CEP Regular Meeting
SONGS Strategic Plan Update and Decommissioning Status

Thursday, November 19, 2020
5:30 - 8:30 p.m.
Virtual Meeting for Social Distancing

THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Topic</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEP and SCE opening comments</td>
<td>David Victor, Doug Bauder</td>
<td>5:30 – 5:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEP general community updates</td>
<td>David Victor, Dan Stetson, Martha McNicholas</td>
<td>5:40 – 5:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic plan to relocate spent fuel offsite</td>
<td>Elizabeth Helvey, Tom Isaacs, Joe Hezir, Manuel Camargo</td>
<td>6:25 – 7:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Dan Stetson, Martha McNicholas</td>
<td>7:05 – 7:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General public comment period</td>
<td></td>
<td>7:10 – 8:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated public dialogue</td>
<td>Dan Stetson, Martha McNicholas</td>
<td>8:10 – 8:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE and CEP closing comments</td>
<td>Doug Bauder, David Victor</td>
<td>8:25 – 8:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Welcome and Opening Comments
David Victor and Doug Bauder
Thank you

Rich Haydon
State Park Superintendent III and CEP Member

Paul Wyatt
Dana Point City Council Member and CEP Member
Opening Comments
David Victor

1. Directions for submitting questions and sign-up for public comment on Nov. 19 meeting webpage

2. Public comment and facilitated dialogue
   - Sign up for public comment via the question form at https://on.sce.com/cep
   - Questions submitted in advance via NUCCOMM e-mail addressed first
   - Dan Stetson and Martha McNicholas will review comments and facilitate discussion
Opening Comments
Doug Bauder

- COVID-19 update
- Decommissioning information on www.songscommunity.com
CEP General Community Updates
1. August 20 CEP public question regarding Native American cultural resources at the EnergySolutions disposal facility in Clive, Utah
   - Inventory performed by prior owner and summarized in NUREG 1476
   - Final EIS to construct and operate facility, Reference Section 4.8 pages 4-32 and 4-33 available on-line and [here](#)

2. Letter from Dr. Kris Singh of Holtec clarifies comments from 2014 CEP meeting
   - Letter available online and [here](#)

3. Response from NRC regarding ISFSI security rulemaking available online and [here](#)
SONGS
The Big Picture

Doug Bauder
Chief Nuclear Officer and
VP Decommissioning
Decommissioning Principles

Safe and prompt **deconstruction**

Defense-in-depth for **on-site storage** of spent nuclear fuel

Take action in an effort to **relocate spent fuel** off site
Big Picture

- First enclosed railcars with solid waste shipped
- Ensuring safe on-site storage
  - Monitoring sea-level rise
  - Horizontal storage radiation surveys ([video](#))
- Strategic Plan to relocate spent fuel
  - Update today
  - Final plan to be released in 1Q 2021
Quarterly Update

- Latest tri-fold mailed in October
- Posted online: https://www.songscommunity.com/about-decommissioning/decommissioning-san-onofre-nuclear-generating-station

ON SAFETY

During the dismantlement of San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, safety is our top priority. But what does that mean? To put it simply, it means we only begin our projects when they can be done with the safety of employees, and the public, firmly in place. If there's any doubt, we don't move forward until we can be sure the safest path is before us. We have many tools to help us make this determination: months of detailed planning, equipment staging, training and dry runs. Once the project is underway, the team meets daily to discuss the procedures to be followed—before we begin the work.

Environmental safety is an important aspect of dismantlement and decontamination. San Onofre is located in a beautiful place with many natural resources adjacent to the site. As we begin to demolish plant buildings and structures, we are working with multiple federal and state agencies to ensure the work we do meets or exceeds regulations.

Environmental monitoring is something that's very important to us. For instance, we currently sample ocean water, shoreline sediment, fish, kelp, air and more to know exactly what impact the site is having on the surrounding environment. I'm pleased to tell you that over the decades San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station has been here, our impact has been very low. We plan to maintain that posture through the dismantlement of the site.

