

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, June 22, 2016, from 5:30-8:30 p.m. PDT in San Juan Capistrano, California

Meeting Minutes and Action Items

1) Community Engagement Panel (CEP) Member Attendance

- a) Present: Dr. David Victor (CEP Chairman/University of California, San Diego), Hon. Tim Brown (CEP Vice Chairman/San Clemente City Council), Dan Stetson (CEP Secretary/Nicholas Endowment), Ted Quinn (American Nuclear Society), Garry Brown (Orange County Coastkeeper), Dr. William Parker (University of California, Irvine), Tom Caughlan (Camp Pendleton), Hon. Carlos Olvera (Mayor, Dana Point), Glenn Pascall (Sierra Club), Rich Haydon (California State Parks), Hon. Lisa Bartlett (Supervisor, Orange County, 5th District), Jim Leach (South Orange County Economic Coalition), Hon. Pam Patterson (Mayor, San Juan Capistrano)
- b) Absent: Hon. Bill Horn (Supervisor, San Diego County), Hon. John Alpay (President, Capistrano Unified School District Board of Trustees), Donna Boston (Orange County Sheriff's Department), Valentine "Val" Macedo (Laborers' International Union of North America, Local 89), Hon. Jerome "Jerry" M. Kern (Oceanside City Council)
- c) Guests: Congressman Darrell Issa (California 49th Congressional District), Rob Oglesby (Executive Director, California Energy Commission), John Kotek (Acting Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy, US Department of Energy), Allison Macfarlane (Professor & Director, George Washington University and Former Chair of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission), Jack Edlow (President, Edlow International Company)
- d) Southern California Edison (SCE) Representatives: Tom Palmisano (VP of Decommissioning and Chief Nuclear Officer)

2) Meeting Convened by Chairman Victor at 5:30 p.m.:

- a) Chairman Victor reminded the audience that the CEP was created to improve communications with the communities, and open a two-way flow of information; the CEP is not a decision-making body
- b) The focus of tonight's meeting is Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS)
- c) The presentations from tonight can be found on SONGScommunity.com, as well as live streaming, links for signing up for public walking tours, and more
- d) Chairman Victor acknowledged the guests present, including Congressman Darrell Issa via video, Rob Oglesby of the California Energy Commission (CEC), John Kotek of the US Department of Energy (DOE), Jack Edlow of Edlow International Company, and Allison Macfarlane of the George Washington University and formerly Chair of the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
- e) SCE has set up educational booths on nuclear processes, staffed by SCE personnel, that were available prior to the meeting and will be available during the break
- f) Dan Stetson spoke at the DOE's Consent-Based Siting meeting in Sacramento on April 26, which will be discussed by John Kotek later in tonight's meeting
- g) Chairman Victor met with Edison International's Board of Directors to update them on the CEP and the vast majority of the conversation was regarding consolidated storage and what Edison can do to help make consolidated storage a reality
- h) A structured public comment period follows the presentations. Comments may be submitted within 5 business days of the meetings on nuccomm@songs.sce.com

3) Decommissioning Update: Progress Report, by Tom Palmisano, VP of Decommissioning and Chief Nuclear Officer

- a) Tom Palmisano reminded everyone of the Decommissioning Principles: safety, stewardship, and engagement

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, June 22, 2016, from 5:30-8:30 p.m. PDT in San Juan Capistrano, California

