



800-843-7348 - **SOUSA.COM** - 877-843-8443

Community Engagement Panel Public Meeting

Transcript of Proceedings

Date: 05/11/2017

Job #: 605866

Court Reporting – Videoconferencing – Trial Presentation – Nationwide Networking

Hermosa Beach - Irvine - Riverside - San Diego - Las Vegas

Dismantling of this transcript will void the Reporter's Certificate

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

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

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
LAGUNA HILLS, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, MAY 11, 2017

Reported by:
CARLOS R. HICHO
CSR No. 13111
Job No. 605866

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

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

Transcript of proceedings, taken at
25555 Alicia Parkway, Laguna Hills,
California 92653, commencing at the hour of
5:36 P.M., THURSDAY, MAY 11, 2017.

1 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

2 DR. DAVID G. VICTOR
3 CEP CHAIRMAN
4 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

5 TIM BROWN
6 CEP VICE CHAIRMAN
7 SAN CLEMENTE MAYOR

8 DAN STETSON
9 CEP SECRETARY
10 OCEAN INSTITUTE

11 TOM PALMISANO
12 VICE PRESIDENT, DECOMMISSION
13 AND CHIEF NUCLEAR OFFICER AT SONGS

14 GLENN PASCALL
15 SIERRA CLUB

16 TOM CAUGHLAN
17 CAMP PENDLETON

18 PAM PATTERSON
19 OCEANSIDE
20 MAYOR PRO TEM

21 JIM LEACH
22 CHAIRMAN
23 SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY ECONOMIC COALITION

24 RICH HAYDON
25 CALIFORNIA STATE PARKS

LISA BARTLETT
ORANGE COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT
5TH DISTRICT

MARNI MAGDA
SIERRA CLUB

PAUL WYATT
(Not present)

24 (Continued.)

25

1 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

2 DONNA BOSTON
3 ORANGE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

4 JEROME M. "JERRY" KERN
5 OCEANSIDE CITY COUNCILMEMBER

6 RICKY SMILES
(Alternate for Val Macedo)

7 GUEST SPEAKERS PRESENT:

8 RAY KELLAR
9 CHIEF OF THE FUEL CYCLE AND
DECOMMISSIONING BRANCH

10 BRUCE WATSON
11 CHIEF OF THE REACTOR DECOMMISSIONING
BRANCH

12 JOHN HEATON
13 VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE EDDY-LEA ENERGY
ALLIANCE, NEW MEXICO

14 PIERRE ONEID
15 VICE PRESIDENT AND CHIEF NUCLEAR OFFICER
HOLTEC INTERNATIONAL

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 THURSDAY, MAY 11, 2017

2 LAGUNA HILLS, CALIFORNIA

3 5:36 P.M.

4 * * *

5 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Good evening.

6 Thanks to all of you for coming out to this
7 meeting of the Community Engagement Panel. My name is
8 David Victor. I'm the Chair of the Panel. On behalf
9 of Tim Brown, Vice-Chair, Dad Stetson, Secretary, I
10 want to welcome you to this meeting that's going to be
11 about the decommissioning oversight process and the
12 Nuclear Regulatory Commission and also about
13 consolidated interim storage.

14 I just want to remind everybody that should
15 there be a need to evacuate the room, that pretty much
16 everything is an exit, as far as I can tell. There are
17 exits on this side, there are exits on that side, there
18 are exits in the back of the room, all under the sign
19 "Exit."

20 I want to thank the people of Laguna Hills for
21 welcoming us here and for this just wonderful facility.
22 This is a fantastic place and really, really wonderful
23 to have our -- our meeting here with you tonight.

24 We have two officers in attendance tonight
25 from the Orange County Sheriff's Department.

1 I want to thank you for your -- for your
2 service.

3 They're here for your safety. And if there's
4 anything we can do to be helpful, please, please don't
5 hesitate to let us know and let the sheriffs know.

6 Reminder: That the Community Engagement Panel
7 is about engagement. It's not a decision-making body.
8 It's designed to set, to create a two-way conduit
9 between Edison, which is managing the decommissioning
10 process of this nuclear plant, and the publics that are
11 affected by that in various ways.

12 And it's a two-way conduit, so Edison can
13 learn what people are concerned about and, hopefully,
14 people can learn about what's actually happening with
15 decommissioning, what some of the options are and so
16 on.

17 I want to remind people about the website,
18 www.SONGScommunity.com. On that site, among other
19 things, you can opt in to email list to where you get
20 notifications about these meetings.

21 Multiple notifications were sent out about
22 this meeting to that list. You can see all the
23 documents that are shared amongst the CEP members,
24 including the documents that were shared in advance of
25 this meeting, which included the slide decks that

1 you'll be seeing later tonight.

2 Information about public transportation and
3 the meetings is up there, livestreaming of these
4 meetings and archival footage from the meetings --
5 complete footage from the meetings are up there.

6 And those who are joining us tonight, there
7 are hard -- there are hard copies of the agenda as well
8 as hard-to-read slides, of which there always are a
9 few, on your -- on your chairs.

10 As you came in, you saw booths in the back
11 related to decommissioning, decommissioning information
12 booths. Two groups in the community also asked for
13 booths -- booths back there and one is actually
14 occupied.

15 And so if others in the future would like to
16 have booths at these events, please let us know and
17 we'll make sure that that -- that that happens in a
18 reasonable way.

19 When we get to the public comment period,
20 which will be later in the meeting, please, if you
21 would like to make a comment, sign up at the table in
22 the back of the room that you came in. You can do
23 sign-ups as well during the break or the intermission
24 and then we'll get you on the list for public comments.

25 During the public comment period, Dan and Tim

1 are going to monitor and help organize the comments and
2 help me facilitate a dialogue and also make sure that
3 all the major comments are documented and that if
4 responses aren't offered tonight, they're offered in a
5 written way after the meeting.

6 I want to welcome our guests here tonight.
7 From the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Bruce Watson,
8 who is Chief of the Reactor Decommissioning Branch,
9 over here to my right, your left; and Ray Kellar, who
10 is the Chief of the Fuel Cycle and Decommissioning
11 Branch sitting next to -- sitting next to him.

12 I also want to welcome John Heaton, who is
13 Vice Chairman of the Eddy-Lea Energy Alliance in
14 New Mexico. He's a businessman, served 14 years in
15 New Mexico House of Representatives and is Chairman of
16 the Eddy-Lea Alliance, which we'll learn more about
17 later tonight, along with Pierre Oneid, who you have
18 seen at previous meetings here, who's Senior
19 Vice-President and Chief Nuclear Officer at Holtec
20 International and it's alliance between Holtec and the
21 local community that is doing that project, that
22 consolidated interim storage project, which we'll talk
23 more about in a little bit.

24 For panel members, as you make comments,
25 please state your name so that those who are watching

1 the livestreaming can know who is talking and I'll call
2 out various items for the public record, so we make
3 sure we capture those, have follow up, and document all
4 of that.

5 I'm going to say a couple of words about the
6 topic of tonight's meeting in just a moment. But
7 before going there, I'd like to acknowledge Glenn
8 Pascall, who served with this Panel for a long time in
9 various capacities and who is stepping down tonight and
10 his seat will be occupied by Marni Magda.

11 And, Glenn, the floor is yours.

12 MR. PASCALL: Thank you.

13 I've written a farewell address, which all the
14 panelists have, and I understand, from Manuel Camargo,
15 that Edison has made copies for anyone who'd like them.
16 I would particularly like the activists to pick up a
17 copy.

18 The content covers three topics: One is,
19 frankly, the value of the CEP. And more frustrated we
20 would be if it didn't exist. This is a very tough
21 issue. Imagine there was no place to come and wrestle
22 with it. That's the first point.

23 Secondly: The farewell address lists the
24 Sierra Club positions on the key issues regarding
25 nuclear waste management and, basically, those

1 positions are in full agreement with the direction
2 taken by the CEP.

3 And thirdly, I'm introducing Marni Magda
4 because I'm stepping aside due to the fact that this
5 issue is now, in many important ways, moving to the
6 federal level, with incredible complex legislative and
7 administrative issues.

8 Marni has been an alternate on the CEP. She
9 is the Research Director of the Sierra Club Angeles
10 Chapter, San Onofre Task Force, and she will be
11 representing us tonight. She's superbly qualified and,
12 frankly, I think, events are moving into a new phase
13 where her talents are absolute top of the line for the
14 benefit of all of us.

15 So, many fun memories, a lot of respect for
16 people who hung in there and wrestled with this stuff.
17 I will miss you, and all best wishes for the best
18 possible outcome at San Onofre.

19 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Very well. Thank you
20 very much, Glenn. And thank you for your service.

21 (Applause)

22 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And thank you also for
23 -- for encouraging Marni to -- to take over this role,
24 so it's really a pleasure to have you join us Marni and
25 the work that people are doing and, from so much

1 different perspectives, is so important.

2 We're going to get, as is usual, an update
3 from Tom Palmisano. I want just want to say a couple
4 of words about the context to this meeting:

5 When you're decommissioning a reactor like
6 this, there are a lot of things that have to happen:
7 To pay very close attention to decommissioning in a way
8 that's environmentally responsible, in a way that's
9 safe, and in a way that respects the local community
10 because the local community has benefited from the
11 plant and many communities are really hard hit by the
12 closure of the plant, so we have to work on that
13 problem.

14 We have to work on the problem of getting the
15 actual decommissioning and the engineering around this.
16 You have to work on the problem of what to do with the
17 spent fuel and, in particular, how do you get the spent
18 fuel out of the pools and into some safe set of
19 canisters, and then we have to find a way to get the
20 canisters out of here.

21 And so the meeting tonight is, in part, about
22 the role of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and
23 overseeing many of these different steps and, frankly,
24 a lot about strategies for getting the nuclear -- the
25 spent nuclear fuel out of here as quickly as possible.

1 We have meetings on lots of other topics.
2 Later this year we're going to have a meeting on what
3 the industry calls Aging Management, and what we've
4 been calling Defense-in-Depth: How do we know that the
5 canisters are safe and secured? How do you monitor
6 them? What is the research going on there? What
7 technologies are needed? What technologies exist?

8 We've been spending a lot of time on that
9 because that's really, really important for long-term
10 steward -- stewardship. But in my view, there is,
11 maybe, nothing more important that we can do to improve
12 the prospects for our local communities than to find a
13 strategy for accelerating the movement of the spent
14 fuel out of here and that's what consolidated interim
15 storage is really about.

16 We'll have a chance to talk more about that
17 later. That's why we spend, at least, one meeting a
18 year on this topic from different perspectives and the
19 perspective tonight is to learn more about the two
20 projects, one going on in New Mexico, one going on in
21 West Texas, that would be viable sites for us to send
22 spent fuel from this plant and other plants that are in
23 the process of decommissioning, including the Diablo
24 Canyon Plant that's been very much in the news.

25 Let me first though ask Tom Palmisano, Chief

1 Nuclear Office at Edison, to give us his update on
2 where we stand. Tom.

3 MR. PALMISANO: Okay. Thank -- thank you very
4 much, David. Good evening, everybody. Thank you for
5 coming out tonight and thank you, again, to the Panel.

6 And Glenn let's echo -- oh, Glenn just stepped
7 out. But we echo the support Glenn that you provide.
8 I guess he was pretty clear on that. Right?

9 Anyway, I shorted my update to allow plenty of
10 time for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission
11 representatives and the Eddy-Lea Alliance
12 representatives because I know, really, they don't get
13 out here very often and I get a chance every quarter to
14 talk about decommissioning status.

15 So, I'll try to be brief and let's make sure
16 the Panel gets their questions answered, then the
17 public questions later.

18 So in terms of -- real quickly, just -- we
19 always remind ourselves of our safety, stewardship and
20 engagement decommissioning principles. Tonight is part
21 of that engagement, the activity of being out here with
22 our decommissioning discussions and the Community
23 Engagement Panel.

24 This is the chart that's the eye test that
25 we've referred to. You have a hard copy of this. This

1 shows you what looks to be our 20-year decommissioning
2 plan for San Onofre. And the scale at the top is a
3 little funny. There's years there and then you see
4 quarters for the current period, then it goes back to
5 years out to 2033.

6 The most important things are what I
7 highlighted in yellow. In a project, we talk about the
8 critical path or the key things that have to proceed to
9 achieve this in 20 years.

10 The center of the page -- let's see if my
11 pointer -- the center of the page on the screen is all
12 around building the on-site dry cask storage system and
13 preparing to offload the spent fuel pools to the dry
14 cask storage system. And I talk about this every
15 meeting and we're going to talk more in-depth at a
16 future meeting.

17 Our plan continues to be to offload the two
18 spent fuel pools by mid-2019, and I'm going to show you
19 a couple of pictures in a minute. The second part of
20 the line or down below there's two things, one is the
21 California Environmental Quality Review.

22 Those of you who attend regularly know that
23 we've had the State Lands Commission out a couple of
24 times. We've talked about the CEQA Process that is
25 continuing. I'll touch on that more in a minute and

1 tell you where that stands.

2 That needs to complete with an approved
3 environmental impact report and then a Coastal
4 Commission Coastal Development Permit before we can
5 actually start the dismantlement of the plant.

6 And then the bottom line should be the
7 decommissioning general contract. And, again, from
8 here, I can't quite read.

9 But that is SONGS Decommissioning Solutions.
10 We introduced them last meeting. We awarded the large
11 8-to 10-year contract to them. They will actually do
12 the planning and do the decontamination and
13 dismantlement of the plant once we have the appropriate
14 environmental permit.

15 So that's just a quick overview of the
16 critical path.

17 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I believe we're going to
18 have them in, maybe, early next year to have --

19 MR. PALMISANO: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- a full meeting on
21 what they're doing and --

22 MR. PALMISANO: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- workforce they're
24 using and so on. Thank you.

25 MR. PALMISANO: Exactly. They've committed to

1 come back regularly to provide an update from their
2 perspective.

3 Since the NRC is here tonight, I'm just going
4 to talk very briefly on our NRC submittals. Those of
5 you who have been with us since 2014 know we talked a
6 lot about this in 2014 and 2015. The most important
7 one is at the bottom.

8 This will be the next change to the plant
9 license or technical specifications, emergency plan and
10 security plan. Once all the spent fuel is in the spent
11 fuel pool -- or out of the pools in a dry cask storage
12 in mid-2019.

13 This is a minor change. The major change was
14 done in 2015. If you can remember, we talked about
15 that extensively in a couple of meetings. So that is
16 under review by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, in
17 Washington.

18 I expect that to be approved in early 2018.
19 Then it will be on the shelf awaiting completion of the
20 work. So we'll talk more about that as we get closer
21 to that. Again, we talked about this quite extensively
22 in 2014 and 2015.

23 Site Activities Update: This is an overview.
24 You've seen this slide before. This is the north end
25 of the site. This is the current dry cask storage

1 facility, which has 50 canisters loaded with spent fuel
2 from Unit 1, Unit 2, and Unit 3.

3 This is the expanded facility that's under
4 construction, which will house 73 canisters and allow
5 us to offload the remaining spent fuel. We have over
6 2,668 assemblies in the two spent fuel pools.

7 I'll show you more pictures. This is a
8 schematic of what the new system will look like. It is
9 a vertical system. Conceptually, it is very similar to
10 the existing horizontal system, a sealed stainless
11 steel canister that is inserted in a steel and concrete
12 overpack.

13 The old system or the current system is a
14 horizontal system. This system is a vertical system in
15 a large concrete structure. And I'm going to show you
16 a picture in a minute.

17 Construction is in progress. These -- let me
18 back up one. To give you some perspective, this can --
19 this outer cylinder, which is steel, is about 24 to 25
20 feet tall, roughly. You're looking at the very --
21 you're looking at the very top of that at this point.

22 And there'll be time for public comment.
23 We'll be glad to try to field questions. It's best if
24 they're coordinated. So that's the status of the
25 current facility under construction. Again, the target

1 is to be offloaded by mid-2019 from both pools.

2 California Environmental Qualify Update:

3 Again, we've -- we've discussed this
4 thoroughly. In the interest of the time tonight, I'll
5 keep this brief. In the next meeting, I'll go into
6 more detail. The key thing at this point, the State
7 Lands Commission is the lead agency.

8 They have held their public scoping meetings.
9 They've selected their -- their contractor to write
10 their Draft EIR. The Draft EIR is being prepared. And
11 sometime this summer as early as mid-June to, I'd say,
12 July -- and this is their schedule, not ours, so I'll
13 be tentative -- they expect to issue the Draft
14 Enviromental Impact Report for public comment, so that
15 will be well noticed.

16 We'll certainly let you know on our website
17 that that has been released. And then they plan to
18 hold meetings in the local area to take public comment
19 on the Draft EIR.

20 And then that process flows out to about the
21 end of 2018. After that Draft EIR is out, we will
22 then, in the fall, submit a Coastal Development Permit
23 application to start the coastal development process.

24 The bottom line is, at the end of the day, we
25 need both the State Lands Commission certifying the EIR

1 and the Coastal Commission issuing a Coastal
2 Development Permit before actual decommissioning work
3 can proceed.

4 So there'll be public comment period during
5 the summer. We want to make sure you're well aware of
6 that. This is important. And part of the engagement
7 is to make sure you're aware of the opportunity to
8 review and comment on these activities.

9 And, again, at a future meeting where we have
10 more time, we'll get a bit more in depth on that.

11 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Tim Brown?

12 MR. BROWN: Is this on?

13 I remember there being some questions
14 regarding particular this component of the
15 environmental impact report.

16 And just to narrow the focus, is primarily the
17 environmental impact of the site going from fully built
18 to being completely decommissioned?

19 MR. PALMISANO: Yeah. There's really two
20 pieces: One of the things, some of you know, but many
21 of you may not, we're actually on federal land. The
22 utility does not own the land, which is not typical of
23 a commercial nuclear plant.

24 So there is a future process that I don't show
25 on the slide. The final end-state of the land, how

1 much material is removed after the NRC criteria is
2 satisfied is up to the Navy.

3 And the Department of the Navy will trigger a
4 Federal National Environmental Policy Act Process that
5 is similar to this, so it's going to occur in a couple
6 of steps.

7 This looks at the decommissioning generally
8 and total. Some of it has to be aligned with federal
9 decisions by the Department of the Navy through their
10 environmental review process.

11 And I'll be glad to bring that back in at the
12 next meeting and clarify that a little more. I didn't
13 add that to the slide tonight.

14 MR. BROWN: Thank you very much.

15 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Let me just say -- not
16 to put Tom Caughlan on the spot, but to say when the
17 time is right, it would be great for us to somehow find
18 out more about what the Navy process is going to be
19 because I know a lot of people in the community are
20 interested in that.

21 Did I just put you on the spot?

22 MR. CAUGHLAN: No. The mic had too many
23 moving parts for me.

24 The Navy, the Marine Corp. end-game issue is
25 to return the land for training purposes, which is the

1 reason it was given to us in '42, and reason that we
2 occupy it today.

3 That will not occur for a long time because of
4 all the other processes that go forward and have to be
5 in place, O-studies, construction, deconstruction,
6 reclamation, and all the things that we hear about
7 every quarter.

8 So the military is taking a look at it parcel
9 by parcel as we look at the parcels that are on the
10 landward side of I-5.

11 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Right.

12 MR. CAUGHLAN: And we take look at that, the
13 condition of that land, survey it, study it, do the
14 sampling necessary and then return it to training value
15 as soon as we can.

16 Now, "training value" might mean bare land
17 that just drive -- run, hike over, run over. It might
18 mean that we return -- we retain a building that's
19 already there because it makes more sense to use it for
20 something else, warehouse, storage, classrooms, IT
21 center, rather than tear it down and return it to bare
22 land.

23 The land is already disturbed, so in
24 environmental terms, it's -- if you want to build
25 something or do something, it's best to do it on land

1 that's already been disturbed, so you're not harming
2 any of the species that you're worried about.

3 And that's kind of the process we're going to
4 go through. But as you correctly say, Tom, it's going
5 to take a long time because the conditions change every
6 time you take a cleanup or remediation action and so
7 we'll wait until we get to the -- we know what we want.
8 We want to return it to training value, but that could
9 be a long time away.

10 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you.

11 We should let you go on, Tom.

12 MR. PALMISANO: Yeah. And just to add, the
13 land on the landward side of I-5 is not part of the NRC
14 license, not part of the nuclear plant, per se. That
15 is a matter we're working with the Navy as a tenant to
16 turn back the land to the landlord.

17 There is a process we follow under the State
18 of California and federal requirements, but it's
19 different than the NRC decommissioning on the power
20 plant property, so --

21 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Please.

22 MR. PALMISANO: Yes. Yeah.

23 Decommissioning General Contractor: Again, we
24 introduced them at the last meeting. And, as David
25 Victor said, we'll bring them in, probably, in the

1 first quarter.

2 Just real quickly, the contract was effective
3 in January. We introduced them here in February.
4 They're mobilizing to site. They have about 60 to 70
5 people.

6 The year of 2017 is really planning for them,
7 so they -- you know, this is a complicated evolution.
8 There's a lot of planning and engineering to do on how
9 to demolish the plant and decontaminate the plant.

10 Physical work itself will not start until 2018
11 when all the appropriate environmental permitting is
12 done and the permits are issued properly, and then the
13 project duration is 8 to 10 years.

14 We'll use that time frame until their planning
15 is done, the permits are issued, and we really have a
16 clearer picture. And then, obviously, we'll have all
17 of the end phase up to the Navy's discretion. So
18 that's the status of our general contractor.

19 So very quickly, that's the overview of the
20 three key elements of the decommissioning plan at this
21 time. There were a couple of questions I was asked to
22 address, so --

23 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Dan, do you want to ask
24 the question right now?

25 SECRETARY STETSON: If I may, real quick.

1 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Go ahead.

