legislation

Diablo - SB 968 Economic Impact Assessment by CPUC

From: David G. Victor
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 8:35 PM
To: Alex Karlin
Cc: Jerry Kern; Daniel T. Stetson; Manuel Camargo
Subject: (External): Re: Diablo - SB 968 Economic Impact Assessment by CPUC

Thanks Alex for passing this along. I copy Dan and Jerry for awareness and Manuel so that he can include this message, if ok with you, in the next circular of emails I share with the full CEP for SONGS. All best, David

From: Alex Karlin
Date: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 at 3:23 PM
To: "David G. Victor"
Subject: Diablo - SB 968 Economic Impact Assessment by CPUC

David

As I am sure you are aware, the CPUC issued its SB 968 Economic Impact Assessment on the closure of Diablo Canyon today.

Here is a link to the report

https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/uploadedFiles/CPUC_Website/Content/Utilities_and_Industries/Energy/Energy_Programs/Electric_Costs_and_Rates/Nuclear/FINAL_SB%20968%20Diablo%20Canyon%20Economic%20Impact%20Assessment.pdf
~~~~~~

One important take away is that the authors of the CPUC report think that there is a **"compelling case"** for a **"more robust and constructive engagement to mobilize local institutions."** See pages 63-64.

Thus, the SB 968 Economic Report underscores my concern that CPUC or the State should create an **independent** decommissioning advisory board, with members selected and designated by all of the affected governmental entities and other key stakeholders (Labor, Native American, Environmental). Such an entity would be a robust, sustainable, and properly resourced advisory board, which could conduct the ongoing public dialogue and monitoring of the 20+ years it will take to decommission Diablo Canyon.

The following is a direct quote from page 63-64 (See also page 9 - of the Executive Summary):
"Although there are clear disparities between public and private sector expectations regarding closure impacts, there is remarkable agreement about what issues are most important for the local economy. As Table 44 and Table 45 clearly indicate, Enterprises, NGOs, and Public Agencies generally agree on the higher priority risks and rewards that are subject to economic uncertainty. Taking these results, discordant expectations over shared values, makes a **very compelling case for determined and expanded commitments to ongoing policy dialog.** We already know that SLO governments are pursuing this with dedicated (SB1090) and other funds, including the new

Hourglass Project. We can only hope the evidence presented here **will support more robust and constructive engagement to mobilize local institutions**."

Note also Table 51 at page 67 of the Report. Here is what, in my opinion, it shows:

In my opinion, the fact only 3% of the the stakeholders surveyed by the CPUC chose to participate in any DCDEP activity (even though the marjority were fully aware of the DCDEP) is a sad and remarkable "No Confidence" vote in the independence and efficacy of the PG&E created DCDEP. These stakeholders apparently did not think it was worth bothering to participate in the DCDEP. Perhaps they are waiting for a more independent advisory board to arise.

Senator Monning and the CPUC will hold a public meeting to discuss the SB 968 Report on June 28th from 1 - 3 pm in San Luis Obispo.
It will be video broadcast, if you are really bored!

Best regards
Alex Karlin

ReplyForward

Attachment – none
~~~~~~
~~~~~~

Congressional Correspondence:

Follow up to question during hearing on "Examining America's Nuclear Waste Management, Storage, and the Need for Solutions"

From: Daniel T. Stetson
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2019 12:37 PM
To: Krahel, Kyle; Hammon, Beth ; Kaity Wolfe
Cc: Doug Bauder; Manuel Camargo; David Victor; Jerry Kern
Subject: (External):Follow up to question during hearing on "Examining America's Nuclear Waste Management, Storage, and the Need for Solutions"
Importance: High

Congressman Mike Levin (via Kyle Krahel)
Congressman Harley Rouda (via Beth Hammon)
Congressman James Comer (via Kaity Wolfe)

Cc: Doug Bauder and Manuel Camargo (SCE)
David Victor and Jerry Kern (CEP)

Dear Representatives Rouda, Levin and Comer:

As you may recall, during the recent congressional hearing on "Examining America's Nuclear Waste Management, Storage, and the Need for Solutions," Congressman Levin asked me to find out when SCE would implement their planned radiation monitoring program. Since that meeting I have followed up and made a formal request to SCE for that information. Attached, just received, is their response.

Please feel confirm receipt of this email and feel free to contact me should you have any additional questions.

Special thanks for your continued efforts for making the safe storage and timely removal of the spent nuclear fuel from SONGS a very high priority.

Sincerely,

Dan Stetson
CEP Vice Chair

Daniel T. Stetson
Trustee and Executive Director
The Nicholas Endowment

All who have meditated on the art governing
human beings have been convinced that the
fate of empires depends on the education
of the youth.
- Aristotle

Attachment #3 - Follow up question re: SONGS Radiation Monitoring during congressional hearing, July 15, 2019
~~~~~~