Meeting Minutes and Action Items

- b) Tom Palmisano provided a review of the 20-Year Decommissioning Plan and identified the most critical activities to complete (highlighted in yellow on the timeline): Decommissioning General Contractor award and startup activities (in the final stages of vendor selection); completion of the Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (ISFSI) pad expansion (end of 2017), ISFSI canister fabrication, and the ISFSI offload campaign; and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Permitting (last meeting included an in-depth look at the process)
 - c) Decommissioning Key Dates:
 - i) System retirements will be complete the 3rd quarter 2016 allowing for the plant to be put in a cold and dark condition to make it safe for workers to decontaminate and dismantle the plant
 - ii) Used fuel offload to dry cask storage is scheduled to be complete mid-2019
 - iii) The CEQA review process and permitting is expected to be complete the 4th quarter 2017
 - iv) Decontamination and dismantlement begins the 1st quarter 2018 and will take about 10 years
 - v) Initial NRC license termination is 2029
 - vi) Site restoration expected to complete in 2032
 - d) Used Fuel Strategy:
 - i) Tom Palmisano provided an update of the used fuel strategy:
 - (1) Safely manage and store San Onofre's used nuclear fuel until it is removed from site (this is our first mission, along with protecting the safety of the workers and public)
 - (2) Promptly offload fuel from spent fuel pools to passive dry cask storage
 - (3) Recover used fuel storage costs from the DOE
 - (4) Support all safe and reasonable options to remove used nuclear fuel from the San Onofre site (whether CIS or a permanent repository)
 - (5) The existing ISFSI holds approximately one-third of the used fuel and the ISFSI expansion will hold the remainder of the fuel
 - (6) Fuel Readiness for Transportation
 - (a) Fifty canisters of Units 2 & 3 fuel are eligible to be shipped by 2020; all that's lacking is a location to ship to. Transfer estimated at 10 years from start to finish
 - (b) Unit 1 fuel is not eligible shipping until 2020 and beyond
 - e) ISFSI Cost Recovery:
 - i) Used fuel management costs are included in the Decommissioning Cost Estimate
 - ii) The Decommissioning trusts are fully funded, including used fuel management costs
 - iii) Used fuel management costs recovered from the DOE to date:
 - (1) June 2010: \$142M awarded for 1998-2005 costs
 - (2) April 2016: \$162M awarded for 2006-2013 costs
 - (3) Net proceeds are refunded to customers
 - iv) Backup slides containing more detailed information can be found on SONGScommunity.com
- 4) Chairman Victor introduced the topic of CIS**
- a) Once the fuel is in the canisters, there is nothing left to be done until there is a repository to send the fuel to, either permanent or temporary
 - b) Tonight's meeting may shed light on what the CEP or communities can do to help move the process along

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, June 22, 2016, from 5:30-8:30 p.m. PDT in San Juan Capistrano, California

Meeting Minutes and Action Items

- 5) Opening Remarks, by Congressman Darrell Issa, Californian 49th Congressional District**
- a) Congressman Issa's comments were mostly directed to the DOE and the need for a permanent storage facility. The Congressman stated that the US government promised nuclear waste would be stored safely in a permanent facility at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, and that promise has not been kept. He would like to understand the DOE's proposal to meet an obligation enshrined in law and already paid for.
 - b) Congressman Issa co-sponsored a solution called "The Interim Consolidated Storage Act." Under this Act, interim consolidated storage facilities would be constructed and then able to legally accept nuclear waste from sites across the country. This does not preclude continuing to find a permanent storage site but would prioritize decommissioned nuclear facilities and allow for the transfer of the 3.6 million pounds of nuclear waste at SONGS. This solution is not the only solution, but Congressman Issa would like it discussed and addressed by the DOE. He encouraged people to put aside their differences and have a good discussion.
 - c) Congressman Issa will be conducting a tele-town hall meeting in the future.
 - i) Chairman Victor mentioned that Congressman Issa's staff was present and would take note of any questions from the CEP or the public
- 6) Introductory Comments on Used Fuel Storage, by Rob Oglesby, Executive Director, CEC**
- a) Rob Oglesby explained the Energy Commission's Nuclear Role:
 - i) The chair of the CEC is the current State Liaison Officer to the NRC and provides a communication channel between the state and the NRC
 - ii) The CEC develops policy and recommendations related to nuclear energy and facilities that are published in the biannual Integrated Energy Policy Report, the state's energy policy document
 - b) The CEC's recent efforts were outlined, most recently the drafting of comments on the DOE's design of a Consent-based Siting Process for Nuclear Waste Storage and Disposal Facilities
 - i) California is not an appropriate place to be a long term repository for spent nuclear fuel
 - c) CEC recommendations/support include:
 - i) Expedited transfer of spent nuclear fuel to an approved dry cask storage installation
 - ii) Rapid development of a storage facility to remove waste from decommissioning sites
 - iii) Priority to waste from coastal sites, such as San Onofre; ISFSIs located in regions exposed to seismic or weather events should be first on the list
 - iv) Development of a comprehensive process founded on safety and scientific research in the siting of both interim storage and a permanent repository and the transport of radioactive materials and spent nuclear fuel
 - v) Early coordination, inclusion, and effective communication with state, tribal, local governments, and impacted communities
- 7) Chairman Victor briefly introduced the guest speakers:**
- a) Three speakers present to discuss what can be expected from the process of implementing CIS, the transportation of used nuclear fuel to interim storage facilities, and the associated regulatory and political context.
 - i) John Kotek is the Acting Assistant Secretary for the Nuclear Energy office of the DOE that is working on an effort to revitalize and catalyze an effort to identify communities and assist them in understanding the risks and opportunities surrounding CIS