2 SECRETARY STETSON: Actually, two questions,
3 Tom:

4 One of them relates actually to our last
5 meeting and the question or comment came up about the
6 Native Americans and their input in this process.

7 Could you give us some discussion on that,
8 please?

9 MR. PALMISANO: And I got my notes in my seat.

10 But, basically, in 2016, there were several
11 outreach efforts to Native Americans, one by the
12 company. We have a full-time liaison that works
13 with -- with tribes in the area.

14 So we made our own outreach efforts to
15 potentially affected tribes to inform them of the
16 decommissioning plans and solicit their input, make
17 them aware of their opportunities.

18 Likewise, the California State Lands
19 Commission has a requirement to notify a number of
20 tribes, which they executed in 2016, so there's a long
21 list of tribes they were provided a name. I think, I
22 want to say, North American Indian Heritage
23 Foundation -- I may have the name wrong -- were
24 provided a list to the State Lands Commission July
25 2016, and they notified them of the start of the CEQA

1 process.

2 So, what I suggest is, I can post this in its
3 entirety on the website so all the detail is there.
4 But, yes, we confirmed there was outreach both by
5 Edison as well as the State Lands Commission.

6 SECRETARY STETSON: Okay. One other question.
7 Thank you. On slide No. 7 it said that the -- you're
8 having an insurance exception request.

9 MR. PALMISANO: Oh.

10 SECRETARY STETSON: Actually, a couple of
11 those.

12 We're not going to be without insurance, are
13 we?

14 MR. PALMISANO: No, not at all.

15 What -- what this is, and we've talked about
16 this before, so I apologize for having gone over this
17 quickly. You've heard us talk before about the need
18 for the NRC to use exemptions because the NRC
19 regulations generally are set up for operating plants,
20 and decommissioning plants don't fit the requirements.

21 So as a plant like San Onofre enters
22 decommissioning and the spent fuel is decayed, in our
23 case now over five years since the plant has operated,
24 much like the basis for changing the emergency plan the
25 hazards are different.

1 The most important thing here is what you see,
2 this off-site insurance. All the operating nuclear
3 plants in the country are in a self-insured pool where
4 we indemnify each other.

5 So if a nuclear plant on the East Coast has an
6 accident, there is a 12 or 13 billion dollar pool
7 funded by the utilities. We own a part of that. We
8 would be liable, our customers would be liable, if you
9 will, the shareholders, for an accident in another
10 nuclear plant.

11 Since we are no longer an operating nuclear
12 plant and don't pose that hazard, that's the same as --
13 you know, the event that could happen in an operating
14 plant, it's important we get exempted from that pool so
15 we can, quite frankly, protect the customers from an
16 unnecessary insurance risk.

17 I gave you a quick and dirty discussion. I'll
18 be glad to talk about this more at the next meeting.
19 But that -- that's what that is. That's the most
20 important aspect on that slide.

21 So a couple of questions -- we received some
22 questions and we're going to try to start answering
23 several questions in each meeting as well as posting
24 answers on the website.

25 So a couple that I wanted to pull up. Used

1 fuel storage is certainly one of the most important
2 questions along with the environmental impact of
3 decommissioning.

4 So a lot of tonight is talking about used fuel
5 storage and ways to get it off site. Many of you have
6 seen this before. The current state is what is on site
7 in wet storage or existing dry storage, 73 additional
8 canisters will be loaded and all this fuel will be in
9 dry storage by mid-2019.

10 So the question is -- one of the questions we
11 got is, we had an existing system, the AREVA Horizontal
12 System. Some of you remember a couple of years ago,
13 AREVA was in, talking about that before we made our
14 decisions.

15 The existing facility has space for 93
16 modules, 50 are currently loaded with fuel, an
17 additional one we call -- we call greater-than-Class C
18 waste-T internals from the Unit 1 reactor. There are
19 12 empty modules, which will be used when we
20 disassemble the units 2 and 3 reactor.

21 That leaves 30 open spaces. That is not
22 enough capacity to empty even one spent fuel pool, so
23 we need additional capacity to empty both spent fuel
24 pools, so that's the status of the AREVA System. We
25 have no plans to use that space other than storage

1 space, lay-down area, et cetera.

2 Holtec: We got a question of why did we
3 select Holtec. And if you remember, we actually
4 brought Holtec and AREVA in before we made our
5 selection for good public discussion of the two
6 different systems.

7 To refresh everybody's memory, it was a
8 competitive bid process. We went out to every vendor
9 who had a license product available in the U.S. We
10 wanted demonstrated experience. They had to have an
11 NRC-approved design for storage and an NRC-approved
12 design or in progress for transport.

13 At the end of the day, we selected Holtec.
14 They have 33 sites in the U.S. They're, probably at
15 this point, the leading provider of dry cask storage in
16 this country.

17 Particularly, they have a similar underground
18 system in service at Callaway that's virtually
19 identical to ours. They have an earlier underground
20 system in service at Humboldt Bay. They also supply
21 the canister system to Diablo Canyon.

22 So they've got a strong California presence as
23 well as a national presence. I get questions about the
24 Castor cask, if you remember that discussion. They're
25 no -- they don't have a license product in the U.S.A.

1 at this point. There is one site that uses them and
2 they're on their own as far as licensing.

3 I actually invited them out and they spent a
4 day with us, talking about their product. And they
5 have made no efforts to reenter the U.S. market. So
6 they were just not a player at the end of the day.

7 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I wanted to say
8 something briefly about this, which is, Tim, Dan, and I
9 on Monday are going to meet with some of the people
10 from the Electric Power Research Institute that are
11 doing research on these casks and are monitoring and,
12 if needed, repair these casks.

13 And we're doing that because we want to
14 understand what's going on in the research community so
15 that we can help organize a meeting with the Community
16 Engagement Panel sometime in the future where we talk
17 about the research, because people have raised
18 questions about when the technology is going to be
19 available and so on, so we have to educate ourselves
20 about that.

21 One thing that's become very clear is that
22 there's a huge amount of information that moves around
23 inside the industry and so it seems to be really,
24 really important that whatever we do here we do it
25 using that same technology that everybody else is using

1 so that we can benefit from that, otherwise, we're just
2 out on our own and that could be a very, very risky
3 situation.

4 MR. PALMISANO: Yeah, you know, one of the
5 things that we look at is the ability to support us for
6 the long term because, the reality is, the spent fuel
7 is here today in the pools, in dry cask. It's going to
8 be here for a period of time and we need to do the best
9 job to contain -- contain it safely; we're committed to
10 that.

11 Part of that is, finding a vendor and making
12 sure they're here for the long term, not the short
13 term. That was some of the experience that the other
14 utility experienced with the Castor System.

15 Transportation: I've covered this slide
16 before, but we continue to get questions, so let's talk
17 about our -- you know, when can these canisters be
18 transported.

19 So the first two lines are what's currently in
20 dry cask storage. The Unit 2 and 3 fuel in dry cask
21 storage today, there is 33 canisters, almost half of
22 them are available to ship today.

23 They're licensed for transport, the
24 transportation overpack is licensed by the NRC. It
25 needs to be fabricated by AREVA and everybody is

1 waiting to order one -- once there's a facility to ship
2 it to.

3 But those canisters are licensed for transport
4 and half of those are transportable today if we had a
5 locations. The remainder of those will be
6 transportable by 2020.

7 Unit 1 is a little different. You'll see
8 Unit 1 starts in 2018 all the way out to 2030. So
9 those 17 canisters are licensed for transport. The
10 transportation overpack is licensed by the NRC and,
11 again, it needs to be built, but those canisters need a
12 longer cooling time.

13 There's cooling time before you can take it
14 out of the water, typically, five years is a minimum.
15 Then there's a longer cooling time before you can ship
16 it over the roads to a destination.

17 Typically, 15 years for the Unit 2 and 3
18 canisters, 20 -- 38 for the Unit 1 canisters. And the
19 reason is twofold: One, the Unit 1 is old fuel that
20 has stainless steel fuel rods. It takes much longer to
21 decay to meet certain radioactivity level.

22 And, secondly, the transport canister has a
23 certain amount of shielding. So the bottom line is,
24 Unit 1 fuel is not transportable until that time frame.

25 The new Holtec System is licensed for storage.

1 Holtec submitted the transportation license. That was
2 our condition, to make sure they license it for
3 transportation; the other utilities as well.

4 The license is under review by the NRC and
5 expected to be issued as early as June. My -- our
6 preliminary analysis based on what's in the license
7 today under NRC review, this is a newer canister design
8 and a newer transportation overpack, heavier with more
9 shielding, virtually all of these will be eligible as
10 early as 2020 to transport.

11 Now, that's preliminary because they've got to
12 finalize a license and then we've got to go through it
13 again. But based on a pretty solid preliminary
14 analysis, they will be available. There may be one or
15 two that are a little farther out in time based on how
16 we load the fuel in.

17 So that's -- that's the story in terms of
18 what's licensed, what's available for transport today
19 or in the near term. So, later, as we talk about
20 consolidated interim storage, again, we are committed,
21 and I think everybody wants this fuel out of here as
22 soon as it can be safely moved. Absolutely, we're
23 committed to that. This is the transportation
24 readiness picture to move it off site.

25 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay.

1 MR. PALMISANO: A lot of questions we get
2 about, you know, can the railroads hand this? So I'm
3 going to show you something. This is a main generator
4 rotor. This is a nonradioactive piece of the plant.

5 You can see this load was 218 tons. That
6 picture was taken on a railroad siting at SONGS in
7 about 2014. This was bought by Detroit Edison, in
8 Michigan, after the plant closed. That left our site
9 by rail all the way to Virginia for refurbishment by
10 rail all the way. The railroads can handle that
11 weight.

12 For those of you who remember when Jack Edlow
13 was in last year, the transportation expert, this type
14 of weight is handled periodically. The rail systems
15 can handle that.

16 So let's look at Dry Cask Storage:

17 The Unit 1 canisters will go in the empty 187;
18 that load is 141 tons, well within what's already been
19 transported. The Unit 2 and 3 canisters, and these are
20 24-assembly canisters, 152 tons.

21 The new 37-assembly canisters will weight out
22 at 209. We have confirmed with the railroads that is
23 shippable over today's rail system.

24 What you're going to see -- my clicker can --
25 Okay. This is actually a Navy nuclear spent

1 fuel casks that weighs 260 tons. That's the actual
2 railcar it's moved on. Okay. So this is -- these
3 weights are shippable over today's rail system.

4 That's the DOE conceptual railcar. They're
5 out for bid for this. It's similar to 12-axle car.
6 That main generator rotor I showed was a 12-axle car.
7 So, basically, they have specialty cars with more axles
8 to handle the weight.

9 They actually -- DOE has awarded a contract to
10 AREVA in 2015 to develop a prototype of the railcar.
11 This is a picture of what it may look like for
12 development of the spent fuel storage shipping cask,
13 and the Holtec HI-STAR 190 is part of that contract.
14 So they're going to encompass the weight that Holtec --
15 that Holtec canister will weigh.

16 So I know we've gone fast over that but,
17 again, I want to touch on questions. The last comment,
18 just real quickly, and I'll talk about this more in the
19 future, that specially with Glenn's service coming to
20 an end, you know, the CEP over the last two and a half
21 years, we have actively listened.

22 And I know there is some things that we won't
23 agree on at the end of the day, and I respect that and
24 appreciate that. But some of the things we've done
25 with the help of the Interjurisdictional Planning

1 Commission, we've agreed to funding for emergency
2 planners and continuing funding, and that's a direct
3 feedback from discussions with the Community Engagement
4 Panel.

5 We've heightened our focus on Defense-in-Depth
6 and Aging Management, and we'll talk about that in the
7 future. We have made changes to the Holtec canister
8 fabrication to reduce the susceptibility to corrosion
9 and we've talked a lot about that.

10 The Planned Tour Program: School tours,
11 public tours, VIP tours, all that came about as a
12 result of the engagement and the feedback from the
13 Panel as well as we're partnering and some of tonight's
14 discussions are pertinent to advance a way to get fuel
15 off site.

16 So I know I've gone quickly, but we've got
17 some other important people to talk, so I appreciate
18 that.

19 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yes. I want to ask one
20 quick question on the previous slide, if you could just
21 go back to that for a moment. This first item here
22 about emergency responders is the topic that came up on
23 the CEP.

24 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

25 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I really appreciate all

1 the work that people did on this. Meanwhile, the
2 Diablo Canyon, that seems like the arrangement the PG&E
3 has made with the local communities is different;
4 longer-term support, maybe more generous support. It
5 seems really important that we find a way to have the
6 communities treated fairly.

7 MR. PALMISANO: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And so I'm just
9 wondering what the thinking is about that and whether
10 and how we can look to what's happened at Diablo Canyon
11 here.

12 MR. PALMISANO: We are. I've already had our
13 staff start to interact with the Pacific Gas and
14 Electric folks to understand, and I don't have the
15 final answer on the nature of their commitment or what
16 it really translates into.

17 What we've committed to is full funding as if
18 we were an operating plant through 2019, then stepping
19 down to 75 and 50, with a commitment to renegotiate,
20 and what all the local responders have is my commitment
21 to do that in good faith to ensure that what they need
22 to support their constituents do the right job from an
23 all-hazards plan, that we are there to support them.
24 So we'll both look at what Diablo did and talk with our
25 local agencies about what their needs are.

1 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. So let's set up
2 some kind of process to understand what actually
3 happened at Diablo and then maybe report back to --

4 MR. PALMISANO: We'll take an action, talk
5 about what they've committed to, what's been finalized
6 as well as what our plan is going forward.

7 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yeah. No. I think
8 that's really important, and I know people are paying
9 attention to that.

10 MR. PALMISANO: Yeah.

11 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Other comments would
12 like to make, questions? Pam Patterson?

13 MR. PALMISANO: Yes.

14 MS. PATTERSON: Thank you.

15 I'd like to know, so are you familiar with the
16 fact that Holtec was fined 2 million dollars?

17 MR. PALMISANO: Well, I don't think that was a
18 fine. We discussed this about a year and a half ago in
19 this forum, and we can pull up the information. But,
20 yes, I'm familiar with that.

21 MS. PATTERSON: And so I don't understand why
22 Edison doesn't have a concern about the fact that
23 Holtec was fined two million dollars for bribing
24 quality assurance inspectors.

25 I thought that one of the main points here was

1 safety.

2 MR. PALMISANO: Yeah.

3 MS. PATTERSON: So how could you be working
4 with a company that's bribing quality assurance
5 inspectors?

6 MR. PALMISANO: So, I don't think those
7 statements are accurate, so what I'd like to do, I'll
8 be glad to come and talk about that the next meeting
9 because we vetted them. We asked Holtec for some
10 information that they provided to the Panel, so let me
11 pull that back up. So, rather than go off memory, I'll
12 be glad to come back and talk about that at the next
13 meeting.

14 MS. PATTERSON: Okay. And isn't it true that
15 the canisters come with a 25-year warranty?

16 MR. PALMISANO: The Holtec canisters, the
17 initial contract is a 25-year warranty, that's correct.

18 MS. PATTERSON: And isn't it correct that we
19 already have 15 years on these canisters?

20 MR. PALMISANO: No, you're confusing the AREVA
21 canisters with the Holtec canisters. The Holtec are
22 new. They will be coming with the longer warranty, but
23 the --

24 MS. PATTERSON: So you're --

25 MR. PALMISANO: -- AREVA canisters are the

1 ones that are loaded. Those are not Holtec.

2 MS. PATTERSON: And so, what you're saying
3 then is that you're going to be taking them out of the
4 current canisters and placing them in new canisters?

5 MR. PALMISANO: No. No. So, again, when we
6 have time in the future, we can talk about warranty.
7 The NRC licenses the canisters. The AREVA canister
8 system, which are the 50 that are loaded today, are
9 licensed initially for 20 years.

10 The typical design life for a Holtec is 100
11 years. I'll have to look up AREVA. The NRC
12 re-licenses them in 20-or 40-year intervals, so you've
13 got to demonstrate that they're acceptable to continue
14 in service. So that's coming up. And I've shown a
15 chart before, but I'll be glad again, when we have more
16 time, to talk about re-licensing the canisters and what
17 that means.

18 MS. PATTERSON: Okay. I think it's important
19 that we allocate time for these important issues.

20 MR. PALMISANO: I'll be happy to. I'll be
21 happy to, yeah.

22 MS. PATTERSON: Thank you.

23 MR. PALMISANO: You're welcome.

24 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Martha and then Tim
25 Brown.

1 MR. PALMISANO: Yes.

2 MS. MCNICHOLAS: Yes. Could I go back to
3 slide No. 22? I missed when you said --

4 MR. PALMISANO: Yeah, let me get back there.
5 Thank you.

6 MS. MCNICHOLAS: Okay. These are the 33
7 canisters. Did you say those are ready to ship now if
8 we had a place to ship them?

9 MS. MCNICHOLAS: -- and awaiting --

10 MR. PALMISANO: You see the arrow runs from
11 2015 out to 2020.

12 MS. MCNICHOLAS: Okay.

13 MR. PALMISANO: So I've got a chart that I can
14 post on the web that shows you for every one of the 33
15 the exact date. Roughly, half of them could be shipped
16 today.

17 MS. MCNICHOLAS: Okay.

18 MR. PALMISANO: The remainder will be eligible
19 2020.

20 MS. MCNICHOLAS: Okay. That was when you said
21 17 out of those, then I saw the 17 down below and I --
22 then you said 33 years for that.

23 MR. PALMISANO: Yes, different group.

24 MS. MCNICHOLAS: Okay.

25 MR. PALMISANO: Different group.

1 MS. MCNICHOLAS: I just wanted to make sure I
2 got that. And then the new ones, when those come
3 online, they may be shippable immediately?

4 MR. PALMISANO: Yes. The information we
5 have -- and the NRC has completed or just about done
6 with an 18-month licensing approval for this.

7 The information I have today, from what's on
8 review by the NRC, will tell us that all 73, or
9 probably 70 of those, are -- will be available to
10 transport in 2020. I need them to complete the final
11 license so I can take the final criteria and apply it
12 to our fuel.

13 MS. MCNICHOLAS: Okay. So --

14 MR. PALMISANO: That's why it says preliminary
15 timing.

16 MS. MCNICHOLAS: Right. So we've done
17 everything we can to get it ready to go if we have a
18 way to get it there and a place to send it?

19 MR. PALMISANO: A way to get it there and
20 transportation is feasible. That's why I try to --

21 MS. MCNICHOLAS: Right. Right.

22 MR. PALMISANO: -- we have to manufacture the
23 overpacks, which is about a two-year item.

24 MS. MCNICHOLAS: Okay.

25 MR. PALMISANO: So by the time there is a

1 place, we will be ready.

2 MS. MCNICHOLAS: Perfect. Thank you very
3 much.

4 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Last question,
5 Tim Brown -- oh, I'm sorry -- and then Tom Caughlan.

6 MR. BROWN: Just from a local community
7 perspective, the idea of the emergency responders and
8 the full funding commitment.

9 Can you hear me okay?

10 PUBLIC MEMBER: No.

11 MR. BROWN: Sorry. Is this better? Is that
12 better?

13 Okay. So just from our local communities, and
14 I speak for, you know, the City of San Clemente, but
15 the idea of funding emergency responders through the
16 life of the -- while the waste is on site --

17 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

18 MR. BROWN: -- is a very important issue, and
19 I think you just spoke to that, and so I look forward
20 to more feedback on that because --

21 MR. PALMISANO: Yeah.

22 MR. BROWN: -- our community is obviously
23 very -- very concerned about it, and having that
24 resource there, I think helps us to be prepared in case
25 anything does go wrong, but more importantly, it shows

1 SCE's commitment to that, so --

2 MR. PALMISANO: We understand and we agree.
3 That's why we entered the current agreement and we are
4 more than willing to negotiate an appropriate level of
5 funding until the fuel is off site.

6 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Tom Caughlan?

7 MR. CAUGHLAN: I understand the engineering of
8 the railcars is on track. Is there an approval process
9 for routing that requires sequential approvals or
10 something like that that we should be briefed on?

11 MR. PALMISANO: So let me give you a brief
12 answer, and let's take an action to bring our
13 transportation expert back in.

14 Real quickly, the fuel is going to leave one
15 of two ways: Either the Department of Energy is going
16 to take it, that's the railcar they're building, and
17 they will have a certain process.

18 If you remember when we had Jack Edlow in here
19 about a year, a year and a half ago, he ships spent
20 fuel today for DOE and other entities.

21 DOE transportation requirements, Department of
22 Transportation, and NRC already has the requirements
23 and spent fuel is already shipped across the country
24 regularly today, so it can either go as a private
25 shipment, if you will, meaning DOT and NRC.

1 And they coordinate with all the states and
2 local responders along the way. And we'll bring him
3 back in because he's certainly more educated and
4 eloquent than I. But there is a way to answer that,
5 yeah.

6 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very
7 much. And just to remind everybody that Tim, Dan, and
8 I wrote to California Energy Commission a little while
9 ago after all these conversations about consolidated
10 storage and asked the California Energy Commission to
11 help develop a California plan for getting spent fuel
12 out of these sites and transportation is really the
13 center of that.

14 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

15 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And we've got -- we've
16 got to focus on that as well as the topics that we're
17 going to be looking at in a little more detail later
18 tonight.

19 Okay. I'm doing a reckless job of keeping the
20 cal --

21 MR. PALMISANO: And I'm sorry.

22 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- agenda. And so I
23 want to now turn the floor over, first, I think, to
24 Bruce Watson from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

25 Bruce, the floor is yours.

1 MR. WATSON: Okay. First of all, I'd like to
2 thank Dr. Victor and the Panel for having me speak
3 tonight. This is my second time at a CEP meeting and I
4 think the NRC has been here three or four times over
5 the life of the panel.