National Academy of Sciences (NAS) Report

National Academy Press - Long-Term Health Monitoring of Populations Following a Nuclear or Radiological Incident in the United States: Proceedings of a Workshop (2019)

From: David G. Victor
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2019 10:57 PM
To: Ted Quinn; Manuel Camargo; John Dobken; Daniel T. Stetson; Jerry Kern
Subject: (External): Re: Recent NAS report

Manuel

Can you pls circulate this to the full CEP with (after Ted's consent) Ted's brief summary email. It is important that folks see where we are (or not) on the question of long range monitoring and understanding of impacts.

David

From: Ted Quinn
Date: Wednesday, July 31, 2019 at 8:50 PM
To: David G. Victor, Manuel Camargo, John Dobken, Dan Stetson, Jerry Kern
Cc: Ted Quinn
Subject: FW: Recent NAS report

Important report.
this report touches on several of the issues that we have discussed in the past re radiation impacts, monitoring and data collection. While focused on radiation-induced catastrophic events, it draws on non-radiological events as well to infer the challenges of establishing registry data and then developing followup monitoring. It looks to me that there hasn't been a lot of solutions on the health "big data" challenges and results of the DOE R&D that was cut short – and hopefully will restart on LNT and low-level radiation hazards.

Best regards,
Ted

Fact Based Public Engagement on Spent Nuclear Fuel Policy and Spent Nuclear Fuel at SONGS

From: David G. Victor
Sent: Monday, July 29, 2019 1:53 PM
To: Manuel Camargo
Cc: Jerry Kern; Daniel T. Stetson
Subject: (External):FW: fact-based public engagement on spent nuclear fuel policy and spent nuclear fuel at SONGS

Manuel

Can you pls be sure that Mike's letter (below) and our original letter get circulated to the full CEP.

Thanks

David

From: "Gilbert, Jonathan"
Date: Monday, July 29, 2019 at 1:14 PM
To: David G. Victor, Dan Stetson , Jerry Kern
Cc: Krahel, Kyle
Subject: RE: fact-based public engagement on spent nuclear fuel policy and spent nuclear fuel at SONGS

Hi David – Please see below for Rep. Levin's response to your email.

Dear Dr. Victor, Mr. Stetson, and Mr. Kern,

Thank you for your letter regarding the need for fact-based public discussion of the issues involving San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS). I always appreciate the opportunity to engage with you about operations at SONGS, which directly impacts the constituents I represent.

I share your desire to see the spent fuel at SONGS moved off the coast and am working tirelessly towards this goal. After arriving in Congress in January, I helped lead the effort to secure $25 million to initiate an interim storage program at the Department of Energy. This funding was included in legislation that has already passed the House of Representatives. I have also sponsored legislation, the Spent Fuel Prioritization Act, which would require the Department of Energy to prioritize the removal of spent fuel from sites located in areas of high earthquake hazard and population, like SONGS. That bill has received a hearing before the House Energy and Commerce Committee. At the same time, I have cosponsored legislation to explicitly give the Department of Energy the authority to take title to spent fuel in order to hold it at an interim storage site. Given your stated preference for interim storage, I believe we have made more progress on this path to remove the spent fuel from SONGS in the last seven months than has been made in the last decade.

I also agree that the spent fuel at SONGS is safer in dry storage canisters than in spent fuel pools, and I have been pleased to see renewed attention to safety by the management at SONGS. However, I strongly believe that media and community attention paid to the operations at SONGS are good for transparency and safety. Southern California Edison has a long history of mismanagement at SONGS and there are significant concerns associated with Holtec, as you have written. Continued attention pressures these companies to put the safety of our communities above their own profits.