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, June 22, 2016, from 5:30-8:30 p.m. PDT in San Juan Capistrano, California
Meeting Minutes and Action Items

- ii) Jack Edlow is President of Edlow International Company, one of the leading firms in nuclear waste transportation. He will explain how to determine if the communities are consenting to either the facilities or the transportation of nuclear waste through their communities, as well as transportation options
- iii) Allison Macfarlane is currently a Professor and Director at the George Washington University and is also Former Chair of the NRC. She is a central player in the process of rethinking what is happening with the entire nuclear fuel cycle in this country and will describe from a political and regulatory perspective how this system may unfold and what the CEP and the communities can do to help this process along

8) CIS and Consent-Based Siting, by John Kotek, Acting Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy, US DOE

- a) John Kotek introduced Andrew Griffith from his staff and DOE consultant Mary Woollen, and mentioned the “Integrated Waste Management Consent-based Siting” booklet that was distributed to attendees and encouraged people to look through it. John Kotek’s plan for this meeting was to describe the DOE’s role in the Consent-based Siting Process and how the DOE is trying to fulfill that role. Various agencies have been working on this problem for 60 years and it has yet to be solved. John Kotek’s current team is now responsible for developing a durable solution for this problem.
 - i) Planning for the development of an integrated waste management system that starts with picking up the fuel from the utility and transports the fuel to a storage or disposal facility. Responsibility for identifying locations and designing and constructing facilities for interim storage of spent fuel, for disposal of spent fuel and high level wastes, and the associated transportation systems (e.g., rail cars, transportation casks), as well as working with state and tribal emergency management and emergency response capabilities along the transportation routes
 - (1) Siting is the most difficult issue encountered so far. Several federally-driven attempts have been made to identify states willing to accept the material for either storage or disposal. All have failed because of resistance at the state level. The DOE believes the key to success is working with willing and informed host communities and host states to achieve a durable solution
 - (2) The technology exists for storing, transporting, and disposing of nuclear waste; the challenges we face are socio-political associated with facility siting. There exists communities that are potentially welcoming of such a mission (e.g., communities in New Mexico and Texas have expressed interest)
 - (3) The DOE believes a process designed and implemented correctly is possible
 - ii) Designing the Consent-based Siting Process is underway. The DOE is holding a series of eight meetings around the country to solicit input from the public, receiving input through the website and through a notice of invitation for public comment in the Federal Register. Page 9 of the Integrated Waste Management Consent-based Siting booklet includes the questions being posed. Public comment period on these questions close at the end of July. The idea of moving forward with a Consent-based Siting Process comes from the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Commission on America’s Nuclear Future

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, June 22, 2016, from 5:30-8:30 p.m. PDT in San Juan Capistrano, California
Meeting Minutes and Action Items