6 I am Bruce Watson. I'm Chief of the Reactor
7 Decommissioning Branch and I am from -- in the Office
8 of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, and my role
9 is -- as the branch chief, is to supervise the people
10 who do the work, ensuring the safety of the licensing
11 of the decommissioning of the reactors.

12 NRC's mission is to ensure that these nuclear
13 power plants are operated safely, transitioned from
14 operation to decommissioning safely, and ensure that
15 the completion of the decommission -- radiological
16 decommissioning is completed safely.

17 And we do this through two methods:

18 Through the licensing process where we have a
19 safety basis for the licensee to comply with and an
20 inspection and oversight program.

21 I want to point out that as San Onofre
22 transition to a more active decommissioning or
23 dismantling program here with the selection of their
24 general contractor, the NRC will be ramping up our
25 inspection resources to inspect the plant more

1 frequently. And, of course, that is consistent with
2 the level of risk and safety considerations for the
3 work.

4 Our decommission regulations will be 20 years
5 old this summer. We think the process is, I'll say,
6 adequate; if not well -- well written for the
7 decommissioning of all types of facilities. Over the
8 years we've completed the termination of over 70
9 licenses and that would include 10 power reactors.

10 In our decommissioning program, we presently
11 have 20 power reactors, six of those are in active
12 decommissioning. We presently consider San Onofre an
13 active decommissioning, so that's two of those in
14 California.

15 We also have Humboldt Bay in Northern
16 California, which is probably in the next two or three
17 years we'll be terminating the license. There are 14
18 reactors in SAFSTOR condition or what's known
19 internationally as a deferred dismantlement or some
20 people refer to it as mothball.

21 However, there are two power reactors in
22 California, presently, and that stated GE Vallecitos.
23 And we also expect that we -- a number of reactors will
24 be increasing and going into decommissioning in future
25 years. As you know, Diablo Canyon has announced they

1 will not be seeking license renewal.

2 We presently have four research reactors in
3 decommissioning status, three of those are in
4 California, two of them are at General Atomics, just
5 south of here. They're nearing completion of their
6 decommissioning and, also, we have GE Vallecitos
7 training reactor up near Pleasanton.

8 Decommissioning: And NRC senses that we -- we
9 will remove the facility or site safely from service
10 and reduce the residual radioactivities that either
11 allow unrestricted release or restricted release.

12 To date, all decommissionings in the
13 United States have met the unrestricted release
14 criteria, and so we expect that trend to continue.

15 We -- my branch actually takes care of the
16 licensing of the facilities by issuing the license
17 amendments, exemptions. We participate in rule-making.
18 As many of you know, there is a rule-making going on
19 right now to improve the efficiency of the
20 transitioning of operating reactors to decommissioning,
21 to connect the existing regulations, which are
22 primary -- were primarily written for operating
23 reactors, to allow for the quicker and more efficient
24 changes in those requirements to decommissioning.

25 We also issue guidance to support the

1 rule-making efforts. We also oversee the inspection
2 program with the three regional offices that conduct
3 the inspection program, and Ray Kellar will get into
4 that in much more detail here.

5 We also provide technical support for
6 inspectors, whether it's hydrogeologists, engineering,
7 or health physics expertise. We also run the knowledge
8 management program for the NRC to ensure our people
9 maintain -- well qualified to do the work, and we also
10 do -- participate with international folks to share our
11 experience and lessons learned.

12 As I say, our oversight continues during
13 decommissioning by the issuing of license amendments.
14 These are issued and noticed in the Federal Register
15 and or also on our website. They allow for public
16 comment and also the opportunity for hearing in
17 amendments.

18 We will also grant exceptions to the existing
19 regulations that are no longer applicable to the
20 facility and we'll issue orders where we need to to
21 ensure compliance.

22 Our decommission program is actually for
23 reactors is in Inspection Manual Chapter 2561. It has
24 a number of procedures to it and, of course, all of the
25 inspection procedures that may be applicable that could

1 be used in an inspection.

2 The key thing here is that the inspection
3 process will continue until we terminate the license.
4 And we adjust that inspection program consistent with
5 the activities that are going -- going to happen at the
6 plant.

7 So as San Onofre, as I stated before,
8 increases their activities on site with the dismantling
9 and decontamination of the site, we will increase our
10 resources and inspection area to provide more
11 oversight.

12 The goals of our program are -- for inspection
13 program is that we do this through direct observation
14 and verification, as I say, boots on the ground. We
15 ensure that the licensee is complying with our
16 regulatory requirements.

17 And, of course, we also look at the trends in
18 the safety activities at the -- by the licensee to
19 ensure that the performance is maintained in the right
20 direction and we look for poor performance trends and
21 to make sure that the licensee takes actions to correct
22 that. With that, I'll turn it over to Ray.

23 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Let me just see if there
24 are any questions about your --

25 Pam Patterson.

1 MS. PATTERSON: Thank you. Is this on?

2 So you say that the NRC's mission is to ensure
3 plant safety. Wouldn't you agree that this is an
4 ultrahazardous condition or ultrahazardous conditions
5 that you're in charge of overseeing?

6 MR. WATSON: Absolutely not. When a op -- a
7 plant is operating with the fuel in the reactor and it
8 is operating at full capacity, that's why we have
9 significant changes in the emergency plan when that
10 plant is shut down and the fuel is removed.

11 So the plant is actually in a much safer
12 condition. Once the pool -- the reactors' fuel is
13 moved from the reactor to the spent fuel pool and then,
14 of course, to the spent -- dry storage situation, so --

15 MS. PATTERSON: Okay. So that might be a part
16 of the problem, that you don't consider this an
17 ultrahazardous situation. So can you explain to me
18 please --

19 (Applause.)

20 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Please, folks. Folks?

21 MR. WATSON: Let's have a --

22 MS. PATTERSON: What -- so, what's --

23 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And respect to our
24 guest's presence.

25 MS. PATTERSON: Excuse me. Can you explain to

1 me, please, what's going on in the State of Washington?

2 MR. WATSON. Actually, I'll go back to the
3 first question you asked.

4 MS. PATTERSON: Okay.

5 MR. WATSON: I did not say it was not a risky
6 situation. I'm saying the risk is reduced from the
7 plant being shut down and the plant -- and the fuel
8 being removed.

9 MS. PATTERSON: You said you did not consider
10 it to be, in any way, an ultrahazardous condition?

11 MR. WATSON: No. It's manageable. The safety
12 is manageable.

13 MS. PATTERSON: Okay.

14 MR. WATSON: To answer your last question
15 here, the NRC regulates the commercial use of
16 radioactive materials. The Department of Energy
17 operates and regulates the Hanford site in Washington
18 State. The NRC actually has very little to do with
19 that site. We do not regulate them, regulate the
20 Department of Energy.

21 So, hopefully, we will learn some lessons
22 learned from whatever actions they did do in the
23 results of their issue with, I think, of the mine or
24 whatever that is.

25 MS. PATTERSON: So, what you're saying is that

1 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has very little to do
2 with that site. So what is -- can you describe what
3 that very little is?

4 MR. WATSON: Well, Under the Atomic Energy
5 Act, as amended, Congress did not give us authority to
6 regulate the Department of Energy, just like they did
7 not give us the authority to regulate the Department of
8 Defense, say, the Naval Reactor Program or any other
9 program that the Defense Department has.

10 So we have to operate within our confines
11 authorized to us by the Congress?

12 MR. PALMISANO: So, what -- in this situation,
13 with the State of Washington, what is it? You said "We
14 don't have very --" you have very little to do with it.

15 So, what is your definition of "very little"?

16 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Maybe we could -- maybe
17 we could focus on the areas because bylaws, the Nuclear
18 Regulatory --

19 MS. PATTERSON: You know, I'm going to ask my
20 questions and I'm expecting an answer from the NRC.

21 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: You can't expect an
22 answer from somebody whose agency does not have
23 jurisdiction over the problem.

24 MS. PATTERSON: I'm responding to what his
25 answer was, so I'd like him to clarify.

1 MR. WATSON: We have a very, very minor role
2 in some of the DOE activities and those are generally
3 with waste disposal and we do review some of their
4 technical papers and comment on them; that's the extent
5 that as a -- I guess I'll call it cooperating agency
6 with technical expertise provide them advice on some of
7 their technical documents they're developing. That's
8 the extent of the NRC's role that I know of.

9 MS. PATTERSON: Okay. And so, what does the
10 NRC do with respect to the Holtec bribes for the -- for
11 the quality assurance inspectors, how did you get
12 involved with that situation?

13 MR. WATSON: It's not my area of expertise and
14 I have no knowledge of that.

15 MS. PATTERSON: So you don't know if that
16 falls under the purview of the NRC?

17 MR. WATSON: I'm just saying --

18 Well, no. What I'm saying is, I can't answer
19 your question because I have no knowledge of that
20 particular situation. If there were some people in the
21 NRC that are aware of it, I'm sure there are. However,
22 I'm not the right person to answer that question.

23 MS. PATTERSON: But as a representative of the
24 NRC, would you be concerned with that situation? Would
25 that be something that would concern you?

1 MR. WATSON: I can't offer an opinion not
2 knowing the facts.

3 MS. PATTERSON: Okay. And so why is there no
4 long-term planning going on with respect to this? Why
5 is it that we're sort of trying to figure this out now
6 after the fact, now that we have a problem on our
7 hands?

8 MR. WATSON: Can you identify what that is?
9 You just said we don't have a plan, but you didn't
10 identify what the subject was.

11 MS. PATTERSON: Well, first of all, we don't
12 know. To me long-term planning would be that you would
13 know what you were going to do with the spent uranium
14 fuel rods at the end of everything, at the
15 decommissioning stage, at the time that you were
16 planning in putting together this power plant in the
17 first place; that would be long-term, that would be
18 responsible long-term planning.

19 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Pam, the entire country
20 is in this situation, the entire country.

21 MS. PATTERSON: Can -- would you please let
22 him answer my question? I'm not asking you the
23 questions.

24 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay.

25 MS. PATTERSON: I'm asking the --

1 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: But you're asking --
2 you're trying to put on the spot a guest of the
3 Panel --

4 MS. PATTERSON: I'm not asking you the
5 question. I'd like to know why --

6 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- about questions that
7 are not in his jurisdiction.

8 MS. PATTERSON: No, because -- quite frankly,
9 we need to resolve this situation for the future. The
10 fact that it comes up that, "Oh, now we have this plant
11 that we have to close down because it wasn't managed
12 properly. And what do we do with all of this
13 radiation?" So --

14 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. But playing
15 "Gotya" with somebody from an agency where his division
16 the agency is not responsible for that problem, how
17 does that advance the agenda here?

18 MS. PATTERSON: I actually -- I want to
19 know -- Nuclear Regulatory Commission's mission is to
20 ensure plant safety, including safe plant operation,
21 and safe transition for operation -- from operation to
22 decommissioning. That's what he said. So, what is
23 that --

24 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And he's talking about
25 the decommissioning process. That's what we asked him

1 to come here and talk about.

2 MS. PATTERSON: So, what I'm saying is, why
3 isn't there --

4 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And if you would allow
5 his colleague to talk --

6 MS. PATTERSON: Why isn't there a plan -- if
7 you'd let me know finish my statement --

8 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- his colleague will
9 tell you about the inspection process.

10 I was in the process of talking, and I've been
11 very respectful of not interrupting

12 MS. PATTERSON: But you don't have the -- you
13 don't have the floor, and I'm not asking you the
14 question.

15 PUBLIC MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

16 MS. PATTERSON: So -- so, what I want to know
17 is, what is the policy with the Nuclear Regulatory
18 Commission with respect you're opening up these new
19 nuclear power plants and where are you going to put the
20 spent fuel rods when you need to move them? Why don't
21 you have that plan in place?

22 MR. WATSON: The policy makers in Washington
23 are responsible for resolving the issues, not the
24 Nuclear Regulatory Commission. If we were authorized
25 to allow for the safe disposal of this material, we

1 would provide the means and the requirements to do
2 that.

3 But right now, we don't that authority and so
4 it's up to the national policy makers and the Congress
5 and the administration to make those deci --
6 determinations.

7 MS. PATTERSON: So then don't you think that
8 your mission statement is incorrect?

9 MR. WATSON: No, because the material -- the
10 decommissioning, the plants are operated safely, the
11 plants are decommissioned safely and the fuel remains
12 safe because that's also our mission.

13 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: How many more questions
14 do you have? Because we -- we have to move on. We are
15 way over time and his colleague has not had a chance to
16 talk, and that's why we asked him to come here, for
17 informational purposes as to what's happening.
18 Relitigating the mission statement of the Nuclear
19 Regulatory Commission seems somewhat out of scope.

20 MS. PATTERSON: Well, you know what, we're
21 actually discussing very important issues.

22 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I -- I agree. So, let's
23 focus on them.

24 MS. PATTERSON: And the fact that we don't
25 know -- we don't know what we're going to do with

1 the -- with the radiation once we have to -- to move
2 it. That's just insane.

3 PUBLIC MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

4 MS. PATTERSON: Excuse me?

5 MR. PALMISANO: It's the Department of
6 Energy's responsibility. And you --

7 MS. PATTERSON: Then I think that the Nuclear
8 Regulatory Commission needs to modify their mission
9 statement.

10 MR. PALMISANO: No.

11 MS. PATTERSON: Because he specifically say --

12 MR. PALMISANO: Just a minute, so --

13 MS. PATTERSON: A safety transition from
14 operations to decommissioning.

15 MR. PALMISANO: So might I suggest we invite
16 the Department of Energy to come out and talk about
17 their responsibility to remove spent fuel from the site
18 and -- (Applause) And that's really the key.

19 PUBLIC MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

20 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Do you have additional
21 questions, Pam?

22 MS. PATTERSON: No. Thank you. Not at the
23 moment.

24 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: That's lovely. Ray
25 Kellar. The floor is yours.

1 MR. KELLER: What happened? It's been going.
2 There we go. Here we go.

3 Thank you, Dr. Victor and Panel members, for
4 the opportunity to be here this evening.

5 My name is Ray Kellar. I'm Chief of the Fuel,
6 Cycle and Decommissioning Branch in Arlington, Texas.
7 We have the responsibility for doing the inspections
8 here at the site of the decommissioning as well as the
9 ISFSI, which would be the independent spent fuel
10 storage installations, that will be loading of the
11 fuel, oversight of the fuel while it's in the spent
12 fuel pools, and then the ongoing inspections of the
13 fuel at the ISFSI pad after it's actually loaded and
14 moved up there.

15 So these are a couple of examples of --
16 actually, three examples of some sites that have safely
17 moved from an operating plant into decommissioning,
18 actually, to decommissioned site, which are Connecticut
19 Yankee, Maine Yankee, and Trojan.

20 This is very similar to what Bruce has talked
21 about. What we do to ensure safety is, the inspection
22 program for decommissioning reactors is based on
23 ensuring the licensee meets the regulations,
24 licensed-based documents, including license,
25 conditions, technical specifications, and technical

1 guidance, such as new regs as appropriate.

2 The program office staff and Bruce's
3 organization would perform license reviews as well as
4 safety evaluations of the proposed amendments.

5 Regional inspectors will be ensuring the
6 licensee is following the regulation's license
7 requirement and documenting inspections performed in
8 the inspection reports along with any violations that
9 might be found. Enforcement actions will be taken for
10 violations in accordance with the NRC Enforcement
11 Policy.

12 Inspection program will be reviewing safety of
13 the spent fuel pool located in the pool as it currently
14 is, observing of loading operations of the spent fuel
15 into the storage canisters and movement to the ISFSI
16 pad as well as the ongoing storage and maintenance of
17 the canisters at the pad.

18 Decommissioning activities will be inspected
19 by observing a variety of licensee activities,
20 interviewing licensee programs. As the amount and
21 complexity of decommissioning work increases, as Bruce
22 mentioned, the number of inspections will also
23 increase.

24 To ensure the radiation levels are within the
25 level limits set by the regulations, the inspectors

1 will be performing independent radiological
2 measurements. Samples are obtained and tested by ORNL,
3 the NRC's independent contractor, located in Oak Ridge,
4 Tennessee.

5 A number of samples have already been sampled
6 and tested, including the Vicentia, the newly
7 constructed ISFSI, and the switchyard, which the
8 synchronous condenser will be placed at.

9 The NRC will continue to perform security
10 inspections and inspections of emergency preparedness
11 during decommissioning activities as well as during the
12 storage of the spent fuel on the pad.

13 The NRC inspection program is responsible for
14 verifying the licensee and contractors are conducting
15 regular activities safely as spelled by the SONGS
16 License and Regulations.

17 Inspectors will verify this by observing
18 licensee activities, reviewing procedures along with
19 the other licensee controls and interviewing the
20 workers. The inspection program ensures that safety
21 issues and violations are promptly identified, placed
22 in the licensee's corrective action program, promptly
23 corrected and reviewed to prevent recurrence.

24 The inspectors review the licensee's programs
25 and documentation as well as independently observe

1 licensee performance. By reviewing previous inspection
2 reports, we can identify trends and degraded
3 performance and bring these to the licensee's attention
4 as well.

5 The inspectors will verify the licensee and
6 all the contractors performing important stipulated
7 tasks are complying with regulations, procedures and
8 licensee requirements. Any violations are enforced,
9 but it's issued against SONGS since SONGS is the
10 licensee.

11 So the region develops the master inspection
12 plan every year. What we do is, we look at what
13 activities the licensee will be performing during that
14 year. We go back to the manual chapter and we pick
15 which inspection procedure which are appropriate for
16 that year and then we schedule those during the course
17 of the year.

18 And as Bruce mentioned, as decommissioning
19 activities increase, we'll perform more and more
20 inspections during that year.

21 The efforts include interview licensee
22 corresponds and previous inspections, performing the
23 inspection, identifying findings or violations, and
24 communicating these to the licensee during an exit
25 meeting.

1 Violations are handled in accordance with the
2 enforcement policy located at the link shown at the
3 bottom of the slide. The inspections are handled by
4 regional inspectors and occur throughout the year,
5 typically based on when major activities are occurring.

6 The inspection reports are currently being
7 issued on a quarterly basis and document -- document
8 inspections conducted during the previous quarter.

9 Separate inspection reports are typically
10 issued for security-related violations due to the
11 sensitivity of the material involved. The NRC Program
12 offices develop programs for performing the
13 decommissioning inspection described in Manual Chapter
14 2561. Bruce mentioned that a little bit earlier.

15 There are over 30 core or mandatory inspection
16 procedures that need to be looked at each year and
17 there are -- I'm sorry -- there are a dozen mandatory
18 inspection procedures and over 30 discretionary
19 procedures that can be used, depending on the type of a
20 reactor and where the licensee is at in the
21 decommissioning process.

22 Examples of mandatory procedures include
23 organization and management and cost control, safe
24 reviews, design changes and modifications,
25 self-assessment auditing and corrective actions, to

1 name just a few.

2 Examples of discretionary procedures include
3 fuel handling activities, spent fuel pool activities,
4 and maintenance drill. The division of spent fuel
5 management has developed an ISFSI inspection program,
6 which is Manual Chapter 2690 as opposed to 1246, which
7 I mention on there, which I've shown on the slide.

8 That includes procedures for construction of
9 the ISFSI, operational test -- pre-operational testing
10 of the ISFSI before the initial loading, operation of
11 the ISFSI and review of the safe reviews performed by
12 the licensee and the vendor.

13 After the inspection is completed, the
14 inspector performs a debrief of the findings from the
15 inspection of NRC's management, typically the next week
16 after they return to the office.

17 As part of this process, management provides
18 an oversight of the debrief and helps determine the
19 significance of any violation and what enforcement
20 action may be required.

21 The inspection report is issued within 30 to
22 45 days after the exit with the licensee. Portions of
23 the inspection report that do not contain
24 security-related information are posted in the public
25 section of ADAMS, the NRC data management system.

1 The SONGS inspections report can be searched
2 and located by using their doc numbers, which are shown
3 at the bottom of the slide.

4 So with that, that completes my portion of the
5 presentation.

6 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very
7 much. Can you go back to the previous slide, please?

8 MR. KELLAR: Which slide?

9 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yeah, that one right
10 there.

11 MR. KELLAR: Okay.

12 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: So if we want to find
13 out, do we go then to this site to find out what the
14 NRC is learning about the inspection process and are
15 these in, like, plain English? Or what can we do to
16 learn in kind of practical sense what's actually
17 happening --

18 MR. KELLAR: Yes, basically, what happens is,
19 we issue an inspection report, which I'll be issuing
20 one next week, relating to both of the Part-50 dockets
21 and the Part-72 docket is placed in ADAMS, which may
22 take about a week to actually make it in there.

23 But you actually go to that website link and
24 you can search on the docket number and it'll show if
25 it's an inspection report and you can pull that up and

1 it'll actually show what was inspected and what the
2 results were and any violations that were identified.

3 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Maybe we should
4 take as an action item at some point sooner rather than
5 later to take a look at some of these and get a sense
6 of what we learned from them because, I think, probably
7 people would be -- would benefit from knowing what's
8 happening there. Marni Magda and then Pam Patterson.

9 MS. MAGDA: I'm -- when we finish emptying the
10 cooling pools -- sorry -- and we are going to the
11 decommissioning of the large buildings and you are
12 going to be, obviously, the huge monitoring that was
13 for the reactors when they were hot and monitoring of
14 the cooling pools, that will not be necessary anymore.
15 The fuel will all be in -- on the ISFSI -- ISFSI.
16 Sorry.

17 MR. KELLAR: ISFSI, yes.

18 MS. MAGDA: But I do -- it was wonderful. I
19 understood from Tom Palmisano that there will be a new
20 computer monitoring system that will still be able to
21 watch the fuel. I'm --

22 MR. KELLAR: So typically at that point what
23 you monitor is the heat load, the temperature of the
24 air going in and the temperature of the air going out,
25 which is an indicator that you have a problem with that

1 canister relative to the heat load and you also still
2 have the TLDs or thermoluminescent dosimeters that are
3 around the site, which measure the dosage rate at the
4 site boundary, so you still have those.

