



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

Community Engagement Panel Public Meeting

Transcript of Proceedings

Date: 07/23/2015

Job #: 597477

Court Reporting – Videoconferencing – Trial Presentation – Nationwide Networking

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

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
OCEANSIDE, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, JULY 23, 2015

Reported by:
CARLOS R. HICHO
CSR No. 13111
Job No. 597477

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
1938 Avenida Del Oro, Oceanside, California
92056, commencing at the hour of 6:07 P.M.,
THURSDAY, JULY 23, 2015, before
CARLOS R. HICHO, CSR No. 13111.

1 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

2 DAVID G. VICTOR
CHAIRMAN

3 TOM PALMISANO
4 VICE PRESIDENT, DECOMMISSION
AND CHIEF NUCLEAR OFFICER AT SONGS

5 DAN STETSON, CEP SECRETARY
6 OCEAN INSTITUTE

7 LISA BARTLETT
SUPERVISOR FIFTH DISTRICT

8 JEROME M. "JERRY" KERN
9 OCEANSIDE CITI COUNCILMEMBER

10 DONNA BOSTON
ORANGE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

11 RICH HAYDON
12 CALIFORNIA STATE PARKS

13 DR. WILLIAM PARKER
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE

14 JOHN ALPAY
15 CAPISTRANO UNIFIED SCHOOL BOARD

16 JAVIER ALVAREZ
LOCAL 89 SAN DIEGO

17 GLENN PASCALL
18 SIERRA CLUB

19 CARLOS OLVERA
MAYOR DANA POINT

20 TOM CAUGHLAN
21 CAMP PENDLETON

22
23 (Continued.)

24

25

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

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

JIM LEACH
SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY ECONOMIC COALITION

TED QUINN

KELLI GALLION
EMERGENCY PLANNING MANAGER

BOB BAKER
SAN CLEMENTE MAYOR PRO TEM

GUESTS PRESENT:

DR. KRIS SINGH
HOLTEC PRESIDENT & CEO

PIERRE ONEID
HOLTEC SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT and CHIEF
NUCLEAR OFFICER

SARA KAMINSKE
ASSISTANT EMERGENCY MANAGER FOR ORANGE
COUNTY SHERIFF and IPC CHAIR.

1 THURSDAY, JULY 23, 2015

2 OCEANSIDE, CALIFORNIA

3 6:13 P.M.

4 * * *

5 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Let's get started.

6 Welcome to the regular meeting of the Community
7 Engagement Panel. Tonight the meeting is going to
8 focus on dry fuel storage, Defense in Depth, and the
9 implementation of emergency plan.

10 We have an extremely busy agenda. I'm sorry
11 we're starting a few minutes late, but the 5 is, by all
12 accounts, a parking lot right now. So, thank you for
13 all of you who have braved the 5 to get here. We may
14 run a few minutes over, but we'll keep the meeting in
15 total at three hours.

16 My name is David Victor, I'm Chairman of the
17 Community Engagement Panel; Dan Stetson, Secretary,
18 here with me. I just want to remind everybody that if
19 there is an emergency and you need to evacuate the
20 building, you can go back out the doors that you came
21 in or those doors there also marked "Exit" and then
22 back out to the parking lot.

23 We have two officers in attendance for your
24 safety and security. And if there's anything we can do
25 to help you, please don't hesitate to let me know.

1 Let me just remind everybody the Community
2 Engagement Panel is not a decision-making body. There
3 are lots of decision-making bodies involved in various
4 kinds of oversight of the Decommissioning of
5 San Onofre. We are -- we're designed and are designed
6 as a conduit between the communities affected by the
7 plant and the owners and operators of the plant and
8 it's a two-way conduit.

9 This body is here to help, Edison, in
10 particular, understand what the communities are worried
11 about and concerned about and talk about that in a
12 serious way and also to help the many communities
13 understand what Edison is doing and to have a two-way
14 interaction and we've had a lot of interaction on the
15 two topics of today's -- tonight's agenda.

16 Before we get started, let me remind you that
17 there's a website, www.SONGScommunity.com, where you
18 can sign up for walking tours, you can obtain all the
19 meeting materials on the website, there's livestreaming
20 there for those around the world who are watching us.

21 I believe all the presentations from tonight's
22 present -- for tonight are already posted on that site,
23 and I will also commit to you that we are going to up
24 our game on improving the usability of that site so
25 that's easier to find information on the site. We've

1 heard from a number of people that had difficulty and
2 we're working on that. But the idea is to be
3 completely transparent and make sure that everything is
4 available to the community.