- (1) Once the meetings are complete and the public comment period closes, a draft report will be issued summarizing the major themes and identifying the public's major concerns
 - (2) A draft of the Consent-based Siting Process will be issued by the end of the year
 - (3) DOE has asked Congress for \$75 million in funding for the implementation of the Consent-based Siting Process (e.g., transportation infrastructure; engagements with states, tribal governments, and communities); part of the request is for grants for local units of governments to challenge and hire their own experts
 - (4) Consent-based Siting has proven successful in other countries (e.g., Finland)
- b) DOE sees value in pursuing CIS and building storage capacity into the system in parallel with a federal repository
- i) Fourteen sites are storing used fuel (13 of them are nuclear plants) and at some of those sites (maybe five) all that is left is dry cask storage
 - ii) Hearing from communities is important to the DOE (especially those that host shutdown plant sites)
- c) Panel questions:
- i) Jim Leach asked for a broad DOE schedule for the siting process
 - (1) John Kotek responded that siting a permanent repository would take decades and the current forecast is 2048
 - (a) Chairman Victor added that this schedule is the driving force behind CIS
 - ii) Ted Quinn asked about regional differences in the public priorities based on John Kotek's experience with the public meetings
 - (1) Communities with shutdown plants expressed more of a sense of urgency, but in general, there are similar goals
 - iii) Glenn Pascall asked whether there is a special queue for decommissioned plants
 - (1) John Kotek will provide additional information about the queue process
 - iv) Pam Patterson remarked that the CEP should increase community engagement in the meetings by allowing the public to participate in the educational fairs held prior to the meeting, as well as posting the meeting presentations two-weeks in advance so the public can be prepared to present their opinions, as both parties need to be heard. Pam Patterson also asked about the procedure for getting items on the CEP agenda and to have an independent evaluation of spent fuel management performed, funded by SCE
 - v) Garry Brown asked if the Consent-based Siting Process was for CIS sites or geological repositories
 - (1) John Kotek responded that it was for both
 - vi) Tim Brown asked about the type of feedback being requested in regards to the questions posed in the brochure
 - (1) John Kotek said any and all feedback is welcome, whether related to the questions, or not
 - (2) Tim Brown suggested having a "Consent-based Siting" page on SONGScommunity.com, posting the questions from the brochure on the page, and forwarding the responses/feedback to John Kotek
 - vii) Chairman Victor asked how the DOE will know when they have appropriate "consent" to site a facility

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, June 22, 2016, from 5:30-8:30 p.m. PDT in San Juan Capistrano, California

Meeting Minutes and Action Items

- (1) John Kotek said that one demonstration of consent is having a legally enforceable agreement with the waste management entity, but it could take different forms in different states (e.g., on the ballot)

9) Transportation of Used Nuclear Fuel, by Jack Edlow, President, Edlow International Company

- a) Jack Edlow explained that his company has moved used nuclear fuel and other hazardous waste (all types of hazardous and radioactive material) for more than 50 years
- b) Edlow International is focused on safety and security (both heightened when it comes to used nuclear fuel). Transportation of used nuclear fuel is highly regulated by the NRC and the Department of Transportation, as well as international regulators
- c) All modes of transportation are used for transporting used nuclear fuel: rail, ship, truck, even air
- d) Packaging is the first line of safety; the packaging is robust and is specifically designed to maintain its integrity during transportation even when subjected to major accidents. The US adopts the International Atomic Energy Agency regulations. Although there have been many accidents, none of them have resulted in the dispersal of materials
- e) Security is also of utmost importance, especially since 9/11. Although safety standards remain fairly constant, security standards can change from hour-to-hour and can differ from shipment-to-shipment. Edlow International has the ability to transport nuclear waste with complex security measures to ensure safety and successful movement of waste all over the world
- f) As soon as a site is available, Edlow International can move the SONGS used fuel with little difficulty
 - i) Chairman Victor asked Jack Edlow to step through the process that would be used if there was an available storage facility or repository
 - (1) Jack Edlow explained that his company would create detailed transportation and security plans (both required by the NRC). The plans would include route surveys to identify the best route logistically. Coordination occurs with all first responders on the preferred route. Only Governors of each state will receive the actual transportation dates in order to maintain security. Preparation of the safety and security plans takes approximately six months. The transportation equipment must be available (e.g., an integrated system that includes rail)
 - ii) Ted Quinn asked about the availability of transportation casks
 - (1) Jack Edlow explained that transportation over packs can be built rather quickly, but he would prefer to see a generic over pack that accommodates a variety of canisters
 - (2) A number of over packs are designed and most of them are approved, however, they have not been fabricated as there is nowhere to send the fuel