5 MS. MAGDA: So the only -- I mean, I have this
6 concern because we have watched firestorms in Southern
7 California come out of nowhere, and it hasn't leaped
8 the I-5. We hop it never will. But when we're to this
9 much reduced time, would we have a way to protect
10 anyone who is watching, monitoring when there's so
11 much -- so little is left but that one building? How
12 will they be safe? I'm just trying to make sure that
13 we're keeping --

14 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I think that may be more
15 of a plant design issue. Tom Palmisano?

16 MR. PALMISANO: That's a question for me.

17 So as part of the new system, we're building a
18 new control room, a hardened facility, for both the
19 operators and the security force. So they will be
20 protected from natural events, so they can continue to
21 monitor the system throughout a natural event.

22 MS. MAGDA: Okay. Thank you. The other part
23 of this is that I have been concerned for a while as
24 I -- if I understand this correctly, because the
25 Nuclear Regulatory Commission nor the Department of

1 Energy do not keep the records of what exactly is in
2 every one of our canisters here at San Onofre.

3 MR. KELLAR: That is required to be kept until
4 it's turned over to the Department of Energy, so it
5 will be maintained.

6 MS. MAGDA: It is maintained there?

7 MR. KELLAR: In fact, dual record have to
8 maintained, not just single records.

9 MS. MAGDA: Oh, so you do have a record of
10 everything at each one of the loading --

11 MR. KELLAR. The licensee will. Tom will. We
12 maint --

13 MR. PALMISANO: Yes.

14 MR. KELLAR: We ensure, during an inspection,
15 that the licensee maintain records of what was loaded
16 in what canister, when it was loaded, what the heat
17 load was, everything that shows what was in that
18 canister.

19 MS. MAGDA: I'm -- I'm just concerned as I
20 look at the long, long picture, on the canister and a
21 redundant system when we think of terrorism taking --
22 you know, changing computer records. I would -- I
23 would hope that we would have either the nuclear
24 regulatory commission or the DOE begin to have for all
25 of our nation's dry canisters some kind of a redundant

1 system that will keep the record for as long as we need
2 it the hundreds of years.

3 MR. PALMISANO: I can provide and answer.

4 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Can you speak briefly
5 about this, Tom?

6 MR. PALMISANO: We, the licensee, maintain the
7 records. We provide the information regularly to the
8 Department of Energy, so -- yeah.

9 MS. MAGDA: They have it also? Okay. I
10 didn't understand that. I thought it was only kept in
11 local reactors.

12 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Let me take as an action
13 item. Steve Maheras, among other people, have been
14 very helpful in teaching us about how the Department of
15 Energy is organizing this information. And let me get
16 from Steve a nice summary of how that's done and what
17 the inventories look like.

18 Pam Patterson, the floor is yours.

19 MS. PATTERSON: Thank you.

20 So, with respect to the bribing of quality
21 assurance inspectors, who is in charge in looking into
22 that?

23 MR. KELLAR: Well, typically, that'll be
24 handled through the allegation program, so that we
25 brought to an allegation with whoever was -- it was

1 reported to, so if it was reported to headquarters, it
2 would be done through an allegation review board at
3 headquarters or if it was reported to a region, it
4 would be reviewed through the allegation program in the
5 region. And I do not know where your potential
6 allegation was vetted through. I'm not sure.

7 MS. PATTERSON: But when you're talking about
8 allegation program, whose allegation program are you
9 referring to?

10 MR. KELLAR: The NRC's allegation program.

11 MR. WATSON: Yes. We have the Office of
12 Investigations, which are, I guess, federal marshals to
13 a certain extent, some of them, who would do the
14 investigations on these allegations.

15 And if they're -- they feel that there's
16 actions to be taken and actions will taken through the
17 Office of Investigation, through the -- and also
18 through the Office of Enforcement.

19 MS. PATTERSON: Well, I would really like to
20 get all the documentation related to the Holtec bribe
21 situation so that I can see, and we all can see, how
22 that was investigated and what came of it.

23 So it's part of the freedom of information act
24 request.

25 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yeah. So, can I just --

1 This panel, a year and a half or so ago, these
2 accusations were made and we spent a lot of time
3 looking at this because I think it's important that
4 people understand, you know, who the commercial
5 partners and so on, I organized all that information,
6 shared it all with the Community Engagement Panel twice
7 and, I believe, separately in response to questions
8 from you, Pam. I sent that to you twice.

9 But I will take as an action item to pull all
10 that information again together and that, I believe,
11 includes the report outs or the links to the report
12 outs from the inspection panel of the Nuclear
13 Regulatory Commission.

14 MS. PATTERSON: Right. But do you -- I mean,
15 you're not the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

16 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: No, but I did --

17 MS. PATTERSON: I mean, I'm happy for you to
18 send me those documents, but the Nuclear Regulatory
19 Commission, under FOIA, is required --

20 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: But they're not --
21 they're not my documents. They're the Nuclear
22 Regulatory Commission's documents, which were -- some
23 of which were obtained under FOIA.

24 MS. PATTERSON: Right. And I appreciate that.
25 I appreciate you sending those to me. But I think,

1 separately, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, because
2 they're bound by making sure that all the documentation
3 is turned over, so --

4 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yeah, and I see no
5 evidence --

6 MS. PATTERSON: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- that there's not been
8 a legal compliance here. Okay. Any other questions?
9 We're quite far over time. Okay. We're going to shift
10 gear. Thank you very much to our two colleagues from
11 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

12 It is very important that we be able to ask
13 people, who are the frontier of all this work, to come
14 and share their information with us and help us
15 understand what's happening.

16 We are now going to move to the segment about
17 consolidated interim storage. We invited -- there are
18 two major projects in various stages of development,
19 one in Southeast New Mexico, one just over the border
20 in Western Texas, we invited both projects to come
21 here, both projects said yes.

22 And then fairly recently, the project in Texas
23 is in the middle of a complicated mergers and
24 acquisitions process. And so, as part of that, the
25 Department of Justice does work to look at antitrust

1 concerns and that meant that they couldn't come in a
2 public forum and tell us how great they are and all the
3 things that they're doing because the lawyers told them
4 they're not allowed to say anything in public in the
5 middle of an antitrust process, which is normal when a
6 merger like this takes place.

7 And so we've asked, somewhat awkwardly, Tom
8 Palmisano because people in this industry are paying
9 very close attention to both of these projects to talk
10 about the waste control specialist project and then
11 we're going to hear from the actual folks who are
12 responsible for the other projects.

13 So, Tom, the floor is yours.

14 MR. PALMISANO. Thank you.

15 And, again, I'm filling in since waste control
16 specialist could not join us tonight, so I'm going to
17 talk about information that's publicly available about
18 their project.

19 To start with, you know, we've said from the
20 start, we are all aligned that we need to find a way to
21 move the spent fuel off the San Onofre site as soon as
22 we can safely and reasonably move it. There's no doubt
23 about that. So we support all safe and reasonable
24 efforts.

25 We touched on earlier that this is

1 fundamentally a Government Department of Energy
2 responsibility that stems from the 1982 Nuclear Waste
3 Policy Act and they have failed to develop a geological
4 repository.

5 And, you know, none of us ever wanted to wind
6 up where we are today, accumulating spent fuel to the
7 degree we are, but that is where we are.

8 We're putting pressure on the government, and
9 the Panel is instrumental in this, and many of you are
10 instrumental in this, trying to get the administration,
11 Department of Energy and Congress to act.

12 We see, probably, the best near-term solution,
13 and by "near-term," I'm talking in the next 10 to 20
14 years, to be blunt. Okay. It's probably a
15 consolidated interim storage effort, whether that's in
16 New Mexico, which we're going to hear about in a
17 minute, or West Texas.

18 The West Texas project is in Andrews County.
19 It's a little hard to see, but it's up here in the
20 corner of the county. They already have a low waste, a
21 low -- a rad waste low-level disposal site. They take
22 low waste.

23 And there's three categories: A, B and C, A
24 being the very lowest, gloves -- medical gloves,
25 something like that, B and C are the higher categories.

1 This site already is licensed and disposes of
2 B and C low-level waste. They also have some federal
3 activities related to DOE that I'm not well versed in,
4 but they do take commercial waste.

5 They're proposed to expand this and put what
6 amounts to a dry fuel storage system in place to be an
7 interim facility for facilities like SONGS to ship
8 spent fuel to, they will store it there awaiting the
9 DOE to develop a geological repository.

10 You see the map key. Just a couple of
11 highlights. They submitted a license application to
12 the NRC in 2016. They partnered with two of the three
13 U.S. cask vendors AREVA and NAC. We have AREVA
14 canisters currently loaded. It's a large facility,
15 14,000 acres.

16 Their proposal has a lot of capacity.
17 Probably, the most important thing is at the bottom.
18 However, in April of 2017, they asked the NRC to
19 suspend the licensing review. It was a financial
20 decision. They're in the middle of a merger and
21 acquisition. They decided they had to focus their
22 finances on the merger and acquisition. The NRC
23 charges people for a licensing review.

24 So that project is on hold at this point.
25 Recent information tells us that that project may stay

1 on hold. So I can't give you a outlook of when this
2 might restart. They did file with the NRC, but that
3 has been suspend -- at their request, they stopped the
4 review and right now they're in a suspended state.

5 So there'll be more to come, probably, by the
6 end of the summer on the likelihood and fate of this
7 project.

8 I know I kept that brief, but that's basically
9 what's currently publicly available on this project.

10 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Excellent. Thank you
11 Very much. I want to see if there are any questions.

12 Pam Patterson.

13 MR. PALMISANO: Yes, ma'am.

14 MS. PATTERSON: Hi. Thank you.

15 It's hard for me to read the PowerPoint here.
16 But what city? What's the nearest city to the site?

17 MR. PALMISANO: Let me -- and, again, I'm not
18 affiliated with this company, so I'm just kind of going
19 off what's publicly available. I believe it's Andrews,
20 Texas, right there in the center.

21 PUBLIC MEMBER: Eunice and Hobbs.

22 MR. PALMISANO: Eunice and Hobbs?

23 PUBLIC MEMBER: Right.

24 MR. PALMISANO: Well, over the border in
25 New Mexico or the closest city.

1 MR. HEATON: Andrews is 37 miles.

2 MR. PALMISANO: So Andrews is 37 to the east
3 and Eunice and Hobbs just over the New Mexico border.

4 MR. HEATON: Three miles.

5 MS. PATTERSON: Eunice is 37 miles from
6 Austin?

7 MR. PALMISANO: No, Andrews is 37 miles from
8 the site.

9 MS. PATTERSON: Oh, okay.

10 MR. PALMISANO: So Andrews, Texas, is 37 miles
11 east to the site. John Heaton is saying the New Mexico
12 city is right over the border or three miles away from
13 the site.

14 MS. PATTERSON: But the site in Texas, can you
15 spell the name of it? What's the -- did you say is
16 Eunice?

17 MR. PALMISANO: Well, it's waste control
18 specialist that's in Andrews County.

19 MS. PATTERSON: But it's not a city?

20 MR. PALMISANO: No.

21 MS. PATTERSON: Or it's just county?

22 MR. PALMISANO: It's in Andrews County, Texas,
23 at the very western edge of the county.

24 MS. PATTERSON: Okay.

25 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And the political

1 decision making around the project happens at the
2 county level because this is a largely unpopulated area
3 of West Texas.

4 MS. PATTERSON: And the nearest city, then, to
5 that site is in New Mexico --

6 MR. PALMISANO: It's New Mexico.

7 MS. PATTERSON: -- or is in Texas?

8 MR. PALMISANO: This -- this is virtually
9 right on the border. The nearest cities are actually
10 in New Mexico.

11 MS. PATTERSON: And can you spell the name of
12 that city in New Mexico?

13 MR. HEATON: E-u-n-i-c-e.

14 MS. PATTERSON: I'm sorry. Can you say it
15 again?

16 MR. HEATON: E-u-n-i-c-e. It's approximately
17 three miles. Hobbs, H-o-b-b-s, is approximately about
18 15 miles.

19 MR. PALMISANO: Thank you.

20 MS. PATTERSON: And Hobbs is in Texas?

21 MR. HEATON: No, they're both in New Mexico.

22 MS. PATTERSON: Oh, they're both in
23 New Mexico?

24 MR. PALMISANO: Yeah.

25 MR. HEATON: They're both in New Mexico.

1 MS. PATTERSON: Okay. Thank you.

2 MR. PALMISANO: Okay. Thank you.

3 Dr. Victor?

4 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Any other questions?

5 I only want to make one comment here, which
6 is, I think you see these two sites moving forward
7 because they see the prospect of business providing
8 consolidated storage.

9 Absent a change in federal law, that prospect
10 is weaker. And so some of what we're seeing here with
11 this project in the middle of this acquisition, merger
12 and acquisition, is people not sure whether the
13 business is actually going to be there, which is why
14 the discussion we're going to have and we always have
15 about changes in federal law is so vitally important.

16 And the other thing I want to say is, this
17 project reveals to us something we've been talking
18 about for a long time, which is that we benefit from
19 having multiple options.

20 The more there's just one option, the way
21 Yucca Mountain was just one option, the more what we
22 want to do in our communities, which is to get the
23 spent fuel out of here, the more that option doesn't
24 become available. And so I think encouraging as many
25 options possible, a diversity in the market, is really,

1 really important. Okay. Excellent.

2 So now we're going to hear from John Heaton
3 and Pierre Oneid. John from the Eddy-Lea Alliance.

4 John, the floor is yours.

5 MR. HEATON: Thank you, Dr. Victor, and thank
6 to the Panel for allowing us to make a presentation and
7 the audience for being here.

8 Good evening. Again, my name is John Heaton
9 and I'm Chairman of the Eddy-Lea Energy Alliance.

10 So the question is, who are we? Well, we're
11 made up of two counties, the Eddy County and Lea
12 County, which are adjacent to each other in the
13 southeastern corner of New Mexico.

14 And we're made up also of two cities:
15 Carlsbad, which is in Eddy County, and Hobbs, which is
16 in Lea County. So we have formed a coalition amongst
17 those communities and we are a formal limited liability
18 company, so that's -- that's who we are.

19 We formed in 2006, primarily, to respond to
20 the GNEP request by the Department of Energy. And I
21 don't know if any of you even remember what that was
22 about, the Global Nuclear Energy Project, which was a
23 project to -- it had a lot of components to it but was
24 mainly to reduce proliferation of nuclear materials in
25 the world, collect those materials from foreign

1 countries, reprocess them, send them back to them.

2 But keep plutonium and other fissionable
3 materials out of their hands. It was basically the
4 principal. We were one of the 11 applicants that were
5 accepted.

6 We did vast geologic studies on the site and
7 we were, again, accepted by them. But in order to
8 start this, we -- we purchased a thousand acres, the --
9 the Eddy-Lea Energy Alliance, to -- that was the
10 requirement for this project.

11 So this is basically what the site looks like.
12 It's a desert site. It's been, as I said, extensively
13 studied through the GNEP project. It's a very remote
14 location. It's some-34 miles from any population from
15 Hobbs or Carlsbad. It's in between the two. I'll show
16 you a map in a second.

17 The geology there is very stable. It's a very
18 dry area. We have a lot of infra -- infrastructure
19 there, water, utilities, and what -- what we need. The
20 rail is very close. And as you saw, we talked about
21 earlier, this fuel would have to be moved by railroad
22 principally because of its weight.

23 And because of WIPP and URENCO, which is -- I
24 don't know whether you know what the Waste Isolation
25 Pilot Plant, is the only geologic repository licensed,

1 I think, now in the world.

2 There are others that are in the licensing
3 process in Europe, but it's clearly the only one in the
4 United States and we take defense only transuranic
5 waste at the WIPP site. So that's -- that's what --
6 that's about -- it's about 15 miles south of this site.
7 And I'll show you the map in a second.

8 But one of the things I want to emphasize to
9 you is how much support we have in the -- in the area
10 where this site is located. The communities have
11 written resolutions, the counties have written
12 resolutions, the governor of the State of New Mexico
13 has written a letter to Secretary Moniz two years ago
14 advocating for the project.

15 And in 2016, in the legislature we passed, in
16 New Mexico we call them memorials, they're like
17 resolutions, but they were passed -- one was passed in
18 the House and the Senate, both -- both of them
19 supporting this project.

20 And interestingly enough, we had about 71
21 percent vote in each House, which is -- I don't think
22 you get that on many bills that come through. So there
23 was a lot of -- there was a lot of strong support in
24 New Mexico. We have two national labs that, to some
25 agree or to a large degree, were a nuclear state in

1 many, many ways.

2 But in the community itself, what I'd like to
3 say about us, because of WIPP and the numbers of years
4 that took to get it open, we have what I call a very
5 high nuclear IQ in our area of the state, and it's
6 important.

7 And so these kind of projects people there
8 understand what they're about and they understand what
9 the risks are and what the risks aren't. We understand
10 that after a hundred years, as an example, that -- that
11 spent fuel would have decayed by 88 percent, the
12 fission materials, the hot materials that are in there,
13 the hot -- radiologically and thermally.

14 So we understand a lot of those things about
15 spent fuel and other nuclear materials that, maybe, you
16 won't find many population groups that understand that.
17 So, anyway, I just wanted to point that out, that we do
18 have strong consent.

19 But you can see where the -- where the site
20 is. This is where the site is. WIPP is south, down
21 here. And URENCO, which is an enrichment plant that
22 enriches raw uranium up to that comes out at .7
23 percent, they have reach it up to 5 percent or whatever
24 a power plant needs for their fuel. So they do that.

25 So we think that because of that, they're just

1 a lot of knowledge and understanding in the area about
2 nuclear materials and nuclear activities.

3 So it's -- we think that central interim
4 storage is really a temporary viable process that needs
5 to be in place. It goes -- and when you think about a
6 system, that's where the fuel is actually studied,
7 that's where the cladding is studied, that's where a
8 lot of the research goes on, will be at the interim
9 storage facility.

10 Any repository, probably you'll have to see
11 repackaging, you'll have to see diminishing of the
12 length of the fuel, a number of those things to go into
13 a repository. And these are the kinds of things that
14 an interim storage can do in a system of disposal for
15 nuclear material.

16 So we think that central interim storage
17 facility is the right thing to do, the right part of a
18 system in the United States and, clearly, it's going to
19 be, probably, decades before there's a repository
20 that's available.

21 So, thank you very much. We think that Holtec
22 is a great partner. We -- we looked at the various
23 companies that do this and we think that they have the
24 very best, safest, most secure system in the world, bar
25 none. And so we're happy to be partners with Holtec in

1 this project.

2 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very
3 much. And thank you. It was very nice to meet members
4 of the community with which we were going to
5 potentially have a relationship.

6 Several flags. Jim. Jim Leach?

7 MR. LEACH: Yes. Thank you.

8 Just a couple of questions. I noticed on your
9 one slide you indicate that CIS is a viable short-term
10 solution. And -- I'm sorry. Did you -- did you
11 specify what short-term means in that respect?

12 MR. HEATON: I -- I don't know. It's until a
13 repository is open, but clearly NRC and others believe
14 that spent fuel and canisters in the form is in is a
15 viable storage activity for a number of years, up in
16 the, you know, the 80-to 100-year period.

17 MR. LEACH: Okay.

18 MR. HEATON: I don't want speak for them, but
19 that's what --

20 MR. LEACH: Is there -- is there a objective
21 standard for short-term? I'm just curious.

22 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I feel like we're
23 channeling Bill Clinton. It depends on what you mean
24 by short-term and solution.

25 MR. HEATON: It's shorter all the time for

1 guys my age, but --

2 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I think -- look, I think
3 this is one of the realities that we all have to face,
4 which is that people thought there was a system in
5 place where the fuel was going to go into the canisters
6 for a short period of time and then be sent to Yucca
7 Mountain. That's not happening, for all the reasons
8 we've been talking about all this time.

9 MR. LEACH: Yeah.

10 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And so we're pivoting
11 now into a situation where we have to potentially have
12 aging management programs that operate over multiple
13 decades. The warranty is no what matters, what matters
14 is the program for monitoring and retrieving and all
15 that stuff. And although is equal, it's better to do
16 that in a few locations than lots of locations.

17 MR. HEATON: Yeah.

18 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Did you have another
19 question?

20 MR. LEACH: I did. And you mentioned Yucca
21 Mountain. I personally am impressed with the local
22 support that you talk about. What about support of
23 your federal representatives, your senators and your --
24 and your mayor?

25 MR. HEATON: We have -- we have some that are

1 neutral and we have some that are very supportive. And
2 right now, we're in a private -- this is a private
3 facility and in this something, typically, that they
4 wouldn't get involved with as a private facility. If
5 it was federal, obviously, they're going to have a
6 vote.

7 And so we think that we've got good support,
8 what they've asked us to do, just to be frank with you,
9 our senators, in particular, have asked us to go around
10 the state and put on presentations, educational
11 seminars, if you will, about what we're doing for the
12 various communities across the state, and we have a
13 plan, a preliminary plan, structured to do this.

14 So we -- we want to do it. We think it's
15 important. It's important for the nuclear industry as
16 far as New Mexico is concerned.

17 MR. LEACH: Thanks very much.

18 MR. HEATON: Yeah.

19 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Martha.

20 MS. MCNICHOLAS: Again, I -- back on your map,
21 and I may have missed this. What does WIPP stand for?

22 MR. HEATON: Waste Isolation Pilot Plant.

23 MS. MCNICHOLAS: Okay. And you said that
24 right now is the only --

25 MR. HEATON: -- licensed --

1 MS. MCNICHOLAS: -- licensed --

2 MR. HEATON: -- deep geologic repository in
3 the United States.

4 MS. MCNICHOLAS: Okay. What we would hope
5 that Yucca Mountain would eventually be, but this is
6 the only one that --

7 MR. HEATON: Yeah, we only take transuranic
8 waste, which are those man-made isotopes above uranium.
9 And if you remember the periodic chart.