Doug Bauder
Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer
San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station
Southern California Edison
SONGS
Decommissioning Update

Vince Bilovsky
Director, Decommissioning Project
## Major Work Streams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Containment Preparation &amp; Internal Component Removal</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismantlement of Plant Electrical &amp; Mechanical Systems</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Demolition (after decontamination)</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbine Building Components, Structures and Crane Demo</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containment Building (Domes), Demo Unit 2 &amp; Unit 3</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove Underground Utility Sumps &amp; Drains</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Status Survey/NRC approval to support license termination</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dismantlement Overview

• Recently completed activities
  – Asbestos removal in power block complete
  – Unit 2 tendon removal complete
  – Extension of operational rail line

• Current activities:
  – Removal of piping systems and cable trays
  – Containment building modifications (e.g., widening equipment hatch)
  – Delivery and staging of specialized tooling and waste containers
Phased Structural Demolition

Administrative building

Technical Phase 1
Red

Technical Phase 2
Red
Rail Upgrades

Rail Spurs

Operational Plan:
1. BSF to shove in up to 15 cars empty cars into inbound track A and B. (5 cars on track A, 10 cars on track B)
2. Industry to perform all interplant car movements.
3. Industry to long (100km) cars on track B under loading tents.
4. Loaded cars are shoved into track F for outbound shipment.
5. BSF to pull up to 14 loaded cars from track F and depart.
Removing Tendons from Containment Domes
Removal of Interferences Inside Containment Domes

Interferences

Reactor Head
Preparations for Cut-up of Reactor Vessel Internals

Tooling to be used in segmentation ("cut-up") process has been delivered
Cutting and Isolation of Piping Prior to Flooding
SONGS Reactor Cavity Flooded with Water
Maintaining Radiological Safety

- Radiation annual dose limits
  - Federal occupational dose limit: 5000 millirem
  - (Lower) SONGS worker dose limit: 1500 millirem
  - NRC and SONGS limits for the public: 100 millirem
  - EPA limit for public dose: 25 millirem

- Limits set to safe levels by NRC and recommended by various national and international agencies¹

¹ Safe levels are recommended by the National Council on Radiation Protection & Measurements and the International Commission on Radiological Protection
Dry Cask Storage Monitoring

Randall Granaas, PE
SCE Nuclear Fuel / ISFSI Engineer

Eric M Goldin, PhD
Certified Radiation Protection Professional
During the August 20 CEP meeting, Donna Gilmore asked about a survey of the outlet air vents of the NUHOMS dry spent fuel storage modules.

From her website, the contention is: “The NRC and Southern California Edison continue to refuse to provide the radiation levels from the outlet (rooftop) air vents of the aging Areva NUHOMS thin-wall canister systems at San Onofre. The San Onofre canisters are only 5/8” thick and some are already 17 years old. What are they hiding?”

Measuring the outlet air vents not necessary because surveying areas accessible from ground level will identify radioactive contamination in the unlikely event of canister leakage, with lower industrial safety risk to workers.

We decided to survey the outlet vents to put to rest this contention about the NUHOMS dry fuel storage system.
Orano (AREVA) NUHOMS Storage Module and Canister

Outlet Vent
Concrete
Canister
Inlet Vent
Special Survey of NUHOMS Storage Module Outlet Vents
Independent Radiation Surveys Performed by Philotechnics Ltd.
All Modules Surveyed for Radiation and Contamination

- Radiation readings were taken at each outlet vent on all 51 NUHOMS modules
  - Survey meter measures down to background levels
  - Assayed for any airborne radioactivity
- Contamination assessment done at each outlet vent using large area smear surveys

Full data in appendix and online click here
Results Show Outlet Vent Readings Lower than Inlets

- Single Row Modules ~0.040 to .060 mrem/hr (millirem per hour) at outlet vents
- Double Row Modules ~0.050 to 0.300 mrem/hr at outlet vents (double row modules combine radiation from shared outlet vent and have slightly less shielding due to adjacent outlet air vents)
- Inlet vent readings, while quite low, are higher than outlet vent readings as expected based on storage module design (greater shielding at outlet vent)
- No contamination found on any of the outlet vents
- No indication of airborne radioactivity at any module
SCE Quarterly Survey of NUHOMS Inlet Vents