There are still legitimate questions associated with operations and planning at SONGS. One of the most important questions is whether the design life of the spent fuel canisters is adequate given the decades-long stalemate over the nation's spent fuel program and how long the fuel may be required to remain onsite. Another question is whether Southern California Edison will be able to ensure there will be no future issues with plant operations, despite its history of safety violations. This history, and the need for greater oversight, are some of the reasons I continue to call for a Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) inspector to remain onsite whenever fuel transfer operations are taking place. I encourage you to support this request of the NRC.

We may not agree on everything with regard to this colossal challenge that we face, but I am pleased that on these major initiatives, we do have common ground. I hope that together we can maximize transparency and accountability at SONGS and I look forward to working with you to achieve these and other goals on behalf of my constituents.

Sincerely,

MIKE LEVIN
Member of Congress

From: David G. Victor
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2019 12:12 AM
To: Dan Stetson; Jerry Kern; David G. Victor
Cc: Krahel, Kyle; McHale, Sterling; Gilbert, Jonathan; Pintar, MaryAnne; Hammon, Beth; Doug Bauder; Manuel Camargo
Subject: fact-based public engagement on spent nuclear fuel policy and spent nuclear fuel at SONGS

To: Congressman Mike Levin (via Kyle Krahel and Jonathan Gilbert)
Congressman Scott Peters (via Sterling McHale and MaryAnne Pintal)
Congressman Harley Rouda (via Beth Hammon)

Cc: Doug Bauder and Manuel Camargo (SCE)

Dear Representatives Levin, Peters and Rouda,

We write to express some concerns that the public debate about moving spent nuclear fuel from San Onofre is disintegrating and moving in directions that will be harmful to our communities and is also increasingly at odds with the best scientific knowledge on the matter.

Compilation of Recent CEP Communications
6/13/19 to 8/1/19

Over the last five years in our volunteer work with the SONGS Community Engagement Panel we have become exceptionally aware of the need to find practical solutions for the spent nuclear fuel that has accumulated at the site. Those solutions require a robust program for putting that fuel into the safest storage facility that is practical available—that means stainless steel canisters with an extensive program for monitoring and "defense in depth" so that the fuel is safe on site. The solutions require, as well, an expeditious and responsible program for moving the spent fuel from San Onofre (and other such sites being closed) to one or more interim storage facilities. The interim storage option is available soon—with a change in federal law—and will be the fastest way to move the fuel away from San Onofre. We are impressed that the process of siting those interim facilities is being done with informed consent and engagement of the local communities at those locations.

We have worked tirelessly toward these solutions, and we appreciate and applaud your efforts to support the same goal—in particular, your work to help change federal law to make interim storage feasible, to fund interim storage pilot programs that can jump start the process, and your support for funding of rail cars that will make it possible to move the fuel to these sites safely.

We have become concerned that dissenting views around the wisdom of this program are getting a lot more attention in local media. We see increasing attention to options that are not practical—such as completely scrapping the existing canister program and moving to canisters that are not currently used widely in the United States. We are seeing SONGS comparisons to risks such as massive Chernobyl-like canister explosions that have zero grounding in scientific analysis and are extremely counterproductive. These efforts may play well for groups raising donations and attention, but they are sowing dissent and disillusion just at the time when our communities should be working together. Worse, they create the wild and false impressions of danger for communities that might offer themselves as sites for interim storage. We need those communities to make interim storage decisions on an informed basis—not one fueled by falsehoods.

We hope that you, as members of the southern California delegation who have been consistently engaged with these topics, can help us right the public discourse in this area and focus on the best, responsible and practical options. It has not helped that Edison and its contractors severely mis-handled a canister of spent fuel late last summer—an event that has been subject to intense scrutiny and revamping of procedures. But as those new procedures are implemented and the fuel offloading resumes it is crucial we keep our communities focused on what really works and what is really in our best interest.