10 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: It's reopened.

11 MS. MCNICHOLAS: And it's full?

12 MR. HEATON: Oh, no. No. No. It's only --
13 it's only about a third full.

14 MS. MCNICHOLAS: Okay. And that isn't an
15 option for our kind of waste?

16 MR. HEATON: Not -- not yet.

17 MS. MCNICHOLAS: Okay. I think I get it.

18 Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Can I just make -- let's
20 share again. We had a very interesting workshop with
21 Per Peterson and some other folks a long time ago,
22 because one of the things that's very clear now to
23 the -- to the professional scientific community is that
24 there are lots of options, including things that are
25 different from -- from an idea like Yucca Mountain.

1 And so if Yucca Mountain ends up not working,
2 for various political or geological reasons, there are
3 other things that people are working on.

4 And let's share these materials with you
5 because I think that you might find that interesting.
6 It's really interesting now that people are starting to
7 really focus on this. There are more options
8 appearing. Dan Stetson and then Marni.

9 SECRETARY STETSON: John, where did -- thank
10 you.

11 John, where did the funding come from to make
12 the actual purchase of the land?

13 MR. HEATON: The counties and the cities.

14 SECRETARY STETSON: The counties?

15 MR. HEATON: Yes, they put up the money.

16 SECRETARY STETSON. That's great. Thank you.

17 MR. HEATON: Yeah, so they're bought in.

18 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Last question, Marni.

19 MS. MAGDA: That was actually my question.

20 That is purchased, you own the land outright, so if you
21 needed to extend the time, for whatever reason, you own
22 that land once those 4,000 canisters are there.

23 MR. HEATON: Yes. Well, we own the land now.
24 Just to be perfectly clear, we would expect to
25 transport that land to Holtec at the point in time when

1 they're ready to go.

2 MS. MAGDA: Okay. Thank you.

3 MR. HEATON: So you understand, that cities
4 and counties don't want to be involved in long-term
5 handling of nuclear materials.

6 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. And very briefly,
7 Pam, before Pierre Oneid comes up.

8 MS. PATTERSON: I'm just curious. What is the
9 zoning there?

10 MR. HEATON: It's rural rural. It's out in
11 nowhere. I don't think it even is zoned. In
12 New Mexico, we -- we have city zoning, we have
13 extraterritorial zoning, which goes out five miles from
14 the city limits. And then past that, it's up to the
15 county to do any zoning that they would, but I would --
16 I would suggest that there is no zoning in that area.

17 MS. PATTERSON: And how far is this location
18 to the nearest city?

19 MR. HEATON: 35 miles.

20 MS. PATTERSON: Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Pierre, as you stand up
22 and take the floor, can I just ask, as you go out
23 across the state and have these discussions, can you
24 keep us informed? Because, we've got a lot of
25 questions about what consent really means and how do we

1 know that if the fuel is sent to another community,
2 that there's real consent and we would benefit a lot
3 from learning from that process?

4 MR. HEATON: You know, we have had -- I've
5 made multiple presentations to multiple groups about
6 consent and what it really means. And, you know, does
7 it mean do you have, you know, some sort of
8 referendum -- referendum in the state? Or do you go
9 city by city and have -- have a consensus of the people
10 that actually come and listen and understand what's
11 going on? Or is it about a contract of some sort?

12 So it is a very difficult, a Morpheus idea and
13 so we think education is really the crux of it and
14 going around and making sure people know about it.

15 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay.

16 MR. HEATON: And, of course, elected officials
17 should be the ones that arbitrate consent one way or
18 another.

19 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Excellent.

20 MR. HEATON: Public elects them or don't elect
21 them.

22 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much.

23 Now, Pierre Oneid, from Holtec. You're
24 partner in this. Pierre, we don't have a lot of time,
25 so if you could help us move through your slides

1 efficiently so we have time for a few questions, and
2 then we'll take a break. Pierre.

3 MR. ONEID: Great. Thank you very much. Good
4 evening everyone. And, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to say
5 thank you very much for this opportunity.

6 As you can see on the first slide here, we
7 have adopted the same principals that you have in terms
8 of safety first, stewardship, and community engagement.
9 I want to congratulate to you and the Panel and
10 everyone here.

11 You know, we have 52 percent -- 52 percent of
12 the country, so we see a lot of the community
13 engagement panels. This is the most active engagement
14 panel that we've seen in the entire country. And I've
15 been with you. This is my fifth time. So I thank you
16 for that.

17 The -- I'm very happy to be the bearer of good
18 news tonight. Yeah, we have a solution. We've been
19 working on it five years. Okay.

20 The first time I called my good friend John
21 was about five years ago, and we started the journey of
22 making sure that we have consent, at least the way we
23 see it. You know, even the 90-year-old lady, we did
24 not want at a corner in the state, we did not want to
25 be a burden on anyone.

1 We thought we have a solution. As it was
2 mentioned, there's a lot of nuclear IQ, high IQ,
3 nuclear IQ in that state. It makes a lot of sense.
4 So, yes, this provides an unprecedented opportunity for
5 DOE to make good on its promise.

6 Supplement is the long-term repository.
7 Here's what we mean by that, we're not talking about
8 replacing Yucca. We're talking about in parallel with
9 Yucca.

10 There's no question that we need a repository.
11 But, in the meantime, let's face it. It's been over 30
12 years. The -- allows removal of the used fuel from the
13 reactor site much sooner than the awaiting repository.

14 To give you an idea, Uncle Sam was supposed to
15 come and pick it up in 1998. Then Uncle Sam said it's
16 2010. Then Uncle Sam said 2018. Then Uncle Sam said
17 nothing.

18 Basically, what we have now is -- here's the
19 numbers I hear, there's a 2040 number, there's a 2050
20 number, there's a 2060 number. And it's in the study.
21 I'll point out to it within a minute. And then there's
22 a 2100 number.

23 So the meantime, does it really make sense to
24 have 68 sites around the country with that? No, it
25 doesn't. It provides a highly-cost efficient way from

1 reactor storage mode.

2 Mr. Chairman, I don't know if you're aware of
3 it, but there has been a study by Oak Ridge. And I'm
4 happy to share with you. There's a study by Oak Ridge
5 that shows clearly, even with Yucca, you save, if it's
6 2040, you save 4 billion dollars.

7 If it's -- in today's money. If it's 2050,
8 you save 6 billion, and if it's 2060, you save 12
9 billion dollars.

10 Folks, I don't know if you know this number,
11 but here's the deal, just legal cost alone, just legal
12 cost alone, this has nothing to do with any solution,
13 is 400 million dollars a year. Folks, that is one
14 million dollar a day.

15 I would like the decision makers, every time
16 they want to fight CIS or not make that decision, to
17 think about this, when you wake up in the morning, just
18 imagine walking over to the basket and throwing a
19 million bucks. That is a fact. At least check that.

20 About two weeks ago, I was on the hill with
21 Shimkus hearing. It was stated the number by the
22 Public Utility Commission chair it was two and a half
23 million. But to be fair, some of that money, you
24 would've spent whether it's on -- two and a half
25 million dollars a day is being spent today.

1 And the last one is really for you.
2 Eliminate, the stakeholder and the political -- I mean,
3 there are many like you, and I've met them, that don't
4 want it. I mean, here I would like to say we're the
5 Cupid, if you will.

6 Here's the communities that don't want it.
7 Here's the community that wants it and we have the
8 technical solution to make it happen.

9 Who is Holtec? Just in a snapshot, folks, we
10 are a U.S. company, with U.S. manufacturing. The other
11 two that are available to you in the United States is
12 AREVA, that's French, and NAC, and that's Japanese.

13 90 percent of their stuff is made out of India
14 and it's made out in Japan. Hundred percent of ours is
15 made in Ohio and Pennsylvania. And that picture that
16 you see up there, brand new 320 million dollar
17 facility, 350,000 square feet manufacturing, and 250
18 people building, that's going online in the next two
19 months.

20 We've already talked about our -- and we're
21 very, very proud of our alliance and our relationship
22 with that -- with New Mexico. You've already seen
23 where the site is. I just want to also highlight the
24 fourth bullet in terms of the strong support.

25 We cannot thank enough the Governor Martinez.

1 Please look up her letter to the Secretary Moniz, the
2 past DOE, very, very strong support, and you've heard
3 the rest of it from John.

4 Some of the characteristic, for those of you
5 who are a little bit like us, very, very concerned
6 about safety and safety is paramount, absolutely
7 paramount, for what we do. We're very proud it of it.

8 There is a reason why we have 52 percent of
9 the country. It's below grade. It's the only system
10 in the world, not just in the U.S., and it's patented.

11 And right now, Korea is looking at the same
12 system. I was just talking to the Korean delegation.
13 They're talking the same system.

14 We are also, in terms of Holtec, back to a
15 little bit about our experience with interim storage,
16 if you recall, the only license facility is the PFSF,
17 Private Fuel Storage Facility in Utah. That's the only
18 one that's ever been licensed in the United States.
19 And it was licensed. Well, it uses Holtec System. No
20 other system. It uses Holtec System and it was
21 licensed.

22 The other one I want to tell you about is, as
23 we speak, we have been contracted to do the Ukrainian
24 central interim storage. So we're not talking about
25 something we think we can do. We're talking about

1 something we did and we know we can do.

2 The system, as you can see here, it's
3 basically -- when you're looking at this, you're
4 digging about 22 feet, if you will, in terms of in the
5 ground. You put a 3-foot pad and then you put the
6 canisters, then you pour concrete around it or plowable
7 fill, and then you put a 3-foot pad of topping in terms
8 of concrete, and that's what you're looking at it.

9 Literally, yesterday I was at SONGS and I
10 stood as where the height of that will be. It's right
11 about here, right here. Instead of 22 feet, is what
12 the other systems are, including ours, we also have an
13 above ground system. It's 22 feet in lieu of this.
14 That's the system. Very, very similar -- and I
15 congratulate you on choosing that system here for
16 SONGS. I'm happy to report to you is going extremely
17 well. I walked the site myself yesterday.

18 The fourth bullet is very, very important.
19 Our site will host any canister that's deployed in the
20 United States, whether it's AREVA, TN, the old ones
21 that used to be offered by Vectra, every -- BNG, all
22 deployed canisters will be able to fit in the system,
23 very key.

24 And there's no repackaging of the fuel
25 required and it's -- and that makes it a lot easier and

1 faster. From a characteristics operational advantage,
2 it's a single system. You're not talking about
3 multiple systems to store different systems. You're
4 talking about a canister that's -- that's, basically,
5 can be done in one shift, so this won't take forever.

6 And also safety, security and economics is at
7 the core of safety first. In terms of safety, a
8 minimum goes to the environment and the crew. It's
9 virtually immune to hurricanes, floods, of course,
10 we're not going to worry about that in New Mexico, but
11 also tornadoes. Are -- any beyond-design basis, if you
12 will, that's what we like to say in our industry, safe
13 beyond-design basis, and that systems does that.

14 And, also, it was designed to withstand
15 crashing aircraft or onsite with the fires. Our
16 system, believe it or not, is the only one that passed
17 one of those big tests that the Sandia did for the
18 Baltimore fire -- Baltimore -- Baltimore tunnel fire.
19 The only system that passed.

20 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: We should let you go on
21 because we're really very tied on --

22 MR. ONEID: All right. Very quickly, this is
23 the layout. I'll skip through that just to show you
24 that we have been spending a lot of time and money on
25 this. And by the way, this is privately funded. We

1 have not gotten a single penny from DOE or the
2 utilities for this. Okay. This is privately funded.

3 We believe and we're committed to this
4 solution. Finally, on the slides for the two-part
5 approach to licensing, part one, you have to make sure
6 that your system is licensed and then you get into a
7 site specific.

8 So we have already submitted our UMAX, which
9 is the underground system that you have here at SONGS.
10 We added the NUHOMS 24PT1 for you. This is for SONGS.
11 That's what you have.

12 We started immediately with that now so
13 there's no delay and then later, like you see on the
14 bottom, in succession we will include every canister in
15 the United States and the second piece is, we have
16 already conducted the first three.

17 The fourth one, we have just conducted that.
18 We submitted it right on time. About a year and a half
19 ago we said we're going to submit it on March 31st,
20 2017. That's when we submitted it. And we anticipate
21 licensing in three years and we anticipate to be ready
22 by -- by 2022.

23 And now I'm happy to take the Panel and
24 Mr. Chairman's questions.

25 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Jerry Kern.

1 MR. ONEID: I know I've thrown this a way, you
2 know, for your use.

3 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you.
4 Jerry Kern.

5 MR. KERN: I have a couple of questions. One,
6 a thousand acres requires, was that by design? Or -- a
7 thousand acres. And the real question is, is it
8 expandable or do we just go through a whole new
9 licensing process?

10 MR. ONEID: That's a super-question. I want
11 to take you back to this slide right there. See, what
12 happens here, when we talked to John, he said he has a
13 thousand. He says, "How much do you need?" And we
14 said we need initially 30 acres.

15 And then when we looked at the entire country,
16 so you see up there the total capacity is 10,000
17 canisters. 10,000 canisters, that means the 2500
18 deployed now, that's what the number is, it's roughly
19 about 2500. And for the life of all the units that we
20 have, for the life of it, will be 10,000.

21 So for 300 acres -- so it's expandable.
22 That's a great question. It's expandable. We started
23 by licensing 500 and once we get that, we go for the
24 rest. And it's good enough for the rest of the
25 country. And agree with Honorable Pam in terms of the

1 you should not be building power plants without a
2 solution. I agree with that statement, and I believe
3 we have it.

4 MR. KERN: And then the other one, who sets
5 the prioritization of fuel movement? Is that the NRC
6 decision or is that a political decision?

7 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: That is ambiguous.
8 Still under current law and practice and this is a an
9 issue that we have been spending a lot of time, trying
10 to raise to the highest -- the highest levels. You're
11 absolutely right.

12 MR. ONEID: Yeah.

13 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Right now, it's not
14 clear.

15 MR. ONEID: My understanding, Mr. Chairman, is
16 that it's the Department of Energy and the standard
17 contracts and first in -- first out/first in, which
18 means the oldest assemblies get first.

19 Frankly, it's very inefficient because that
20 means you got to go to site A, get the oldest ones
21 there, then go to site B, get the oldest ones there,
22 and then go back to site A. It makes no sense. So I
23 agree in terms of there's a lot of --

24 MR. KERN: I guess. Is that ultimately a
25 political decision?

1 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yes.

2 MR. KERN: And direction from Congress to the
3 DOE?

4 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yes. And let me ask
5 Marni Magda to share with you some terrific work she's
6 done on the standard contract to help flag this issue.

7 Pam Patterson, I saw your flag, next. And
8 then we'll go to Pat. I was going to ask Pam
9 Patterson. The flag is up.

10 MS. PATTERSON: Oh, thank you.

11 With respect to the 2 million dollars that
12 Holtec paid and somebody going to jail with respect to
13 the bribing of quality assurance inspectors, can you
14 please explain to me that situation?

15 MR. ONEID: Happy to. Happy to.

16 You know, in fairness, first it's fake news.
17 You've got the wrong information. And I'm more than
18 happy, personally, to come to your office and spend a
19 considerably time. To answer in two minutes, it's not
20 fair to you and it's not fair to us.

21 We -- we know exactly what happened. This is
22 a 2001 incident, by the way, including the Q&A issue
23 you mentioned, please get to know us. There's nothing
24 not to love about us, seriously.

25 Just try to get to know us. I'm happy to come

1 to your office. And I'm also offering you to come to
2 ours. We'd be delighted, seriously. We'd be delighted
3 if you come see us.

4 There's a reason, folks, why TVA, immediately
5 after that, they gave us 300,000 -- 300 million dollar
6 contract. We, today, have a 10-year contract with TVA.
7 Really? If we were that bad. If we were that bad,
8 would we really be 52 out of 99 units. AREVA has 39
9 and NAC has 7. Really?

10 So, please get to know us. I know --

11 MS. PATTERSON: Well, I think --

12 MR. ONEID: You must have the wrong
13 information.

14 MS. PATTERSON: If you could explain the
15 2 million dollars that you paid? That's -- I mean, why
16 can't you explain that?

17 MR. ONEID: It's very simple. You said --

18 MS. PATTERSON: I think that people here would
19 probably want to know.

20 MR. ONEID: -- it was a fine. You said it was
21 a fine. That's completely erroneous and it's unfair
22 because it was an administrative fee because there
23 was --

24 MS. PATTERSON: And did somebody go to jail
25 regarding the situation?

1 MR. ONEID: -- no wrongdoing. No.

2 MS. PATTERSON: No?

3 MR. ONEID: Nope. Nope. Nope. Believe me.
4 I'm happy -- I'm -- even tonight, I'll stay with you
5 until the morning and explain everything to you.

6 But it's just --

7 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Well, can I just --

8 MR. ONEID: -- not fair to everybody here to
9 answer all this in two minutes.

10 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Can I take as an --

11 MR. ONEID: I am happy to answer them.

12 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Can I take as an action
13 item, I think, a meeting would be helpful.

14 MR. ONEID: Happy to.

15 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: May I send you, please,
16 Pierre, the documents that I have repeatedly shared
17 with this panel so that we can get an additional view
18 from Holtec as to the accuracy or not of that whole
19 perspective. And then, maybe, in the spirit of
20 transparency, you can share with us before or after or
21 both, if you meet with Pam, what you talked about and
22 kind of what Holtec's view is about this.

23 Because, I think it's really important what we
24 understand what happens and I think it's also worrisome
25 that we continue to hear various words used that have

1 very specific legal meaning when, in fact, it seems
2 something very different happened.

3 But let's -- let's have another round of
4 discussion about this. We did this already a year and
5 a half ago. We'll do it again. Pat Bates.

6 PUBLIC MEMBER: Put it on the website.

7 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: The letter that I've
8 shared with the Panel and all the material are on the
9 website already.

10 PUBLIC MEMBER: And explanation.

11 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Of course. Everything
12 that we circulate with the CEP is on the website.

13 Sorry. Lisa Bartlett. It's been a long day
14 for me.

15 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: It's been a long day for
16 us all. Is this on? It's been a long day for all.

17 MS. BARTLETT: Can you hear me? It's
18 practically at -- in my mouth. All right. I know that
19 getting the spent fuel rods off site is extremely
20 important to all of us. You know, it's a significant
21 concern, specially for Orange and San Diego counties.
22 Between the two counties, we've got about 6 million
23 people.

24 Orange County alone is the third largest
25 county in the State of California, 6th largest county

1 by population in America. We're bigger than 22 states.

2 The Nuclear Waste Fund is the primary funding
3 mechanism. It's got about 30 billion dollars in it. I
4 was in Washington, D.C., last week meeting with the
5 legislators. We had a number of very important and
6 informative meetings.

7 What we've got to keep in mind is, we can have
8 all the conversations in the world, but until we get
9 the enabling legislation, we cannot do virtually
10 anything. So that's why our legislators in Washington
11 D.C., are extremely important.

12 We want to support Congressman Darrell Issa's
13 HR474, which was introduced again this year, in 2017,
14 which amends the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 to
15 define the interim consolidated storage and allows the
16 Secretary of Energy to enter into contracts and it
17 provides us some funding.

18 So the Nuclear Waste Storage Act of 2015,
19 which was introduced on a bipartisan basis by coalition
20 of Senators Alexander, Murkowski, Feinstein, and
21 Cantwell. Many aspects of the -- at that legislation
22 are applicable to future legislation.

23 So, in my meetings, I met with Congressman
24 John Shimkus, from Illinois. He's the senior member of
25 the House Energy and Commerce Committee and Chairman of

1 the Environment Subcommittee; a very, very important
2 person. He is going to be calling a lot of shots with
3 regard to moving our project forward.

4 I also met with Congressman Darrell Issa
5 again, who is very intent on pushing forward through
6 the legislation to get interim consolidated storage for
7 us, getting that spent fuel off site.

8 I met with Congresswoman Mimi Walters. She's
9 supportive, but deferring to Congressman Issa on his
10 HR474 Bill. Congressman Dana Rohrabacher is also very
11 supportive in getting the spent fuel rods off site.

12 So the key person that really controls how the
13 spent fuel is going to be handled is Congressman John
14 Shimkus. So write down that name -- very, very
15 important. He is a key person in all of this.

16 There are opposing views regarding a permanent
17 repository, as we've heard before, with regard to Yucca
18 Mountain and consolidated interim storage. The House
19 and the Senate in Washington, D.C., are divided on this
20 issue.

21 Congressman Shimkus basically is putting forth
22 a bill for consolidated interim storage, but not
23 putting it forward if it does not incorporate
24 permanent -- a permanent repository. So he considers
25 that not having the permanent repository irresponsible

1 and feels that the federal government must uphold the
2 laws as it relates to nuclear waste.

3 The environmentalist and the people in
4 Nevada -- Nevada, the representatives there, they
5 oppose Yucca Mountain as a permanent repository.
6 Senator Feinstein will not allow a bill to go through
7 that identifies Yucca Mountain as a permanent
8 repository.

9 So you can see we've got legislators that are
10 on both sides of the isle. So it's really important at
11 this point you've got to contact your legislators in
12 Washington, D.C., in order to get something for
13 enabling legislation to move forward.

14 So with regard to Senator Feinstein, contact
15 her office to reconsider Yucca Mountain as a permanent
16 repository, contact Congressman Darrell Issa, be
17 supportive of his HR474, and contact Congressman John
18 Shimkus to consider consolidated interim storage and
19 not having to mandate for the permanent repository.