- Radiation levels at inlet vents from ~0.2 to 0.85 mrem/hr
- No radioactive contamination detectable on modules
- Low levels do not require Radiation Area posting
- Note this quarterly survey is in units of microrem/hr (= 0.001 mrem/hr)
SCE Monthly Surveys Show the Spent Fuel is Safely Stored

- ~0.010 mrem/hr at publicly accessible boundaries
- Background in the SONGS vicinity is ~0.010 mrem/hr
- Federal limit is 25 millirem per year (mrem/yr) above background; annual reports show <1 mrem/yr
ISFSI Radiation Monitoring
Monthly Reports Available Online

- Data streamed to CA Department of Public Health, Radiologic Health Branch (CDPH)
  - Publishes monthly reports
  - Provides high, low, and average radiation levels at each monitor
- CDPH publicly available online
  - https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CEH/DRSEM/Pages/RHB-Environment/SONGS-ISFSI-reports.aspx
- SONGS website provides contextual information and a link to CDPH reports
Trace Radioactive Contamination Addressed at Unit 2 Outfall

Ron Pontes
Manager Environmental, Waste and Radiation Protection
Trace Radioactive Contamination Addressed at Unit 2 Outfall

Trace contamination found here in late August
Sea-level Rise and Monitoring

Ron Pontes
Manager Environmental, Waste and Radiation Protection
Sea Level Rise Monitoring

• During the 2020 2nd Quarter CEP meeting questions were raised about the potential impact of Sea Level Rise (SLR) on the SONGS site
• SCE assesses and reports the potential impact of SLR using California Ocean Protection Council (OPC) SLR guidance
• 2019 assessments and reporting conclude that
  – Revetment (aka “rip-rap”) is in good condition and able to withstand extreme SLR through at least 2050
  – Beaches fronting SONGS have narrowed to pre-construction widths
  – Holtec ISFSI support foundation remains above the groundwater table through 2050
CA State Lands Commission Lease Provision 14 requires preparation of an annual report to assess SLR vulnerability, structural integrity, and adaptation capacity for the SONGS site based on:

- Ocean Protection Council (OPC) Medium-high and H++ extreme SLR projections combined with annual, 20-year and 100-year-storm events, as well as King Tides and,
- Quarterly ground water elevation data collected from onsite monitoring wells
Sea Level Rise Impact Assessment Report

- Prepared annually and provided to the CA State Lands Commission (CSLC)
- Posted on SONGS website
- Assesses impact of SLR through year 2050 on SONGS
  - Revetment stability
  - Seasonal beach profile changes
  - Ground water elevation

Link: 2019 SLR Impact Assessment
Revetment (Rip-Rap) Stability Analysis

- Performed laser scan survey to produce digital elevation model (DEM) of revetment
- Compared 21 modeled transects to historical data
- Measured rocks to produce detailed estimation of rock weights
- Revetment stability calculated based on measured data and design wave estimates for SLR medium-high and H++ projections for years 2020 and 2050

**Revetment stability analysis indicates that the rocks are of sufficient size and weight to withstand at least the median expected combined design wave height and maximum sea level expected between now and 2050**
Seasonal Beach Profile Assessment

- Quarterly beach profile surveys started in March 2017
- 2019 assessment based on 12 seasonal surveys performed through October 2019
- Each survey covers seven transects
- Standard survey methods used onshore and digital acoustic echo sounder used for offshore
- Onshore & offshore data integrated on a laptop computer to create a profile for each transect
- Profiles compared to historical data to estimate seasonal cycles and long-term trends in beach width
Conclusions

• Construction activities at SONGS over the 20-years from 1965 to 1984 resulted in substantial increases in beach width adjacent to and north of the plant

• Since the removal of the Units 2/3 laydown pad in 1985, the beaches have narrowed and returned to their pre-construction configuration

• From 2000 to 2019 beaches have narrowed due to limited sand supply from the surrounding creeks and rivers since the last wet period in 1998

• The average seasonal beach width fluctuation from 2017 to 2019 is about 26 feet

Figure 7-5. Historical beach width adjacent to Unit 1, 1928-2000. Vertical columns show periods when laydown pads were present.
Ground Water Elevation Monitoring