10) Integrated Strategy, by Allison Macfarlane Professor & Director, George Washington University and Former Chair of the NRC

- a) Allison Macfarlane has seen the preliminary results of the project spearheaded by Stanford University called "The Reset of the Nuclear Waste Management Strategy in the US" that she has been involved with. Tonight's discussion pertains to integrating the back-end of the fuel cycle (not specific to SONGS), for which there is a lack of a good national strategy, and the need for some type of federal repository
- b) Guiding Principles

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, June 22, 2016, from 5:30-8:30 p.m. PDT in San Juan Capistrano, California

Meeting Minutes and Action Items

- i) Above-ground storage is not an acceptable permanent solution for spent nuclear fuel; it will eventually result in contamination and therefore continued focus needs to be on a permanent repository
- ii) Ethical responsibility to future generations to find a solution; must be addressed now
- iii) Waste generators are not responsible for disposition of waste; the government is responsible, however, the US currently has a broken system
- c) Integration is required that pulls together technical aspects (e.g., types of fuel and canisters), logistics (e.g., the planning of fuel moves, as discussed by Jack Edlow), social aspects (e.g., all interested parties are participating), and regulatory aspects (e.g., that the necessary rules are in place)
- d) Current situation:
 - i) 80% of US nuclear power plants have dry storage (though 71% of spent fuel is in pools)
 - ii) There is stranded fuel at 12 sites with more to come
 - iii) Dry storage:
 - (1) The majority of used nuclear fuel is in welded metal canisters inserted into concrete over packs
 - (2) Inventory is diverse
 - (3) The current trend is toward higher capacity canisters
 - (4) Thermal constraints will limit transportability for decades (up to five decades)
 - (a) There are different limits for storage versus transport
 - (i) The transport thermal heat limit is half of the storage thermal heat limit
 - iv) Current back-end practices are optimized for reactor operations (i.e., reduced occupational dose and efficient reactor operation) and not for transport and disposal (i.e., package size, design, and thermal load)
- e) Regulatory situation:
 - i) Continued Storage Rule (reinvented Waste Confidence Decision)
 - (1) Generic evaluation of all the environmental impacts of storage of spent fuel beyond the licensed lifetime of reactors. The NRC evaluated three time periods: 1) up to 60 years after license, 2) up to 160 years after license, and 3) indefinitely
 - (2) The Generic Environmental Impact Statement evaluates 20 categories of impact and almost all were determined *small* for all time periods (e.g., air quality, ground water, terrorism, etc.)
 - (3) Implications of Rule – there is no need for a repository if even the “indefinitely” time period impacts are *small*; assumes institutional controls continue forever
- f) Impacts of the current situation:
 - i) Stalemate
 - (1) Congress: waste is safe now; next election is more important (political time horizon of two, four, six years)
 - (2) DOE: no legal authority to solve the problem entirely
 - (3) Department of Justice (DOJ): Judgment Fund forces lowest cost option
 - (4) NRC: no forcing mechanism in current regulations for any kind of action
 - ii) Technical issues:
 - (1) Variety of cask types exist
 - (2) Stranded sites
 - (3) Thermal loads will drive extended on-site storage