20 So if you can contact your legislators is
21 very, very important because, as I stated before, we
22 cannot get anything moving forward with getting those
23 spent fuel rods in dry cask storage off site until we
24 get enabling legislation, allows us for funding, and
25 then we can finally move things forward.

1 So we've got to get the legislators in D.C. to
2 work together to allow for the consolidated interim
3 storage and then, eventually, you know, the permanent
4 repository. And you can see the legislators are all
5 over the map.

6 So, contact people in D.C. They need to hear
7 from you. Because if they don't hear from you, we're
8 not going to get anything done. So, keep that in mind.
9 If you have any questions about addresses or names,
10 feel free to contact my board office in Santa Ana or
11 you can contact my policy advisor Victor Cao, who
12 raised his hand. He's here in the audience.

13 He can get you the names of all the
14 legislators, the addresses to mail. And you want to
15 mail directly to Washington, D.C., not their local
16 offices because their local offices, when they mail, it
17 takes about three weeks to get it through security in
18 Washington, D.C. All right. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very
20 much. And I want to thank you, Pierre, for -- for your
21 comments. Also, Lisa, your summary has saved us
22 sometime after the break because we were going to have
23 a little summary of where we are, and that was a
24 terrific -- a terrific summary.

25 We have had now many plant visits from various

1 members of Congress that come through, including on
2 Monday. Scott Peters will be at the plant. Tom
3 Palmisano will be spending sometime with him, giving
4 him a briefing on where the discussions are and how do
5 we build more support, and he's offered his office to
6 help build more alliances with -- with other
7 communities that are in the same situation.

8 There's a letter on SONGScommunity.com from us
9 to Representative Peters that summarizes those
10 discussions.

11 So this has been a very helpful conversation
12 in a very, very important set of developments. We're
13 quite far overtime, but we're going to take a
14 five-minute break and we're going to have a one-hour
15 public comment period, so that means the meeting is
16 going to run longer than originally advertised, but
17 we're going to allow an hour for public comment and
18 then finish from there.

19 (Five-minute break taken.)

20 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- people to do in terms
21 of informing their legislators is very, very important.
22 We're doing a lot of work in that area as well. And
23 the second thing I want to say very briefly is on the
24 administration front.

25 The administration is, as expected, very

1 enthusiastic about Yucca Mountain. We have not seen
2 the full budget that they're proposing, so we have no
3 real feel. This failure of the Trump administration to
4 fill out key staff positions is a huge problem.

5 There's really nobody to talk to right now in
6 the Department of Energy about these kinds of issues
7 and so we have to kind of see how that percolates out.

8 As we discussed in this panel many times,
9 there's a distinct possibility over this session in
10 Congress to actually get new law. That, of course,
11 assumes that Washington does not become seized by a
12 crisis and there seems to be one per week. But there
13 is a real distinct possibility and serious work going
14 on on the hill right now about these -- these topics,
15 so I think that's very important.

16 Gary Headrick and others have raised questions
17 about -- important questions about whether there's a
18 program that understand how high burn up fuel ages, and
19 so I went off and did some work with the help of Edison
20 and some people at the Department of Energy to put
21 together one little summary slide of a program that is
22 just getting going, that will eventually allow fuel
23 that has been stored in casks for many years, have the
24 casks open up and then see how the high burn up fuel
25 actually ages and its brittleness -- embrittlement and

1 so on.

2 So we'll keep you posted about that program as
3 it develops. Ted Quinn and I -- Ted is not here
4 tonight. He had a business trip. But Ted Quinn and I
5 have spent a lot of time, trying to keep track of
6 what's going on with these kinds of aging management
7 research programs.

8 And I think the last update I want to share
9 with you is upcoming CEP meetings. Tentatively
10 scheduled for August 31st and October 26, the first one
11 about transportation and specially about
12 Defense-in-Depth, a crucially important topic, and the
13 last one for the year, tentatively about easements and
14 leases -- lease in the Department of the Navy, if
15 they're ready to come talk with us about that topic.

16 There's also a lot of other meetings being
17 organized along the way and notices about those being
18 put on SONGScommunity.com. A number of groups in the
19 community have asked some important questions about the
20 geology. We heard a lot about the geology in our last
21 meeting. Today's meeting is not about the geology.

22 It took a while to schedule that meeting,
23 which is actually going to be tomorrow morning, and so
24 several groups are going to sit down with, you know,
25 Driscoll, the geologist who spoke to us last time, and

1 his collaborators, and look at how the data is
2 structured, look at how the models are organized.

3 Neil, I spoke with him earlier today. He's
4 offered to share all the code and, of course, as is
5 normal with academic publication, as each of the papers
6 comes out, to have the data itself publicly available
7 and shared with everybody who wants to look at it and
8 so on.

9 So we'll have a technical -- it'll be a
10 technical discussion about that tomorrow morning. But
11 a summary of that discussion and some of the questions
12 raised and the answers to that will all be shared with
13 the panel and, therefore, the community so that we can
14 make that process as transparent as possible.

15 We now go to the public comment period. We
16 have 40 people who signed up for public comment, so we
17 will literally be here to the point where Pierre is
18 going to take over and talk about what's happening with
19 Holtec late at night.

20 We have an hour for public comment. And,
21 although, we're going to be out of time, we're going to
22 take a whole hour for the public comments, so the
23 meeting is going to run long. We won't get to
24 everybody, most likely, but we will get through as many
25 people as -- can speak in an hour and leave a few

1 minutes at the end for some initial responses from
2 members of the Panel and specially from Edison.

3 So, we have Helen Gaskins and then Daryl Gale.
4 (Brief pause)

5 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Helen Gaskins, are you
6 here?

7 PUBLIC MEMBER: She's outside.

8 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Oh, she's outside.

9 You know what, Daryl, why don't you come up
10 and take the floor first and then when Helen comes
11 inside --

12 PUBLIC MEMBER: She can be next in the line.

13 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: She can be next in the
14 line. The floor is yours, Daryl.

15 MS. GALE: I'm reading from an abstract from
16 April 12 from the California Natural Resources Agency
17 and the California Ocean Protection Council, which I've
18 never heard of them and probably half the people here
19 haven't either, in collaboration with the Governor's
20 office, they prepared a 71-page document to help state
21 and local official prepare for rising seas. The report
22 was created by seven climate scientist experts.

23 This new analysis is based on ice melt at the
24 earth poles. 75 percent of Californians live in a
25 coastal county. It concludes that the thawing of ice

1 sheets will soon become the primary contributor, not
2 melting glaciers, as we previously thought.

3 And it says Greenland has enough ice to raise
4 global sea level by 24 feet and Antarctica, specially
5 Western Antarctica, will be impacting California, has
6 enough to lift oceans 187 feet. So a few weeks ago, we
7 just hit 410 parts per million of carbon in the
8 atmosphere.

9 So now I'm going to segue into my editorial
10 comments: Unfortunately, without the support of our
11 government or the news media, I don't see any massive
12 curtailment of our greenhouse gases producing -- our
13 greenhouse gas producing lifestyle by the federal
14 government private industry or the general population,
15 which means this sea level catastrophe might even be
16 happening sooner than these reports are telling us, you
17 know, about.

18 So, I came downtown -- down here by train this
19 morning. I live in Downtown Los Angeles and I also
20 live in walking distance of Kamala Harri's office. I'm
21 ready to start meeting with her staff and informing
22 them of our waste disposal -- disposal problem, but
23 want to offer -- and I want to offer some potential
24 solutions to discuss and explore.

25 So I invite anyone in front of me or behind me

1 to give me some talking points or join me, come and go
2 to her office because I want to inform the federal
3 government of what we want and what we need.

4 Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much for
6 your comment. Helen Gaskins.

7 PUBLIC MEMBER: She's passing.

8 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Passing, Helen.

9 Gene stone is next and then Yosh Yamanaka
10 after Gene Stone. Gene, the floor is yours.

11 MR. STONE: Thank you.

12 I left you all a little card to send to the
13 administration that you mentioned earlier to talk about
14 your environmental concerns.

15 First of all, I'd like to comment to our NRC
16 guest. Thank you for coming. And I wish you were here
17 at every public meeting. The CEP has done a really
18 good job of bringing the public's attention throughout
19 the country about nuclear waste. As we know, there may
20 be four or five more nuclear power plants
21 decommissioning this year.

22 So while this meeting is important and as
23 Glenn Pascall said earlier, we would be much sadder
24 without it because we'd had no place to gripe. But if
25 the NRC wants to see how meetings could possibly work

1 better, I think this type of meeting is very important,
2 but I think a real community engagement panel run by
3 the communities is much more important because we
4 cannot just be confined by structure all the time.

5 Structure can be designed to stop
6 communication and only to be giving a particular point
7 of view. So, real discussions in the community, CEP
8 panels in the future from other cities, it might be
9 much, much more advantageous to have a decision-making
10 power by that body set by the community.

11 And the other thing, when I was visiting with
12 Pierre and Dr. Singh two years ago, I was ready to
13 drive away with a huge canister. They were such a good
14 salesman. But then I was listening to Dr. Singh and he
15 said, "There's a lot of profit to be made."

16 When I think of the environment, I think there
17 was a lot of profit to be made in cleaning it up. And
18 I'm not sure that I want to put nuclear waste in the
19 hands of people that are only thinking about profit.

20 Thank you very much.

21 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you for your
22 comment, Gene. Yosh Yamanaka and then Gary Headrick.

23 Yosh Yamanaka, the floor is yours.

24 MR. YAMANAKA: Yes. Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Am I mispronouncing your

1 name, by the way?

2 MR. YAMANAKA: No. It's correct.

3 We can talk about safety and assurances until
4 we're blue in the face and I'm sure you consider
5 safety, but I just want to point out that you're all
6 familiar with Dakota access pipeline and just recently
7 last month there was an oil spill at Dakota access
8 notwithstanding all the protest and the water
9 protectors. This has been going on for a year and
10 still Dakota access leaked and it's not even in full
11 operation, so I just want SoCal Edison to keep that in
12 mind. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much for
14 your comment. Gary Headrick and then Laurie Headrick.

15 MR. HEADRICK: Good evening. I had a speech
16 prepared and there's so many things going through my
17 mind right now, I just have to speak my mind.

18 And let you know that I've been pretty
19 critical of the CEP because it's one-sided in the sense
20 that we're not hearing from independent nuclear
21 experts. We're hearing a very convincing persuasive
22 argument to do exactly what Edison wants and we are
23 getting no solid answers on very critical issues, like,
24 I'll bring up two that were over a year long.

25 I wanted to know what are the -- what are the

1 responses we're going to have if we have a criticality
2 event in either the spent fuel pool where something
3 goes nuclear reactive or in a dry cask storage, and I
4 want to know what we're prepared in order to prevent
5 it.

6 I think there is too much emphasis on how
7 we're going to get this out of here. You're playing on
8 our fears to want this out of here immediately and rush
9 to judgment without peer review from people that we
10 trust.

11 Because I said it before, I'll be brief, but
12 the history with the NRC and Edison is horrible. You
13 guys approved so many terrible things when the plant
14 was operating. You almost caused us to have a nuclear
15 meltdown from all the steam generated problem. You
16 didn't listen to us then. You didn't listen to the
17 whistle blowers that told us that was going to happen
18 and then it happened.

19 And you're talking tonight like you're -- you
20 have some view into the future where nothing's going to
21 go wrong. Things go wrong in WIPP, right? I didn't
22 hear anything about WIPP's failure.

23 And then, you know, we talked about educating
24 the public. This is not educating. This is getting a
25 sales job. I would not buy a car from you. I'm sorry.

1 But I have the documents that show Holtec, a little
2 semantics game there.

3 You were fined 2 million dollars for the
4 bribery attempt and TVA did their good job to catch you
5 at that and you're disbarred for a period of time and
6 then you got this massive contract.

7 You know, that's a good deal. Two million
8 bucks, that's a good investment. You got how much, 33
9 million following that or more than that, right. It's
10 just obscene that we are listening to for-profit only
11 and we're not getting independent experts, telling us
12 that, you know, "Wait a minute. Maybe we shouldn't
13 rush to take these steps."

14 And I don't even pretend to know what the
15 right steps are. All I know is the people that helped
16 us through the steam generator project are not being
17 consulted now. And I think the 2 million dollars that
18 Dr. Singh said he would pay if we proved that he was
19 lying, which I think I have the documents right here
20 that prove you're lying and said it's an administrative
21 fee instead of a fine.

22 You take that two million dollars and you fund
23 an independent panel of experts that we trust and we'll
24 get some answers that we need right now before we make
25 a critical mistake. I'm tired of this. You guys are

1 reckless and you're misleading the good people, the
2 CEP, because we don't have that extra input.

3 So let's get on it. Let's do it right. We're
4 setting the example for the nation. We've got to get
5 this right.

6 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much for
7 your comment. Laurie Headrick. Laurie Headrick is
8 passing and then Jerry Howard and then Charles Langley.
9 Jerry Howard? No? Okay. Charles Langley and then
10 Aron North.

11 MR. LANGLEY: Hi, my name is Charles Langley.
12 I'm with the Public Watchdogs and I would like so seed
13 my time, Mr. Palmisano, to Angela Mooney D'Arcy from
14 the Juaneno Band of the Acjachemen Nation.

15 MS. MOONEY D'ARCY: Hi, everybody. Thank you.

16 I'm here on behalf of Sacred Places Institute
17 for Indigenous Peoples. I live in L.A., so it took me
18 a billion hours to get here. And I wasn't here at the
19 beginning of the meeting, but I'm told that someone
20 says that the native nations, for whom this area is
21 significant, have been consulted, and that's actually
22 not the case.

23 I was on the phone with the attorney for
24 San Luis Rey Nation earlier today and I was just at the
25 House of the Tribal Manager for the Juaneno Band of

1 Mission Indians Acjachemen Nation, and I have these
2 letters here today from them and also a Letter from
3 Sacred Places Institute, requesting
4 government-to-government consultation with the
5 appropriate bodies.

6 So, clearly if that consultation had happened,
7 if any sort of meaningful outreach had happened, then I
8 wouldn't be standing here with letters signed by this
9 native nations requesting government-to-government
10 consultation.

11 Additionally, I do just want to highlight the
12 fact that while recent -- our Western Archeological
13 Science dates our existence here at about 15,000 years,
14 you may be aware that there was a recent report from
15 National Geographic that just came out a couple of
16 weeks ago that found human edgings on mammoth's bones,
17 so then places our time here at about 150,000 years.

18 And so specifically when you're talking about
19 something like nuclear waste storage, I -- it behooves
20 you to engage with the only people here in this place
21 that have an extensive period of time here that post
22 dates the amount of time that that nuclear waste is
23 going to be harmful, right.

24 You need to engage with and consult with the
25 local native nations and it's just shameful that

1 despite the fact that these governments have been in
2 existence for thousands and thousands of years, there's
3 no representation of either Acjachemen or San Luis Rey
4 Luiseno People on the Community Engagement Panel.

5 Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thanks. Thank
7 you for your comment. Aron North and then Kaila
8 Higgins.

9 MR. NORTH: Thank you. So this is my first
10 time ever coming to one of these and it's been very
11 eye-opening. There is a relative calm amongst the
12 Panel and I find it a little bit frightening. Sorry.
13 It's the first time.

14 So I just have some general questions and,
15 again, being a novice, this may have been answered
16 previously. But I'm very interested, since we're
17 talking about a vertical cask and we're putting it 22
18 feet deep and you said it was like this (indicating),
19 I'm curious what sort of studies you guys have done on
20 earthquake preparedness for these types of canisters.

21 And if you do have it, love to have it
22 published online so we could understand what that is,
23 because we live on two fault lines and we're talking
24 about a piece of land right next to the ocean.

25 Also, there was a comment earlier about

1 looking for exclusions on insurance and that -- that's
2 bothersome to me because, I think, the way I view it --
3 again, novice -- is you're held -- the nuclear plant
4 hold each other sort of liable, right.

5 So they all put this money in a fund and then,
6 if something goes wrong, the other nuclear power plants
7 or shareholders have to pay for it.

8 Well, our time here, in the time with the
9 power plant, even though is not generating power, I
10 feel like those entities still should be liable and, if
11 we don't have those exclusions, it's going to put
12 incremental eyes on this project because there's going
13 to be more shareholders and more power plants that are
14 going to be accountable for any mistakes. So I would
15 actually like to recommend that you don't look for that
16 exception and you maintain it.

17 And then just a couple of other -- just
18 thoughts. So I'm wondering if in this transition
19 process when you're moving radioactive materials from
20 one state to another, is there a real-time monitor or
21 radioactive activity around the plant? And is it
22 something that's publicly available on a website where
23 you can see if there's a push up in radioactive
24 contaminants in the air?

25 And then I was just curious as well, when it

1 comes to storage, is that where, like, traditional
2 storage, where if you have a public storage facility
3 you pay a monthly fee? Or is this us paying and it's
4 gone and it's gone forever? Is it ever coming back?

5 So those are things that I just don't
6 understand. I'd love to see it posted on the website.

7 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much.

8 Just by way of reminder, we collect these
9 comments, we'll answer some tonight, but then all the
10 comments are going to be collected and there'll be
11 answers to all the comments, and so let's make sure
12 that for those of you who haven't been to our meetings
13 before that you understand that process and, also, if
14 you don't see answers, let us know and we'll get
15 answers for you.

16 Kaila Higgins and then Judy Jones, I believe.

17 Kaila? Judy Jones and then Bob Hope.

18 Are you Kaila?

19 MS. HIGGINS: It's Kaila.

20 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I'm sorry for
21 mispronouncing your name, Kaila. Did I pronounce your
22 last name correct?

23 MS. HIGGINS: Higgins, yeah.

24 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Higgins. Okay. Hi.

25 MS. HIGGINS: Hi.

1 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. The floor is
2 yours.

3 MS. HIGGINS: It absolutely makes no sense to
4 bury nuclear waste in an area which is surrounded by
5 8.5 million people. I don't understand why the Coastal
6 Commission can bypass the general public's concern of
7 the Southern California Edison.

8 I think you should make better decisions
9 because you are supposed to be representing the
10 citizens of the community. We are saying no, but you
11 individuals are ignoring our demands.

12 Our generation has to clean up for the mess
13 your generation is making. When your organization are
14 risking the safety of children and the future, surely
15 you feel some type of responsibility. If you don't,
16 then you should not be in the position of making
17 choices for the general public.

18 Most of the Panel will not be alive in 20
19 years from now. Don't you think it's kind of selfish
20 and greedy to destroy the lives of others?

21 It's obvious that nuclear companies and
22 coastal commissions are working together, but what
23 you're doing is creating a negative environment for
24 future generations. Please find a better place to
25 better your problems somewhere else.

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you. Thank you
3 for your comment and for your confidence in our
4 longevity. Judy Jones and then Bob Hope.

5 MS. JONES: I'm going to plan to live to a
6 hundred now. I'm Judy Jones. I'm citizen of
7 San Clemente.

8 And I think that you did receive a brief
9 summary of some work that Donna Gilmore and I have been
10 doing on looking at the proposed Nuclear Waste Policy
11 Amendments Act of 2014.

12 This was at -- in hearings last week and this
13 is not -- this is not the Issa one, but this is the one
14 having hearings and Issa's just seems to be stalled and
15 not having hearings, so Shimkus, I think, is the person
16 to pay attention to.

17 So we -- we would like to tell our elected
18 officials and have people here in the community tell
19 your elected officials to oppose that NWPA amendment
20 because it eliminates state and local control water
21 rights and other utility rights.

22 It eliminates state and local oversight of the
23 facility. It eliminates requirements for a
24 site-specific environmental impact report. It
25 eliminates requirements for monitor to retrievable fuel

1 storage for preventing radioactive leaks.

2 It eliminates authorizations currently
3 required by Congress and other checks and balances. It
4 gives lots of power to the Secretary of the DOE and the
5 President and Congress and state governors and so on
6 cannot do anything. It's the way a lot of it is
7 written there.

8 It eliminates requirements to prioritize
9 safety and environmental protections over the cost and
10 speed and says that the DOE can just do something
11 because it'll be faster and cost less.

12 It eliminates requirements to consider
13 transport issues before selecting a site. It kind of
14 does that one backwards. Some of these changes or
15 these eliminations are also appropriate to look at in
16 the Issa bill. So if you look at them careful, I'd
17 appreciate everybody doing that. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very
19 much for your comment. And if you want to share it
20 with me, the email that has that document, we can make
21 that part of the communications of the CEP.

22 MS. JONES: Okay. I will.

23 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Bob Hope and then, I
24 believe, Kevin Higgins.

25 Bob Hope, the floor is yours.

1 MR. HOPE: Thank you.

2 There are documented accounts of Holtec
3 canisters developing cracks at other locations around
4 the world. And my question to Pierre is, what is the
5 seismic rating of a partially cracked canister?

6 And then the slides that Tom Palmisano shared
7 showing the weights, the mass of the canisters being
8 loaded and how the canisters that are currently being
9 loaded or planned to be loaded weigh so much that they
10 can't be transported by railroad.

11 What we didn't hear is that if you only loaded
12 those canisters with half the number of fuel rods, they
13 would be transportable using the current rail system.

14 And another thing we didn't hear is that if
15 you didn't fully load the canisters, the casks, they
16 would actually cool more quickly and become
17 transportable sooner.

18 So I'd like to ask, have we considered only
19 partially loading casks and having more casks or did
20 you just decide to go with the maximum capacity, for
21 some other reason?

22 And I want to restate what Gary Headrick
23 stated and that was, whoever spoke on the WIPP facility
24 and they spoke of it as if it's one third full and it
25 kind of sounded like is receiving waste, but there was

1 a nuclear accident there that contaminated the interior
2 of the WIPP facility and is not presently receiving
3 waste.

4 And it would've been nice if the person who
5 spoke about that would've been forthcoming and shared
6 that with us. And my final comment is that the USGS,
7 in 2015, acknowledged that the risk for an earthquake
8 in Southern California, an 8.0 or higher magnitude
9 quake for Southern California in the next 20 years is
10 more likely than not.