- Quarterly water level data from SONGS site groundwater monitoring wells collected and trended against tidal data
- Each of the wells was assigned to one of three groups based on their elevation and location within SONGS
- Group 1 wells occupy the lowest ground surface elevation and are located between the shoreline and Holtec ISFSI
- Groups 2 and 3 wells occupy the middling and higher ground elevations on the site
- Group 1 data used to determine the distance between groundwater level and the Holtec ISFSI support foundation

Figure 2-2. Locations of Group 1 SONGS groundwater wells.
Ground Water Elevation Monitoring

Groundwater Level Based on OPC-2018 SLR Projections

Correction 11/23/20: concrete vertical width changed from 15ft to 10ft
Summary

- Revetment is in good condition and able to withstand H^{++} SLR through at least 2050
- The beaches fronting SONGS have narrowed to pre-construction widths and are mainly influenced by dry weather conditions since the early 2000s
- Even considering H^{++} SLR scenario, the Holtec ISFSI support foundation remains above the water table through 2050
STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE RELOCATION OF SONGS SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL TO AN OFFSITE STORAGE FACILITY OR REPOSITORY

SONGS Community Engagement Panel

November 19, 2020
Outline

1. Context and “how did we get here?”
2. Why develop a Strategic Plan?
3. Team and process
4. Off-site alternatives and ongoing assessment
5. Preliminary path forward
6. Legislative agenda
7. Next steps and timing
Historical Context: How Did We Get Here?

- Congress focused U.S. spent nuclear fuel (SNF) disposal on Yucca Mountain
- Utilities paid for disposal, $989M from SCE customers; NWF holds $41B
- DOE failed to start disposal of SNF in 1998 as required by contract
- Yucca Mountain project halted since 2010 and dismantled
- DOE disposal organization has been defunded and disbanded
- Leaders of both parties have pledged not to further pursue Yucca Mountain
- Instead, utilities are reimbursed for on-site storage through Judgment Fund

Currently, no off-site facility can accept SONGS SNF
### Status of Legislation and Appropriations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nuclear Waste Administration Act of 2019 (S. 1234)</strong></td>
<td>Sponsored by Senator Murkowski (R-AK) and co-sponsored by Alexander (R-TN) and Feinstein (D-CA), to establish a new organization to manage nuclear waste, provide a consensual process for siting nuclear waste facilities, and ensure adequate funding for managing nuclear waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clean Economy Jobs and Innovation Act (H.R. 4447)</strong></td>
<td>Includes a 5-year $508M authorization for research, development, demonstration and commercial application of a variety of options for SNF storage, use and disposal; Incorporates bills introduced by Rep. Levin (D-CA), H.R. 8258; and by Reps. Lamb (D-PA) and Newhouse (R-WA), H.R. 6097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi-agency Appropriations Act for FY 2021 (H.R. 7617)</strong></td>
<td>Includes $20M in appropriations from the Nuclear Waste Fund for CIS, directs DOE “...to move forward under existing authority to identify a site for a federal interim storage facility...” using a “...consent-based approach...” Accompanying House Report encourages “…planning for the removal of spent nuclear fuel from sites located near cities...” and “…site preparation activities at stranded sites...”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On February 6, 2020 President Trump committed to respect Nevada’s opposition to Yucca Mountain and instead explore “innovative approaches”

Both the New Mexico and Texas governors have written letters opposing the consolidated interim storage facilities in their states

- States cannot block NRC licensing but can pose impediments
- In similar situations, circumstances have changed over time

International progress

- Sweden and Finland
- Structure of siting organization and siting process
Case Study and Insights
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP)

A federal underground disposal facility in NM for transuranic waste (TRU); development took 30+ years, required navigating windows of opportunity

Summarized Sequence of Events

✔ Mining economy in Carlsbad, NM went bust
✔ Local political and influence leaders initiated an interest in a repository
✔ Initially intense opposition at state level, some NGOs, and some at the local level
✔ Over time, a win-win-win was fashioned through trust-building and compromises:
  ➢ A TRU\(^1\) repository was approved
  ➢ The Environmental Evaluation Group (EEG), set up with federal funds, conducted independent technical evaluations of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) and published their findings
  ➢ DOE agreed that SNF could not be brought to WIPP
  ➢ A by-pass was built around Santa Fe among other commitments
✔ Local community generally supports WIPP and some want its mission expanded