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, June 22, 2016, from 5:30-8:30 p.m. PDT in San Juan Capistrano, California

Meeting Minutes and Action Items

- iii) Who will pay for storage over long time frames?
 - (1) Nuclear Waste Fund is broken
 - (2) Judgment Fund is committing US taxpayers to endless payments
- g) Solutions
 - i) Three paths forward: 1) repackage at reactor or at centralized site, 2) work with what we have and find a repository that will accept the current variety, and 3) surface storage forever - which is unacceptable
 - (1) Need funding reform, as in incentives for change by the industry, DOE, NRC, DOJ
 - ii) The solution appears to be the public applying pressure on Congress and the political system
- h) Chairman Victor asked how the communities can form an alliance across the nation
 - i) Allison Macfarlane suggested starting with the communities that already have some kind of organization (she has a list) but further discussion would be needed
 - ii) Chairman Victor commented that other communities have done similar as well as different models for community engagement and asked if there were any guidelines established
 - (1) Allison Macfarlane mentioned that Maine Yankee has a good model, however, there is no regulation that requires a citizen engagement panel
 - (a) Successful panels/advisory boards are sponsored by the utility
- i) Pam Patterson asked that if the DOE has no authority to solve this issue entirely, what authority has it to solve the issue partially.
 - i) John Kotek responded that the DOE has asked Congress for 2017 funding for the actual implementation of the Consent-based Siting Process, as discussed earlier
 - (1) Pam Patterson asked John Kotek to clarify if he had authority to solve this issue partially
 - (a) John Kotek clarified that he cannot implement the full strategy without legislation
 - (b) Chairman Victor added that no one agency is completely in charge and we need to focus on putting pressure on the agencies to work together
- j) Garry Brown asked how to lobby Congress, or whether we should go through the legislators
 - i) Allison Macfarlane believes it is all of the above, but also identify a champion who will take this issue on and build a coalition
 - (1) Garry Brown commented that the spent fuel must be transferred from wet to dry storage. Focus needs to be kept on CIS and pressure must be kept on the Federal government to solve the long term repository issue. Everyone must communicate and work together to make both CIS and a long term geologic repository happen
 - (a) Allison Macfarlane added that focus must be on the higher level messages and not get stuck in the weeds

11) CEP General Updates

- a) Dan Stetson mentioned that since retiring from the Ocean Institute he is spending an enormous amount of time on the CIS issues as well as being the Secretary of the CEP; Dan Stetson put together the agenda for tonight and is very pleased with the results
 - i) Chairman Victor added that the CEP can also hold workshops on CIS and perhaps should consider that in the near future

12) Chairman Victor Facilitated the Public Comment Period

- a) Public Comments were made by the following individuals:

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, June 22, 2016, from 5:30-8:30 p.m. PDT in San Juan Capistrano, California
Meeting Minutes and Action Items