11 If that "more likely than not" should happen
12 in calendar year 2017, what does any of what you shared
13 today matter? Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Can you just say --
15 since you talked about Southern California, can you
16 just quickly, Bob Hope, tell us what do you mean by
17 Southern California? Because, it really matters which
18 fault system we're talking about, as you know.

19 MR. HOPE: I understand that. The USGS didn't
20 acknowledge individual fault systems. Collectively,
21 the fault systems in Southern California, more likely
22 than not, for an 8.0 or greater magnitude quake in the
23 next 20 calendar years from the 2015 study.

24 Thank you

25 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you. I just

1 wanted to make sure the record was clear about what you
2 said. Kevin Higgins and then Russ Tanton.

3 MR. HIGGINS: Hello. Sorry about that. And
4 the microphone now. Anyway, just very quickly, the
5 comments that were made by Pam, I feel that her
6 comments are accurate because that's what the general
7 public wants to know.

8 I mean, when I talk to people where I live in
9 the City of Temecula, I own four properties out there,
10 and I'm thinking downwind. Okay. Tim was talking
11 about San Clemente in regards to downwinders and some
12 of his family members had died from the downwinders,
13 what I'm curious to know, how is it possible that if I
14 go to Disneyland and I can't smoke a cigarette, they'll
15 arrest you basically for having a cigarette on there,
16 how can you bury -- what is it? 300,000 pounds of
17 nuclear waste at a facility where you have 8.5 million
18 people, no evacuation plan in place?

19 I mean, we know that. All you have to do is
20 look at the fire that took place, I think, it was two
21 years ago, down by San Onofre and the traffic got
22 backed up on the freeway, the 5, going each direction.

23 You couldn't get out. There is no emergency
24 plan in place and you know that. I mean, if there was
25 a nuclear accident, when would the public know? That's

1 one of the biggest concerns that I have.

2 Because if you live directly downwind and the
3 winds are blowing and they go over the mountains of --
4 what's the place? -- Camp Pendleton and then down to
5 Temecula, you wipe out that whole area.

6 I mean, and the other thing is, on the Panel,
7 what I'd really like to see is a radiologist or
8 somebody that could indicate what radiation does. I
9 have no idea. I mean, I know that it's harmful, but I
10 don't know what it does.

11 And I'd love to see radiologist on board. I
12 would love to see someone on the other side of the
13 nuclear industry, like Arnie Gundersen, who spoke and
14 speaks on the other side of it. Some representatives
15 that can actually tell us the other side of the story.

16 Granted, I respect everybody on the Panel. I
17 mean, obviously, you guys are experts. But the general
18 public doesn't understand what you guys are saying a
19 lot of times. We're sitting there going, "What the
20 heck is going on here?"

21 Because we want to know -- these questions
22 over here, for example, how can you guys have a nuclear
23 facility then, all of a sudden, it's, like, "Wow, what
24 were you going to do with this stuff?" We don't know
25 what to do with it.

1 Now you're telling the general public don't
2 worry about it. But it's 300,0000 pounds of -- and I
3 don't know if I'm right, but I've heard that -- of
4 nuclear waste that want to be stored with 8.5 million
5 people. I don't know. Add up the numbers in regards
6 to real estate if there's a nuclear accident. What is
7 it? 225 billion, maybe. I'm not sure. But that's
8 just with the 10-mile radius, what the NRC says, that's
9 the evacuation zone, when we know that if there's a
10 nuclear accident, it's going to be much wider.

11 So, thank you, for everybody that's on the
12 Panel. Thank you for trying to answer some of the
13 questions. But these questions over here are important
14 to the public. That's -- that's what we want to hear.

15 Okay. Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much for
17 your comment. Next we have Russ Tanton and then Nina
18 Babiarz.

19 MR. TANTON: Thank you.

20 I've got two areas of concern that, I think,
21 need addressing that I have not heard addressed:

22 One is the earthquake safety.

23 And I noticed from your documentation, you
24 talk about the fact that the containers are designed to
25 withstand a 1.5G acceleration, and the requirements

1 are -- right now are .38.

2 I think that's based on old data and that .38
3 is probably wrong because a New Zealand study has
4 recently shown that earthquakes, even though they're
5 separated by more than seven to 10 kilometers, can
6 trigger another one.

7 In other words, it's very likely that the
8 San Andreas Fault could very likely trigger the New --
9 Newport/Inglewood Fault at the same time. That is new
10 information that just appeared in science magazines.

11 So I don't think you're really looking at the
12 requirements that you may need to withstand an
13 earthquake.

14 The second area that I've got concern with is
15 with 3/16th stainless, that's the container for
16 storage:

17 It's well known that the 3/16th stainless can
18 suffer stress corrosion cracking and there is currently
19 no procedure in place to look at stress corrosion
20 cracking and study it as it's happening.

21 Looking at it with a dosimeter is only
22 something that you can determine after the fact, after
23 you've had a failure. You're not -- you're not looking
24 at whether there's a potential for failure. If that
25 container fails, you have no way of handling it.

1 I think everyone looks at their stainless
2 steel refrigerator and assumes that it's much -- it's
3 very uniform, shiny, smooth surface. But if you look
4 at the microstructure, it's really no different than a
5 piece of granite. It has crystals in it. They're just
6 much smaller and it can be subject to cracking, just
7 like your stainless steel countertop.

8 Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you for your
10 comment. Nina Babiarez and then Robert Johnson.

11 MR. BABIARZ: Well, good evening.

12 My name is Nina Babiarez. I'm a board member
13 Public Watchdogs and I have a few questions.

14 First of all, Tom Palmisano, you mentioned
15 earlier an insurance exemption exactly for a
16 non-operating plant. But I'd like to know what
17 insurance, what pool of insurance money there is, if
18 any, for the waste that's going into the ground if
19 something should occur. I want to know what that pot
20 of money is and who is -- who is paying for it and how
21 much it is.

22 Secondly, a question for Mr. Palmisano: You
23 indicated tonight that the design life of these
24 canisters is 100 years, but my understanding, in the
25 warranty documents, that the design life is indicated

1 as 60. So I would like some explanation to that
2 discrepancy, please.

3 And then, also, I noticed what was missing
4 from your PowerPoint tonight. You know, the California
5 Coastal Commission granted a permit to bury this waste
6 under special conditions and one of those special
7 conditions, No. 2, is an aging management system.

8 Your February presentation, your application
9 indicated you don't have the technology, you don't know
10 how you're going to get the technology, and the Coastal
11 Commission is not requiring you to demonstrate that
12 technology for 20 years.

13 So where is the aging management update, the
14 monitoring system for those casks once they go into the
15 ground. The last February update that was provided was
16 that you were in collaboration with some industry
17 partners. Well, we want to know what the status of
18 that is as well.

19 And I'm really glad that somebody from the NRC
20 is here because when Edison applied for to the NRC and
21 got massive emergency planning exemptions, under the
22 auspices that the plant was closed and the risk of a
23 radiological accident was low.

24 Other than Edison making that claim, what
25 proof or what professional risk assessment was ever

1 conducted? On June 4th of 2015, when the NRC granted
2 Edison massive emergency planning exemptions, what, if
3 any, risk assessment was ever done regarding the burial
4 of that waste on a bluff that it doesn't take a nuclear
5 physicist to figure out is vulnerable?

6 The California Coastal Commission, the very
7 agency that granted that permit, is requiring the
8 coastal communities all the way up the coast to do
9 sea-level rise studies.

10 Del Mar finished their last year and
11 recommend -- one of the recommendations was to relocate
12 railroad the rail line. So, you know, I want to know
13 exactly some answers to those questions in terms of why
14 would we even be considering putting this on a bluff
15 that we everybody knows is about to crumble.

16 And why in God's name would you grant
17 exemptions for emergency planning and change an
18 emergency plan and not even talk about that in a
19 communicate engagement meeting? So those are the
20 answers that we need. Those are the questions.

21 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you for your
22 comment. Rog -- Roger Johnson and then Karen Hadden.

23 We'll come back at the end of the meeting and
24 give a few folks a chance to talk about that and many
25 other topics. Roger Johnson, the floor is yours.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

2 A little while ago, Jim Leach asked the
3 question "What do you mean by short term?" And
4 everybody broke out in laughter, and we can't even
5 answer something like that. I think we realize that
6 short-term probably means indefinitely, and that's what
7 we're worried about.

8 We're worried once that waste goes over the
9 ISFSI plant, it's never going to leave, now, specially
10 if there are any cracked canisters and my guess is that
11 there's a lot of evidence that that's a possibility.

12 It won't be able to be moved. It's going to
13 be here forever. So a lot of this has to do with
14 long-term planning that Pam raised up.

15 The record is abyss in the long-term planning.
16 If we go back to the last century, let's take an
17 example, the whole nuclear industry was founded on a
18 principle that is all going to disappear by 1998. That
19 was really terrible planning. And then they raised it
20 again.

21 Now, listening to some of these slide shows
22 tonight, I see long-term planning. And what's
23 happening, one of the things that doesn't happen is,
24 you don't anticipate the unanticipated.

25 Two days ago, what happened in Hanford? Oh,

1 Really? It's possible that a stupid accident like
2 that? And then a little while ago, the gentleman from
3 New Mexico is bragging about the WIPP plan in Carlsbad,
4 New Mexico. That's an example of a failure.

5 The plant was closed. There were fires,
6 explosions, radiation leaks. They spent billions of
7 dollars trying to fix it. It's still not fixed.
8 That's part of the problem.

9 So, New Mexico is so expert at this, then --
10 their record is not -- is not very keen. So, anybody
11 who presents the WIPP as a model, forget about it.

12 Another thing I don't like about anticipating
13 the future in the long-range planning is the narrowing
14 of the hazards and we've seen almost all of the
15 discussions focus on the canisters, and I think that's
16 Edison's agenda.

17 But I think the major problem is probably
18 terrorism. Anybody in a truck bomb, in a boat, cruise
19 missile, drone, Korea could fire a missile. It doesn't
20 need to be nuclear because the nuclear stuff was
21 already here. Terrorism is a real danger.

22 And if there's a radioactive plume that covers
23 Southern California, we don't care whether it was an
24 earthquake or terrorist attack or an accident or a
25 human error or faulty canisters, we're going to all be

1 irradiated. So I'd like to see this addressed, these
2 issues.

3 I support Bob Hope's comment about getting
4 smaller casks. The problem is magnified by having
5 Edison use the 37-assembly canisters. If they went
6 back to the 24 or 22, it would cool faster. It'd be
7 lighter. It could be shipped out, everything would be
8 easier. Yes, it cost more money. But let's do the
9 right thing.

10 Finally, we need consent-based siting. They
11 brag about it in New Mexico. Good for you. Nobody
12 here supports this plan. Why doesn't -- why can't we
13 have consent-based siting and they have it in
14 New Mexico. There is no consent. We don't want it
15 here. Let's get it out. Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much for
17 your comment. Karen Hadden and then Ray Lutz.

18 PUBLIC MEMBER: I'm not sure, but we can
19 check.

20 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: No, I haven't. No.
21 You're still on the list. I know, you're three down
22 the list. We'll get to you in a second.

23 Karen Hadden, I believe you have a slide; is
24 that right?

25 MS. HADDEN: That's right.

1 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay.

2 MS. HADDEN: Hi. My name is Karen Hadden.
3 I'm delighted to be here in California. I'm from
4 Texas. I work with SEED Coalition. We work with
5 people in Texas and New Mexico. Our state agency put
6 the quote at the top of this, that they were worried
7 about sabotage or terrorism incidents during
8 transportation and said the risks are greater than
9 storage.

10 Let's go ahead. Next slide, please.

11 So our organization is opposed to consolidated
12 interim storage. We think that a permanent repository
13 needs to be found and a real solution, which Yucca
14 Mountain is not.

15 And we support California moving this waste up
16 the coast because, out of every site we see, this one
17 has huge peril of living it in place. However, it
18 doesn't make sense to haul waste all around the whole
19 country just to store it somewhere else.

20 We need to have a real repository. And,
21 certainly, if California wanted to store it for a while
22 somewhere and then it could later be moved to a
23 repository. Great.

24 But a consolidated interim storage means from
25 all over the county just to store it in another

1 location and they're going to still keep making it, it
2 means one more site that needs to be guarded and
3 secured.

4 These are folks from Andrews County. They
5 want you to know that they do not support this and they
6 do not want to be dumped on.

7 Next slide. This is people at the hearing in
8 Andrews County where waste control specialists had --
9 has had their offices as well as in Dallas. They say,
10 "We don't want it" in terms of radioactive waste.

11 Next one.

12 Resolutions have been passed by many county
13 commissions now opposing high-level radioactive waste,
14 dumping and transport through the communities. There
15 are county commissioners in San Antonio, Dallas, county
16 commissioners in Dallas, City of San Antonio, Midland
17 County, resolution similarly have been passed by the
18 Lone Star Chapter of Sierra Club in Texas, the Rio
19 Grande Chapter of Sierra Club in New Mexico, and the
20 Texas Democratic Party. This represents millions of
21 people.

22 We are being portrayed -- next slide.

23 Once more the message is going out, "Don't
24 dump on us."

25 Next slide.

1 This is the DOE, who went around the whole
2 country, telling everybody that Texas and New Mexico
3 wanted radioactive waste. And somebody earlier said,
4 "Oh, maybe, they'll want the money" or whatever. But
5 you know what, a few people want the money that stand
6 the profit.

7 And the DOE went around to Atlanta,
8 Sacramento, Denver, Boston, Tempe, Boise, and
9 Minneapolis, and you see that big glaring hole in the
10 middle of the country, they never set foot in Texas or
11 New Mexico while they were trying to gain consent and
12 we were ground zero and there was already an active NRC
13 application on the table.

14 Thank you. Next slide.

15 This is what we think would be the radioactive
16 waste transport routes from around the whole country,
17 West Texas, New Mexico could get dumped on by all U.S.
18 reactors. Waste control wants 40,000 metric tons. I
19 believe that Eddy-Lea wants 100,000 tons.

20 This is literally thousands of shipments
21 across the whole country that would take 20 years.

22 I'll wrap up.

23 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you for your --
24 thank you for your comment. Ray Lutz and then Torgen
25 Johnson.

1 PUBLIC MEMBER: Give her a little break.

2 MR. BROWN: Taking time from other people.

3 PUBLIC MEMBER: She came from Texas.

4 MS. HADDEN: Can I wrap up? I'm very close to
5 finishing.

6 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Sure. Wrap up.

7 MS. HADDEN: Thank you.

8 Next slide.

9 We're right next to the Ogallala Aquifer.
10 Again, millions of people could become contaminated by
11 these sites, if there was a waste release.

12 Go ahead.

13 Extreme desert temperatures. The Holtec cask
14 are rated for 101 degrees. We get up to 110. There's
15 lightening, tornadoes, and there are earthquakes in the
16 region, and wild fires. That train wreck was two
17 trains head-on 65 miles per hour. This stuff is pretty
18 risky to put on trains.

19 Go ahead.

20 Accident impact can result in facilities and
21 so forth.

22 Okay. Go ahead.

23 What should be done? Don't move the waste
24 twice, don't use consolidated storage, set a repository
25 first. And if you set up consolidated storage, all the

1 pressure is off for the real -- I'm wrapping up -- all
2 the pressure would be off for a real solution, and the
3 waste casks would be bake and crack and be stuck in one
4 site with no political pressure to ever find the right
5 solution. We could have a massive contamination that
6 would affect entire country for decades and millions of
7 years.

8 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you for your
9 comment. Ray Lutz is next and then Torgen Johnson.

10 MR. LUTZ: Hello, Panel. This is -- my name
11 is Ray Lutz. I'm with Citizens' Oversight and I have
12 some questions firs to pose.

13 The DOE and the NRC published a generic
14 environmental impact statement, but the concept that I
15 understood was that it would be reviewed to make sure
16 that it fits with local conditions.

17 Cassie E. prepared a specific environmental
18 impact statement regarding the ISFSI. Secondly,
19 Palmisano says the fuel canisters can be shipped
20 relatively right away. How much experience do we have
21 in actually shipping these specific canisters or is it
22 all just theory?

23 I note that Alison McFarland, when she was
24 here said it would take 45 years before the canisters
25 could be moved. This is a critical point because it

1 appears that the canisters did not need to be cool
2 substantially, according to Palmisano, and they could
3 be moved immediately to the storage location, if we can
4 find it.

5 But we need to resolve that question.
6 Thirdly, we noticed that the new ISFSI is located
7 directly over the old Unit 1 reactor site. Has the
8 radioactivity of the Unit 1 reactor been cleaned up or
9 is the location of the ISFSI a convenient way to cover
10 up a very contaminated site?

11 And that would explain the ridiculous place
12 that is being located, only 150 feet from the water.
13 The reason is there is probably because it's a cover
14 up.

15 Thirdly, one issue with CIS is, who has the
16 liability for the waste. Because, they don't want the
17 liability. Who has the liability? And I understand
18 this is a key issue.

19 Suggestion: NRC inspection report should be
20 posted on the SONGS community website.

21 Now, as you know, Citizens' Oversight has sued
22 the Coastal Commission and the indisputable additional
23 party of Southern California Edison where it talks
24 about this.

25 We do not want this site built. It looks like

1 now we're very, very close to having the solution. The
2 fuel pools, if you ask a nuclear person, are very, very
3 safe. In fact, the nuclear plant is very, very risky
4 and the fuel pools, by comparison, are almost not risky
5 at all.

6 Thank God the nuclear plant isn't running
7 because that was our largest risk factor. Now we have
8 a fuel pool and now they're saying canisters are much
9 safer than a fuel pool. I beg to differ. Specially,
10 specially if you put them this close to the ocean.
11 It's probably about the same.

12 We're wasting money by building this big block
13 of concrete, which then we have to treat a radioactive
14 waste and clean up again a second time. We should wait
15 a few years that we need to to get these other sites
16 going.

17 So I challenge everybody here, join with us.
18 Say no to this ridiculous place. And I say directly to
19 Edison, you do not have to follow through on this
20 permit. You've gotten the permit, you can say no.

21 I realize it is stupid what we're doing. It's
22 insane. And we're not going to do it. It's your
23 choice. You do not have to follow through, so don't do
24 it. And everybody in these cities should send a letter
25 directly to Edison and say, "Please don't follow

1 through with your insane permit. It's wrong."

2 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you for your
3 comment. Torgen Johnson and then Nathan Gibbs.

4 Torgen Johnson, the floor is yours.

5 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

6 Almost four years ago, my wife and I invited
7 the Former Prime Minister of Japan to come to Southern
8 California to speak at a conference we organized. It
9 was held down at the County Administrator Center in
10 San Diego. We had one county supervisor support
11 that -- that conference.

12 We televised it. And we had a lot of Japanese
13 press and a lot of local press there. The lessons
14 there were from him. Accidents happen and plan for
15 them. He said, "Severe accidents happen and expect
16 them."

17 He also said that the fuel was the thing that
18 he was most fearful of, losing control of the fuel.
19 And he said that they had contingency plans in the
20 early days of that accident to evacuate out 160 miles,
21 not 2 miles or 10 miles, or like the inter --
22 Interjurisdictional Planning Committee has told us, you
23 know, we've got 10 miles and we have an ingesting zone
24 that goes out 20 miles or 15 miles.

25 The purpose of that conference was to hear the

1 truth about these things. I think the CEP should stand
2 for citizens engagement or maybe citizens education
3 process rather than a sales job and really kind of
4 co-opting people from the community to sit up here and,
5 really, be over their heads on this issue; we all are.

6 And I want to say that sophomore jokes about
7 your genitalia or present genitalia shows me that this
8 is not a serious discussion. We need to bring
9 independent experts that can talk on this issue, with
10 an understanding of the severity of an accident and
11 sequences to the 7th largest economy in the world,
12 which is California office space down here in Southern
13 California.

14 I think you need to engage the public. You
15 need to engage the real risk, the real stakeholders,
16 which are the real estate industry, the industry that's
17 down at 78 Corridor, South Orange County, all the
18 businesses there, and the tourism industry here, and
19 have them part of this discussion, because the
20 discussion is very different when you're bringing
21 people outside of those who are over their heads and
22 those who are here to profit from this industry, one
23 way or another.

24 There is -- there's independent thought out
25 there. And I think the Primer Minister of Japan had a

1 very clearly perspective on that. He said, "I almost
2 lost Japan as a viable nation." Nobody's ever heard
3 that before. So when we think about the fuel and,
4 really, the sequences of a severe accident here, my big
5 concern is, I'm hearing -- I'm hearing people talk
6 about saving a few million dollars.

7 I hear kind of a salesman steals jobs, it
8 really concern me. When I hear about private industry
9 taking over fuel storage and securing fuel that's going
10 to be -- need to be babysat for 10,000 years, I don't
11 even see a government that's able to do that much less
12 an industry that's susceptible to mergers and
13 acquisitions. By who? Who is overseeing these
14 companies as they morph and their liabilities morph,
15 and they -- and they shift responsibility back to who,
16 the public.

17 I think this -- this CEP Panel, I know it's
18 not a decision-making panel -- I know my time is out --
19 but use our time wisely, educate the elected officials
20 on what the real issues are, what are our real options
21 are. They're not many and, at the best, they're pretty
22 lousy. That's the truth with this fuel.

23 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you for your
24 comment.

25 MR. JOHNSON: And I just want to say one thing

1 about consent, there has never been consent in any
2 aspect of this power plant and now the storage of the
3 fuel is -- again, there has been no public consent on
4 that outside, maybe, Tim Brown. I think he's the one
5 person who consent to this. But I think, outside of
6 that, I think the rest of us are really kind of worried
7 about what we're looking at going forward with this
8 fuel being left on the beach indefinitely.