\(^1\)Material contaminated with transuranic elements—artificially made, radioactive elements, such as neptunium, plutonium, americium, and others—that have atomic numbers higher than uranium in the periodic table of elements. In the U.S., TRU is produced by using plutonium to fabricate nuclear weapons
A requirement and an opportunity

A requirement of a settlement agreement regarding implementation of interim on-site SNF storage...

And an opportunity to –

• Find a commercially reasonable pathway to more promptly relocate SNF offsite
• Consider the restart a national program for interim storage and timely permanent disposal of SNF to meet national needs and commitments
• Provide new and unique insights on SNF disposition issues from a utility and a customer perspective – informed by local stakeholder input
• Establish an SNF disposition framework that readies the utility to act as circumstances warrant
An “Experts Team” comprised of six nationally recognized experts provided independent review and advice to SCE on Strategic Plan development.

North Wind, a leading DOE nuclear waste management company, organized a team of subject matter experts to conduct the analysis, identify and assess alternative pathways for offsite disposition of SONGS SNF.

A stakeholder interview component was built into the Plan development to feed input into the analysis.

An internal SCE team is reviewing the ongoing North Wind analysis, and with input from the Experts Team, is formulating a Spent Fuel Action Plan.
The Strategic Plan Framework

Goal:
Safe, commercially reasonable relocation of SONGS spent nuclear fuel (SNF) to another facility, restore the site, and return the land to the Navy

- Timely off-site disposition of SNF
- Satisfy current DOE contractual requirements
- Prevent incremental costs due to continued inaction given that nuclear utility customers have pre-paid for SNF disposal
- Avoid unrecoverable costs to SCE customers
- Protect SCE customers from residual liability risk once SNF leaves SONGS
Representative pathways for permanent disposal and interim storage were identified for assessment; each pathway may contain multiple variations.

Federal Permanent Geologic Repository
- Yucca Mountain or new site

Consolidated Interim Storage Facility (CISF)
- Federal CISF
- Federally-supported non-federal CISF
- Various forms of public/private arrangements
- Non-federal CISF

Other Alternatives Identified by Stakeholders
- Multi-utility storage (e.g. moving SONGS SNF to Palo Verde)
- Moving the current SONGS ISFSI (e.g. elsewhere on Camp Pendleton)

Reconnaissance of other concepts beyond current policy and regulatory framework
- Deep borehole disposal, for example
A comprehensive set of assessment factors were developed to analyze representative alternative pathways.

- Technical, Safety, and Regulatory Feasibility
- Commercial Reasonableness
- Timeliness of Offsite Disposition
- Implementation Feasibility
Assessment Factors Guiding the Analysis

**Key Questions:**

- Has the disposition alternative been technically proven? What are the residual technical risks?
- Is the necessary NRC regulatory framework in place to enable the disposition alternative to obtain necessary approvals?
- What is the level of regulatory preparation required to obtain necessary approvals?

**Examples Emerging from Current Analysis:**

- The private CISF projects in New Mexico and Texas have been in regulatory development for years and are well positioned to obtain NRC licenses.
- Moving the current SONGS ISFSI to any new site will take many years of technical planning and regulatory review.
- Deep borehole disposition, while an interesting innovative concept, poses technical issues that do not match up well with current licensing criteria.
Key Questions:

- What are the major factors affecting implementation schedule? What is the degree of uncertainty in those factors?
- How soon can the alternative be implemented?
- To what extent is implementation governed by the timeline for Congressional action on new federal legislation?
- What steps are needed to prepare the SONGS site for SNF transportation readiness?