- i) Toni Iseman: Concern about the location of the plant and urged the group to work together for a joint statement on removal of used nuclear fuel
 - ii) Jerry Mirsky: A variety of issues covered, ranging from iodide tablets to property values
 - iii) Charles Divona: Concern about the selection of the Holtec canisters and the ISFSI design
 - iv) Gary Headrick: Desire to request revocation of the California Coastal Commission permit for the ISFSI expansion
 - v) Charles Langley: Failure by NRC when it approved the design of the replacement steam generators
 - vi) Ray Lutz: Would like the DOE's process to be shared at the next meeting
 - vii) Rita Conn: Need for all to work together and build trust
 - viii) Nina Babiarez: Concerns about the ISFSI in relation to the major rail corridor
 - ix) Sue Savary: Would like to see Congressional support of the used nuclear fuel issues
 - x) Roger Johnson: Concerned about ability to move the canisters in the future (e.g., window of opportunity for transporting the canisters)
 - xi) Audrey Prosser: Trust in the CEP needs to be improved
 - xii) Vinod Arora: Would like to understand the root cause of the steam generator failure
 - xiii) Donna Gilmore: Holtec canisters cannot be inspected and thicker canisters are needed
 - xiv) Marni Magda: Requested a CEP workshop on how to create a California coalition to get the used fuel moved off the sites
 - xv) Sharon Koch: Support for interim storage while also not losing sight of a federal repository
 - xvi) Alexander Warner: Concerned about not having a location for a permanent repository and lack of a plan B
 - xvii) Karl Aldinger: Believes the issue of stranded used fuel is the problem of the utility and the NRC
 - xviii) Kevin Blanch: Ship the used fuel to Yucca Mountain
 - xix) Kurt Bauer: This is a terrible situation
 - xx) Mr. Boinus: SCE should distribute iodine tablets
- b) Dan Stetson facilitated dialogue based on themes conveyed during the Public Comment Period:
- i) Are there thicker canisters such as those that survived Fukushima that are licensed here in the US?
 - (1) Neither John Kotek nor Allison Macfarlane had the answer on hand
 - ii) Can the canisters in use at SONGS be moved?
 - (1) Allison Macfarlane responded that the SONGS canisters are dual purpose made for both storage and transport and are licensed as such – they will require a transportation cask
 - (a) Chairman Victor asked when the transportation cask would be available
 - (i) Tom Palmisano clarified that the Unit 1 canisters are licensed for storage and transport and the transport cask is licensed today; the Units 2 & 3 Areva canisters are licensed for storage and transport and the transport cask is licensed today; the transport casks would need to be built (~ 6 months to fabricate). The Holtec canisters are licensed for storage today, the transportation license is under review by the NRC and is expected to be issued late this year or early next year
 - (b) Tim Brown mentioned that Gary Headrick had commented that there was a possibility of further fuel degradation during transportation and that a criticality accident could happen during transportation

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, June 22, 2016, from 5:30-8:30 p.m. PDT in San Juan Capistrano, California

Meeting Minutes and Action Items

- (i) Tom Palmisano mentioned that all fuel in the spent fuel pools was recently inspected and 2% had indications of leaks from their time in the reactors; this was expected. There are NRC rules regarding whether these fuel assemblies can be put into canisters or if they require damaged fuel containers and the determination has yet to be made
- iii) How soon will the design for transportation casks be ready?
 - (1) John Kotek estimates it would take eight years once Congressional action was received (rough order of magnitude)
- iv) How susceptible is the Consent-based Siting Process to the upcoming presidential election?
 - (1) Allison Macfarlane responded that it is susceptible; the Blue Ribbon Commission recommended that the management of nuclear waste be taken out of the direct political process (i.e., the DOE), and recommended creating a non-federal and separate agency (private or public)
- v) Explain why the CEP meetings are held this way and how do items get on the agenda?
 - (1) Chairman Victor responded that the CEP charter is followed and reiterated that the CEP is a non-decision making body. CEP members and the public are polled late in the year to identify agenda topics and CEP members together decide on the agenda for the following year’s meetings

13) Meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

14) Action Items:

| | Action Item Description | Comments |
|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | Tom suggested future discussion to provide more detail on the DOE litigation and David Victor agreed | |
| 2 | David Victor requested a future workshop to educate in depth on Aging Management Program | |
| 3 | John Kotek told Glenn Pascall he would have his counsel provide further information on the queue process | |
| 4 | Tim Brown suggested having a “Consent-based Siting” page on SONGScommunity.com, posting the questions from page 9 of the “Integrated Waste Management Consent-based Siting” brochure, and forwarding the responses/feedback to John Kotek | |
| 5 | Upload to SONGScommunity.com the Edlow International video showing the transportation cask being loaded | |
| 6 | Tom Palmisano told Rita Conn that he would pull up the site specific license information for the canisters and share at a future meeting | |
| 7 | Tom Palmisano told David Victor that it would be beneficial to have a workshop to explain fuel (types of inspections, results of inspections, potential for fuel degradation during transportation, etc.) | |