Thanks for your support,

David G. Victor
Dan Stetson
Jerry Kern
Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Secretary, SONGS Community Engagement Panel
Attachment – none
~~~~~~

NRC Updates

NEIMA Section 108 Public Meeting Near San Onofre

From: David G. Victor
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2019 10:51 AM
To: Jerry Kern; Daniel T. Stetson; Manuel Camargo
Subject: (External): Fwd: NEIMA Section 108 Public Meeting Near San Onofre

Dan and Jerry,
FYI below concerning the NRC meeting series. I don't see any dates yet.

Manuel, can you please make sure this email gets included in the next circular to the CEP.

Thanks, David

Sent from limited typing device

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Watson, Bruce"
Date: July 15, 2019 at 5:03:45 PM GMT+2
To: "David Victor"
Cc: NEIMA108 Resource; "Doell, Marlayna"
Subject: NEIMA Section 108 Public Meeting Near San Onofre

Dear Dr. Victor:

As you may have seen in our recent press release, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is planning to host a public meeting in the vicinity of the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station in San Clemente, California, as part of the agency's Implementation of Section 108 of the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act (NEIMA). Section 108 requires the NRC to develop a report identifying best practices for establishment and operation of local community advisory boards (CABs) associated with decommissioning activities, including lessons learned from existing boards.

As part of developing the report, the NRC will host 11 public meetings and at least one nationwide Webinar in order to gather information from host States, communities within the emergency planning zone of a decommissioning nuclear power reactor, existing CABs, and other interested members of the public, regarding the best practices for establishment and operation of local CABs associated with decommissioning activities. The information obtained from these meetings, as well as other information provided in response to the NRC's information collection activities, will be appropriately captured in a best practices report that will be submitted to Congress as required by NEIMA.

The NRC has identified the areas surrounding the following nuclear power reactors as locations to host the Category 3 public meetings. At NRC Category 3 public meetings, the public is invited to participate by providing comments and asking questions. The meetings will be held in

the general vicinity of (1) Crystal River 3 Nuclear Power Plant in Crystal River, Florida; (2) Diablo Canyon Power Plant in San Luis Obispo, California; (3) Humboldt Bay Nuclear Power Plant in Eureka, California; (4) Indian Point Energy Center in Buchanan, New York; (5) Kewaunee Power Station in Kewaunee, Wisconsin; (6) Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station in Forked River, New Jersey; (7) Palisades Nuclear Generating Station in Covert, Michigan; (8) Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station in Plymouth, Massachusetts; (9) San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station in San Clemente, California; (10) Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Plant in Vernon, Vermont; and (11) Zion Nuclear Power Station in Zion, Illinois.

The NRC staff anticipates that the public meetings to discuss best practices and lessons learned associated with the establishment and operation of local decommissioning CABs will begin in August and continue through October of 2019. The NRC staff is also planning to host one or more nationwide Webinars to discuss the topics required by Section 108 of NEIMA, as well as to answer any questions on the other upcoming public meetings. Specific details regarding the dates, times, locations, and other logistical information for each of the meetings and Webinars are still being developed and can be found on the NRC's NEIMA Section 108 public Web site at:
https://www.nrc.gov/waste/decommissioning/neima-section-108.html.

In addition, the NRC plans to distribute a questionnaire to solicit information on specific topics that NEIMA Section 108 requires to be included in the best practices report for decommissioning CABs. This questionnaire is still in development, but should be issued in early August. This questionnaire will be available on the NRC's NEIMA Section 108 public Web site once it is completed. The questionnaire will also be distributed during the public meetings as a guide for our planned discussions. Any interested person may submit a written response to the NEIMA Section 108 questionnaire. Once issued, please feel free to distribute this questionnaire, and any other information about the agency's activities in response to Section 108 of NEIMA that you feel is relevant, to any other interested stakeholders in your area.

If you (1) have any questions regarding the NRC's obligations under NEIMA or our upcoming plans to host a public meeting in the San Onofre area, (2) would like information about attending the NEIMA Section 108 Webinars, or any of the other planned public meetings, and/or (3) would like to provide the NRC with any feedback in advance of the meeting and associated NEIMA questionnaire, please see the public Web site listed above or contact Marlayna Doell at (301) 415-3178 or Kim Conway at (301) 415-1335 or via e-mail at NEIMA108.Resource@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,
Bruce A. Watson, CHP, Chief
Reactor Decommissioning Branch
Division of Decommissioning, Uranium Recovery and Waste Programs
Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards

Attachment #5 – NRC to Hold Public Meeting to Discuss Oversight Activities at San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, August 1, 2019

~~~~~~
~~~~~~