Examples Emerging from Current Analysis:

- While needed, the path forward for the development of a permanent geological repository will be much longer and more highly uncertain than other alternatives.
- Notwithstanding current socio-political issues, past experience and current plans suggest offsite consolidated interim storage alternatives can be implemented sooner.
- Current federal policy regarding the prioritization of shipments of SNF could stretch out the offsite shipments of SONGS SNF over several decades.
Assessment Factors Guiding the Analysis

Key Questions

✓ What are the likely costs? What are the major cost uncertainties?
✓ Will the Federal Government fund the costs through the Nuclear Waste Fund? What is the likelihood of appropriations?
✓ Can the costs be reimbursed from the Judgment Fund?
✓ Would it be prudent to use Decommissioning Trust Funds to pay for certain costs?

Examples Emerging from Current Analysis:

• Requiring the federal government to perform its statutory and contractual responsibility to take title and possession of SONGS SNF at the fence line will avoid additional costs to utility customers

• Private CISF providers will charge fees for storing SONGS SNF, but the full costs of transport and storage may not be fully reimbursable from the Judgment Fund, and more importantly, utility customers may not be fully shielded from liability for SONGS SNF at private storage facilities absent federal government intervention
Assessment Factors Guiding the Analysis

Key Questions

- Are changes in federal law required? What are current prospects?
- What socio-economic-political factors might impact successful implementation?
- What can SCE do to improve prospects for successful implementation?

Examples Emerging from Current Analysis:

- Federal reimbursement from the Judgment Fund for some or all costs of relocating SONGS SNF to a private CISF will require new federal policy guidance that ultimately may need to be incorporated into settlement agreements.
- Assumption of liability by the federal government for SONGS SNF stored at a private CISF liability will require new federal legislation.
- Resolution of these issues likely will have to be industry-wide, requiring collective support across the nuclear industry and broad coalition support for federal action.
Federal action is needed, but the prospects and timing are uncertain; SCE will need to maintain optionality and flexibility to take advantage of opportunities as they arise.

- **Re-establish federal leadership**
  - Re-start the national program and secure funding
  - Leverage approaches advanced by members of the CA Congressional delegation to pursue a clear consensus approach
  - Build alliances with other stakeholders to amplify advocacy efforts

- **Maintain optionality and flexibility**
  - Monitor potential off-site CISF alternatives, be prepared as situation warrants

- **Continue to implement the current Decommissioning Plan safely and effectively**
  - Safely store SNF via inspection and maintenance and other programs
  - Pursue readiness actions to be prepared once a destination becomes available
National Legislative Agenda

Establish aspirational policy and legislative objectives, building from nuclear industry-wide principles

**Strategic Programmatic Objectives:**

1. Appropriations to restart the national program
2. A national consolidated interim storage program – either as a federal program or in cooperation with non-federal entities
3. Re-establish a program for a permanent geologic repository, including stakeholder engagement and consent of state, local and tribal governments
4. Streamline and prioritize SNF transportation scheduling, improving schedule efficiency and cost effectiveness while cognizant of the problem of stranded SNF
Final Plan will be Three Documents

**Strategic Plan for Disposition of SONGS SNF**
- Addresses alternative pathways and offers findings regarding the offsite relocation of SONGS SNF

**SONGS SNF Conceptual Transportation Plan**
- Identifies on-site preparations needed to prepare SONGS SNF for transport

**SCE Action Plan**
- Outlines follow-up steps by SCE to catalyze action based on findings in the Strategic and Conceptual Transportation Plans
Current Status
Alternatives analysis is being completed, stakeholder input is being integrated, and drafting is underway