9 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Nathan -- Nathan Gibbs
10 and then Karl Aldinger. Let me just say that we
11 have -- we have less than 10 minutes for the public
12 comment period, and we're only at comment number 21,
13 and so a number of people, because of the time, will be
14 unable to speak, but we'll make all the folks who
15 wanted to speak that information available.

16 And you come to the next CEP meeting, we'll
17 find a way that -- to make sure you don't get left off
18 the list when we run out of time.

19 Nathan Gibbs and then Karl Aldinger.

20 MR. GIBBS: All right. I come to you as a
21 resident, obviously, of South Orange County, a school
22 teacher and an avid user of the ocean and the beach.

23 I moved to California actually to live near
24 this particular stretch of ocean and coastline from
25 Dana Point to San Onofre. I choose to raise my

1 children there as well, frolicking in the shoreline and
2 learning to surf.

3 This is probably something you've already
4 heard many times at these meetings. This is the first
5 meeting I've been to. And so, while we may not be
6 facing a current threat from a foreign nation on our
7 shores at this time, I am very nervous, standing here
8 talking to you about this because I know it is at
9 stake.

10 I'm also very nervous because I know things --
11 if things do not change, we run the risk of
12 endangering, not only my family, friends, livelihood
13 but everyone in this room, including yourselves.

14 Having nuclear waste stored here is our
15 greatest threat and residents around the area should
16 and are treating it as such.

17 With that said, I did find it odd when I moved
18 here that a nuclear power plant would be stuck on a
19 coastline near an earthquake fault and in a possible
20 tsunami zone. It was a little odd. But, hey, what do
21 I know? I'm not a nuclear physicist.

22 I was even shocked when I was given free
23 iodine pills when I moved to San Clemente. I thought
24 that was something that was quite interesting, but I
25 appreciated that.

1 To store unusable nuclear waste near
2 coastlines seems illogical, so I'm here today not to
3 yell and be angry, but I am going to tell you of a
4 conversation I had with my 8-year-old daughter the
5 other day and, in the end, ask a couple of questions.

6 I showed her a picture of where that nuclear
7 waste would be stored and when I told her that that
8 dangerous waste was being stored near the beach to
9 where we go to almost weekly, she said, "Why are they
10 storing it in that place?"

11 I said, "Because, Honey, it's a lot of money
12 move it and nobody wants it."

13 She said, "Wouldn't it cost a lot more money
14 if something went wrong, like what happened in Japan?"

15 I said, "Yes, you're right. It would."

16 She said, "That doesn't seem logical." She's
17 a pretty logical girl.

18 I said, "You're right."

19 She said, "Why don't they move it someplace
20 else?"

21 I said, "Well, like, where?"

22 "She said, "Why don't they just put it in the
23 desert, way out in a map where no none is or even
24 across the road away from the ocean, on those hills
25 where nobody lives?"

1 I said, "It's probably too expensive."

2 She said again, "More expensive than if there
3 was disaster here, like a tsunami, like in Japan."

4 I said, "I don't know."

5 She said, "Don't they already put this stuff
6 out on the desert with other stuff like it?"

7 Is said, "Yes. But it's really complicated.
8 Nobody wants it."

9 She said, "More complicated than if they had
10 to clean up the mess if something went wrong here and
11 it leaked into the ocean?"

12 I said, "No, not more complicated."

13 She said, "That seems pretty illogical, Dad."

14 She said, "Daddy, how many people live in the desert
15 where they store that other stuff?"

16 I said, "Not many."

17 She said, "Is it more than the people who live
18 in Los Angeles and San Diego?"

19 I said, "No, Honey. That's millions of
20 people."

21 She said, "It seems like it would be better
22 for something bad -- if it were something bad to happen
23 around a few people than millions; right?"

24 I said, "That seems logical."

25 "What if bad people wanted to blow it up?"

1 Wouldn't that be a bad situation?"

2 I just sat there frowning. She also was
3 sitting there frowning with a confused look and walked
4 away. There is a real fear among kids in the area.

5 And my question -- and I'll end it -- is what
6 is -- what is the Panel or people in the area going to
7 do to educate children who don't understand scientific
8 terms and can't think in hundreds of years of time
9 frame? Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you for your
11 comment. Karl Aldinger and then Ron Rodart or Rodarte.

12 MR. ALDINGER: The Poseidon desalinization
13 plant in Carlsbad, California, is supplying 50 million
14 gallons of drinking water per day by pumping ocean
15 water through reversed osmosis system.

16 They're proposing building an additional
17 desalinization plant in Huntington Beach. That
18 technology is no equipped to filter radiation, nor are
19 they testing for it.

20 What is the plan to detect radiation in the
21 drinking water? What is the contingency plan to pull
22 the 73 Holtec underground canisters contents if they
23 are indicated to be leaking into the Pacific Ocean and
24 polluting the drinking water generated at those desalt
25 plants?

1 Are there backup casks and holes for them?

2 As you well know, Fukushima Daiichi has been
3 dumping radiation in the pacific for six years and,
4 clearly, they did not have a viable contingency plan to
5 stop irradiating their coastal water.

6 Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you for your
8 comment. We're going to take two more and then we're
9 finished with our hour and we'll have to take some time
10 to provide some initial answers, specially taking
11 advantage of our guests.

12 So Ron Rodart. Rodarte? Not here?

13 Mary Beth Brangan and then Jamie Issac.

14 MS. BRANGAN: Now that I know that you put all
15 the answers to these questions in -- onto the website,
16 I would really appreciate your putting in the very -- a
17 very complete report on why Yucca Mountain is not a
18 viable place to store radioactive waste.

19 And I can provide you with lots of those
20 reports. It's not a political thing. It's a technical
21 thing as well. It's not conducive for the requirements
22 of storing radioactive waste. So that's one thing.

23 The other thing is, I want to echo everybody
24 else's comments about the lack of sincere thinking
25 about this problem. It does -- I know -- maybe that's

1 all you're capable of. I'm sorry to say that.

2 But it doesn't seem like you are thinking in
3 terms of contingencies of the prior problems that have
4 occurred all over the world with nuclear technology.
5 It just doesn't ring true.

6 The CEP panel does not seem to be grappling
7 with reality. It would be also very helpful, I think,
8 to have on the website reports of other disasters that
9 have happened and what -- for instance, the Fukushima
10 disaster in Japan, there was a commission by the
11 government created and it said that this was
12 human-caused disaster because there was such a
13 collusion between industry and government beforehand to
14 not consider the problems that could occur.

15 So it will be helpful to have on your website
16 that report, for instance, as well.

17 Thank you very much.

18 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you for your
19 comment. Jamie Isaac. Jamie Isaac.

20 Daniel Beeman. You've given me actually your
21 email address, but I assume from the email address is
22 Daniel --

23 MR. BEEMAN: Yeah, same name.

24 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Daniel. Okay. Great.
25 This will be the last comment.

1 MR. BEEMAN: I come from San Diego where we
2 just got three notice of increase, because we have a
3 dual monopoly in San Diego, not just a single monopoly
4 for energy, but a dual monopoly. We have two increases
5 in electricity and one increase on gas.

6 My representative is the only representative
7 of San Diego who never comes here. He will not listen
8 to us if they do not listen to us, and I'm very
9 concerned because you don't listen very well.

10 I have one lady over here that works really
11 hard. I have other people that have political agendas
12 here, I have a big company here that has made billions
13 of dollars off of all of you and me and continually
14 look to make billions of dollars, because it's more
15 about money than your children on the beach, your pets
16 on a beach, the grandchildren, the great-grandchildren.

17 My great grandfather invented the garden
18 tractor. My great-great-grandfather was here as a 49er
19 and discovered Nome, Alaska. We can do this if we want
20 to, but where is the will? You let it go down.

21 Where is the -- where is the national
22 representative for any of us here today deciding to do
23 something. You don't invite them, and he comes out.
24 We need somebody to be responsible.

25 SCE, which I pay for in my bills too, can be

1 responsible, and they can say we deny the permit, we're
2 not going to use it, we're going to take it off the
3 beach, we're going to put it at some other station that
4 we already own because that's the safe way of doing it.

5 There are other nuclear plants they own and
6 they can deposit it there. You can put it in smaller
7 canisters and you can look at somebody who'll do it
8 that's nonprofit rather than a profit because when a
9 non-profit has it, they do it with their heart.

10 But when a profit has it, they do it with one
11 thing and it does not go to heaven and it will not get
12 you out of here and it will not leave here. So I'm
13 being truthful and honest that you have a major concern
14 here.

15 When this nuclear stuff gets out, even one
16 millionth of micron gets out, it will affect you all
17 instantly. Why am I passionate? I don't have any
18 children. I don't have any grandchildren, because I
19 care about people. I care about nature.

20 See, we are alive today. When that little
21 spirit of a plant comes out of the crack of cement, it
22 is alive and it can do many great things. Do we have
23 the will to do those many great things? Will we do
24 them? You're deciding. And don't -- don't let SCE
25 tell you what to do. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you for your
2 comment. We're going to take a few minutes and raise
3 some questions, specially questions that related to
4 Holtec and the New Mexico site and the NRC and a couple
5 for -- for Edison. Let me ask Dan and Tim to lead this
6 segment of the meeting.

7 SECRETARY STETSON: Thank you.

8 Tom, the young lady wasn't here earlier when
9 you addressed the Native American. Without going
10 through the whole thing, could you maybe give her some
11 insight?

12 MR. PALMISANO: We'll post this on the
13 website. So we checked two things: Edison has a
14 full-time person who is a tribal liaison. We
15 interacted with a number of organizations and, if
16 you'll give me your card, I'll follow up.

17 And, also, we confirmed State Lands Commission
18 had a list of native from the Native American Heritage
19 Commission, they sent a list to the State Lands
20 Commission of the tribes to contact.

21 So, again, if you give me your card, let me
22 get this back to the appropriate people.

23 MS. MOONEY D'ARCY: Just to be clear, just
24 because you have a contact list, it doesn't mean
25 they're going to actual contact me.

1 MR. PALMISANO: No, I understand. That's what
2 I'd like to follow up on because I'm told contacts were
3 made. So if you'd give me your card, we'll follow up
4 on it. Thank you.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN BROWN: So the next question is
6 related to Gary Headrick asked, what is the response in
7 a criticality event? And this hasn't been answered
8 satisfactory -- satisfactorily.

9 And so do we have prepared a response in the
10 event of a criticality?

11 MR. PALMISANO: Yes. So, first of all, the
12 spent fuel pool is designed and the dry cask storage
13 canisters are designed to prevent criticality. Okay?

14 There are what are called neutron poisons in
15 both the spent fuel pool, there's more in the water --
16 I'm sorry. Is this not on?

17 How is it? Okay. Thank you.

18 So both the spent fuel pool and the dry cask
19 storage are designed to prevent criticality and I can
20 give you more elaboration. The spent fuel pool racks
21 in water, have neutron poisons in them, so a
22 criticality cannot occur, likewise the material in the
23 dry cask storage has neutron poisons.

24 So, Tim, this takes a longer response in
25 writing. But the criticality event is prevented by the

1 design in the materials that are used.

2 PUBLIC MEMBER: The question is, what if the
3 design doesn't work?

4 VICE CHAIRMAN BROWN: Just continue on.

5 PUBLIC MEMBER: What do you do?

6 MR. PALMISANO: Yeah. So they can test that
7 the criticality doesn't occur and the fuel loading, the
8 selection of assemblies is done so that criticality
9 can't occur.

10 PUBLIC MEMBER: I think you're missing the
11 point.

12 MR. PALMISANO: Yeah. No, I understand.

13 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Dan.

14 SECRETARY STETSON: This is a question for the
15 gentleman from Holtec. It has to do with earthquake
16 preparedness and what are the design specifications for
17 the canisters.

18 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Including a partially
19 cracked canister.

20 MR. PALMISANO: So let me start with that.

21 SECRETARY STETSON: Yes.

22 MR. PALMISANO: So the earthquake requirements
23 stem from our requirements. Okay.

24 SECRETARY STETSON: Okay.

25 MR. PALMISANO: We talked about this

1 extensively last meeting when we talked about the
2 seismology. Just to repeat it very simply, the spent
3 fuel pool, the power plant itself, the spent fuel is
4 designed for a .67 peak ground acceleration, the
5 canisters are designed for a much higher peak ground
6 acceleration, 1.5.

7 So Holtec had to design and the canisters
8 licensed and reviewed by the NRC for that seismic
9 requirement. Okay. And, again, we'll be glad to
10 rehash what we covered last meeting on that when we
11 have more time.

12 SECRETARY STETSON: There was, also, kind of a
13 follow-up question related to "Has there been any
14 cracks on the Holtec canisters and, if so, what's the
15 probably of them withstanding an earthquake?"

16 MR. ONEID: No.

17 SECRETARY STETSON: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Well, that's -- okay.
19 So "no" is the answer about those?

20 MR. ONEID: If you'd like me to elaborate on
21 that, there has been, as I mentioned -- there's been --
22 and not just Holtec, frankly, as an industry. I'd just
23 like to remind the audience and the panel that this has
24 been over 32 years of dry storage, not a single crack,
25 not a single significant -- of incident of any kind.

1 And we have already been working under the
2 leadership of Tom Palmisano on the aging management
3 program. We've also have been designing systems that
4 would actually -- if for any reason, whether 20 years
5 or 30 years from now there is a crack, we have an aging
6 management program that will cover it, which I'm sure
7 has been mentioned by you, Mr. Chairman. That will be
8 covered on --

9 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: So, yeah. Our next
10 meeting is going to be about that. And we need to get
11 input from Holtec and others about what -- not just the
12 monitoring program, but even though it's never
13 happened, if -- as people pointed out, things happen,
14 if a crack appears, what's the strategy and so on.

15 I think it's a very important point for the
16 next meeting.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN BROWN: I think there is an
18 important point that also came up as a question that
19 they said that there's a reference to burying the
20 nuclear waste at SONGS. Could you refer -- could you
21 just clear up for the folks what the term burying as if
22 it's going to be in the beach or in a berm, etcetera?

23 Could you perhaps add some detail on that?

24 MR. PALMISANO: Yeah. You know, we don't use
25 the term buried. We've shown the schematics of the

1 system. The system starts with concrete monolithic
2 block inside our steel cylinders.

3 And inside of that, the sealed steel canister
4 is placed and there's a 30 ton lid place on top that.
5 There's a berm built around the concrete structure, so
6 in terms of if it's a subterranean or below grade
7 system, but it's not buried directly in the sand in the
8 sense that the fuel is not buried in the sand.

9 You know, trying to clear up some of the
10 terminology that's used.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN BROWN: So there were two
12 questions for the NRC and it was regarding emergency
13 planning exemptions. What risk assessment was done for
14 the exemptions, the insurance exemptions, that were
15 provided?

16 MR. WATSON: There has been exhausting studies
17 on the risk associated with spent fuel and the safety
18 of it and storage in -- in wet storage in a pool and
19 also in dry storage in the ISFSI.

20 So those studies are available on our website.
21 I wish -- it's getting a little bit for me, being an
22 East Coaster, but I can't produce any exact references.

23 But you can look up those studies on our -- on
24 our public website.

25 VICE CHAIRMAN BROWN: And then the question

1 is --

2 PUBLIC MEMBER: What about the risk assessment
3 here on the bluff in San Onofre? Not a study, a risk
4 assessment for this waste going into the ground and
5 actually -- my question with regard to the insurance
6 was separate. It wasn't one question.

7 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: We're going to come back
8 to the insurance in just a second. The insurance is a
9 question to --

10 VICE CHAIRMAN BROWN: And then the second item
11 is why change the emergency planning as a result of
12 those exemptions?

13 MR. WATSON: The emergency planning is reduced
14 because of the reduced risk. It's impossible to meet
15 the EPA protective action guide recommendations for an
16 off-site release beyond the site brow -- boundaries.

17 So, therefore, there's no need to have an
18 off-site emergency response requirement out to 10 to 50
19 miles for both the plume zone and ingestion zone.

20 You can't there once -- after a certain time
21 that the fuel has decayed or cool down and that's about
22 a little over a year.

23 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: But I think, just an
24 action point here, which is the question has been
25 raised about kind of risk assessment was done around

1 the siting of the ISFSI and that's, I think, been a
2 split responsibility. Let's pull all of that together
3 and have response to that question that points to those
4 documents.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN BROWN: And then for Tom: What
6 pool of money covers the storage insurance? So you
7 have a pool that cover the operating plants and then --

8 MR. PALMISANO: We carry both primary and
9 secondary insurance as an operating plant; that's still
10 in effect today. We will carry primary and secondary
11 insurance as a decommissioning plant to cover both
12 on-site and off-site actions.

13 And, Tim, I'm not -- I don't have the
14 financial numbers at my fingertips, but I can explain
15 in the next meeting what the exemptions mean. But
16 their insurance will continue for the decommissioned
17 site for the spent fuel.

18 PUBLIC MEMBER: Will that include the waste
19 that's being buried in the ground?

20 MR. PALMISANO: Yes, that includes the spent
21 fuel. Yeah, so we carry insurance --

22 PUBLIC MEMBER: Do you have the numbers, Tom?

23 MR. PALMISANO: No. That's why I'm saying I
24 don't have the numbers, so I can bring that in at the
25 next meeting and I'll be happy to.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN BROWN: So one other question --
2 I'm sorry -- I want to throw in here is, Ray asked the
3 question -- he questioned the idea that, "Are the
4 canisters safer than the fuel pools?" And so I'd like
5 to get a definitive answer to that question. It seems
6 to be core to what we're talking about. I'll throw
7 that out there.

8 MR. PALMISANO: I'm sorry. Tim, I was taking
9 notes. Did you want --

10 VICE CHAIRMAN BROWN: My apologies.

11 The question was, Ray asked the question, "Are
12 the canisters safer than the fuel pool?

13 And if so, why?

14 MR. PALMISANO: So, probably start with the
15 NRC and then I'll be glad to --

16 VICE CHAIRMAN BROWN: Sure.

17 MR. KELLAR: The NRC's position is that both
18 are safe.

19 MR. PALMISANO: Yeah. You heard me talk
20 before about, as an operating plant, there's a need for
21 an operating spent fuel pool. With the decommissioning
22 plant, when the fuel is decayed to this point where it
23 can all be put in canisters, in our opinion, that's a
24 more suitable storage mechanism.

25 Fundamentally, the spent fuel pool certainly

1 is safe. It meets the required safety standards, but
2 requires electricity, requires water, requires operator
3 action, many things to keep the fuel cool and to keep
4 it covered with water.

5 Once you put fuel that's decayed long enough
6 that is eligible for dry fuel storage, you have many
7 fewer assemblies in a container, either 24, 37. It is
8 totally passive. Okay. It's just -- it's sealed.
9 It's filled with helium. It's welded shut, radiates
10 heat, it's removed by air convection. It is a simpler
11 passive, more reliable cooling system.

12 So in our judgment, that all -- well, both are
13 safe. And I would agree with the NRC's conclusion,
14 from a safety analysis standpoint, dry cask storage is
15 more suitable for a decommissioning facility.

16 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: There's a national --
17 Academy of Science's National Research Study in this
18 area that leans pretty strongly in exactly that
19 direction. I've interviewed several members of that
20 panel. They've all said the same thing.

21 And I just want to mention my read -- and, you
22 know, this is an area where there are important
23 debates, my read of this is that you also want to have
24 the fuel in canisters that can be shipped because we're
25 trying to demonstrate credibility around a plant to get

1 the fuel out of here.

2 MR. PALMISANO: Yeah. The other thing I
3 referred you to is, there's a number of comments for
4 independent experts and that's certainly appropriate.
5 I would refer you to David Lockbaum of the Union of
6 Concerned Scientists.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN BROWN: Yes.

8 MR. PALMISANO: I think he's independent.
9 He's credible. Get his opinion on dry cask storage for
10 decommissioning facility.

11 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Last question from Dan
12 Stetson and then I want to wrap up.

13 SECRETARY STETSON: Sure. This -- a couple of
14 questions here built into one. It has to do with the
15 monitoring for radioactivity. And do our friends at
16 the NRC, do they monitor that? Are they required to be
17 monitored? And is that done both above and below the
18 water? And is any of that information available to the
19 public?

20 MR. WATSON: The environmental monitoring
21 program continues throughout decommissioning and then
22 there's an environmental monitoring program that goes
23 along with the license with the ISFSI.

24 So, yes, the environment is continued to be
25 monitored and they continue to report that to the NRC,

1 I think, on an annual basis.

2 MR. PALMISANO: And those reports are
3 public --

4 MR. WATSON: Those are publicly available.

5 MR. PALMISANO: They're publicly available
6 reports?

7 MR. WATSON: Right.

8 MR. PALMISANO: So that it's reported
9 regularly.

10 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: May we can have a slide
11 on what the monitoring scheme looks like as part of our
12 next meeting, which is about aging management and
13 monitoring, along with a link to where people can look
14 at the results from those monitoring. Okay. This has
15 been a very, very productive meeting, a huge amount of
16 material. I want to thank the Panel members and our
17 guests and, also, all of you for your patience.

18 I know we went over time tonight, but it was
19 very important that we try to cover our materials and
20 also that we allow time for public comment. And I'm
21 just sorry that the 11 people who were still on the
22 list couldn't make their comments as well. With that,
23 please drive very safely on your way home. And thank
24 you for spending your evening with us.

25 (Whereupon, the CEP meeting adjourned at 8:51 p.m.)

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

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

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

That said CEP proceedings were taken by me Stenographically and was thereafter transcribed into typewriting under my direction, said transcript being a true and accurate transcription of my shorthand notes.

I further certify that I am neither financially interested in the action nor a relative or employee of any attorney or any of the parties.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have on this date subscribed my name, MONDAY, JUNE 26, 2017.



CARLOS R. HICHO
CSR NO. 13111