Next Steps
- Complete Strategic Plan, Conceptual Transportation Plan, and Spent Fuel Action Plan in 1Q 2021
- Publish documents in February/March 2021
- Pursue actions identified in the Action Plan
BREAK
Public Comment
Submit written comments to nuccomm@songs.sce.com
CLOSING COMMENTS
DAVID VICTOR AND DOUG BAUDER
KEY TAKEAWAYS
DAVID VICTOR
## 2021 CEP Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Topics</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1Q CEP Meeting SONGS Strategic Plan Implementation</td>
<td>~March 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Q CEP Meeting Dismantlement Overview by Decommissioning General Contractor</td>
<td>~May 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Q CEP Meeting Topic TBA</td>
<td>~Aug. 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q CEP Meeting Topic TBA</td>
<td>~Nov. 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject to Change
Thank you
Stay safe and healthy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronyms</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMP</td>
<td>Aging Management Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;D</td>
<td>Cold &amp; Dark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>Corrective Action Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>California Coastal Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDP</td>
<td>Coastal Development Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC</td>
<td>Cavity Enclosure Container</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>Community Engagement Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>Consolidated Interim Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CISCC</td>
<td>Chloride-Induced Stress Corrosion Cracking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPUC</td>
<td>California Public Utilities Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSLC</td>
<td>California State Lands Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&amp;D</td>
<td>Decontamination &amp; Dismantlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Decommissioning Agreement; Decommissioning Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCE</td>
<td>Decommissioning Cost Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDT</td>
<td>Decommissioning &amp; Dismantlement Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGC</td>
<td>Decommissioning General Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DID</td>
<td>Defense-in-Depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>Department of Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON</td>
<td>Department of Navy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSAR</td>
<td>Depleted Safety Analysis Report (replaces FSAR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>Dry Storage Canister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-SEIS</td>
<td>Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-SER</td>
<td>Draft Safety Evaluation Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF</td>
<td>Decommissioning Trust Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>Emergency Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPRRI</td>
<td>Electric Power Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIER</td>
<td>Final Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTO</td>
<td>Fuel Transfer Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEMS</td>
<td>Generic Environmental Impact Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI-PORT</td>
<td>Holtec International – (Engineered Low Profile) Transporter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI-TRAC</td>
<td>Holtec International – Transfer Cask</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFMP</td>
<td>Irradiated Fuel Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFSI</td>
<td>Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAR</td>
<td>License Amendment Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCD</td>
<td>Large Organism Exclusion Device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPS</td>
<td>Managing Aging Programs in Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARSSIM</td>
<td>Multi-Agency Radiation Survey Site &amp; Investigation Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAHC</td>
<td>Native American Heritage Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDCTP</td>
<td>Nuclear Decommissioning Cost Triennial Proceeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDE</td>
<td>Non Destructive Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDTF</td>
<td>Nuclear Decommissioning Trust Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEI</td>
<td>Nuclear Energy Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGS</td>
<td>Nuclear Generating Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>Notice of Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP</td>
<td>Nuclear Power Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC</td>
<td>Nuclear Regulatory Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>Orange County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDEP</td>
<td>Permanently Defueled Emergency Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDTS</td>
<td>Permanently Defueled Technical Specifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSSDAR</td>
<td>Post-Shutdown Decommissioning Activities Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q&amp;A</td>
<td>Questions &amp; Answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REIR</td>
<td>Request for Environmental Impact Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>Southern California Edison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG&amp;E</td>
<td>San Diego Gas &amp; Electric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>SONGS Decommissioning Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFP</td>
<td>Spent Fuel Pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFPI</td>
<td>Spent Fuel Pool Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLSC</td>
<td>State Lands Commission (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLR</td>
<td>Sea Level Rise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONGS</td>
<td>San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>To Be Announced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCT</td>
<td>Vertical Canister Transporter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZCAP</td>
<td>Zion Community Advisor Panel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX
Holtec Dry Cask Storage

- Inlet Vent
- Outlet Vent
- 35,000 lb steel/concrete closure lid
- 9 ½ inch stainless steel welded plate
- Concrete monolith
# Full NUHOMS Radiation Readings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AHSM #</th>
<th>Lowest Dose Rate in µR/hr (closed)</th>
<th>Highest Dose Rate in µR/hr (closed)</th>
<th>Lowest Dose Rate in µR/hr (open)</th>
<th>Highest Dose Rate in µR/hr (open)</th>
<th>Large Area Wipe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>≤ BKGD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Routine Survey of Holtec Dry Cask Storage

- Radiation levels at inlet and outlet vents ~0.2 mrem/hr
- No radioactive contamination detectable on modules/vents
- Survey units in mrem/hr
ISFSI Radiation Monitoring System

- Radiation monitoring:
  - Added in response to public interest; SCE exceeds NRC requirements
  - ISFSI radiation data streamed to offsite agencies
  - Monthly public reports published by CA Department of Public Health, Radiologic Health Branch
ISFSI Radiation Monitoring System