5 I want to acknowledge several alternates and
6 guest speakers tonight: San Clemente Mayor Pro Tem,
7 Bob Baker, who is sitting down here, sitting in for Tim
8 Brown, who unfortunately is unable to be with us
9 tonight due to overseas travel.

10 We'll have a presentation later on the
11 permanent -- Permanently Defueled Emergency Plan, the
12 PDEP. And I acknowledge Sara Kaminske, who is the
13 Assistant Emergency Manager for Orange County Sheriff
14 and Chair of the IPC. Sara, thank you for joining us
15 tonight.

16 We'll also have presentations from Holtec on
17 the Defense-in-Depth Plan along with Edison. And from
18 Holtec tonight we have Kris Singh, who is President and
19 CEO of Holtec, as well as Pierre Oneid, who is Senior
20 Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer for -- for
21 Holtec. I think, also, Javier Alvarado, from Local 89,
22 is here to observe because Val Macedo is -- and Rick
23 Smiles aren't able to be with us tonight.

24 Let me remind you that the public comment
25 period is not completely open-mic night where you can

1 get up and say whatever you want to say, but if you
2 have a theme for your comment, please let us know what
3 that is, and you have to sign up for the comment period
4 over at the registration table. And we'll talk later
5 about a slight revision in that process to hopefully
6 make the open-comment period as productive as possible.

7 We have on everyone's chairs agendas as well
8 as hard-to-read documents. I've discovered, as I get
9 older, that more and more documents are in the
10 hard-to-read category. But there are hard-to-read
11 documents on your chairs.

12 And those of you who speak both in the
13 open-comment period and members of the CEP during the
14 sessions prior, please do state your name for those
15 watching, not only livestream but in the archive.
16 Every single CEP meeting is archived. And I will call
17 out, along with Dan Stetson, various items that come up
18 for the public record and for a concrete action by
19 Edison and by others afterwards.

20 Let's begin now. We have -- the first segment
21 of our meeting is going to be an update on the
22 decommissioning process and, in particular, focusing on
23 what's happened since the last report from Edison. And
24 we have, as always, Tom Palmisano, who is Vice
25 President of Decommissioning and Chief Nuclear Officer

1 for Edison, a familiar face and a key supporter of the
2 CEP.

3 Tom, the floor is yours.

4 MR. PALMISANO: Okay. Thank you, David. Good
5 evening, everybody. I look forward to addressing the
6 Community Engagement Panel and the public tonight. In
7 this segment, I'll provide an overall update on our
8 decommissioning activities and some related activities.

9 The -- just to refresh, keep in front of all
10 of us are Decommissioning Principles: Safety,
11 Stewardship, and Engagement. You know, fundamentally,
12 safely decommissioning San Onofre, safely storing and
13 then managing spent fuel until the Department of Energy
14 removes it from our site; Stewardship of the
15 environment and the Trust Fund; and Engagement,
16 ensuring we are talking openly about what we're doing,
17 what our plans are, and listening actively in terms of
18 feedback from the panel and the public and other
19 stakeholders.

20 I'll keep this brief, David, because I know
21 we've got some significant topics in the agenda, so if
22 there are any panel members at this point who have
23 questions, please, please ask as I go.

24 You've seen our 20-year timeline before. I
25 just want to give you an update. Again, the bold

1 vertical line to the left of that is quarters; that is
2 the first quarter of 2016. And after that is years,
3 taking us out to a 20-year timeline. We're still in
4 the pre-decommissioning activities at this point.

5 The upper left activities are all in progress.
6 This is retiring systems and equipment that are no
7 longer required. This is reconfiguring the plant.
8 You've heard me talk before about removing hazards,
9 such as transformer oil and acid and caustics; all that
10 is well underway and a good bit of that is now
11 complete. So we anticipate completing --

12 And go back one, please. Hit the wrong button
13 too quick.

14 So we anticipate completing that at the end of
15 the fourth quarter into the early first quarter. The
16 middle section is really the NRC licensing basis
17 changes. I'm going to talk in a few minutes about the
18 Defueled Emergency Plan, which has been approved and
19 implemented.

20 And this week we received approval for the
21 Defueled Technical Specifications, which are part of
22 the license, and that's been implemented. This now
23 changes the license to reflect that we're no longer
24 authorized to operate the reactor and modifies all the
25 extraneous stuff from the license that doesn't apply

1 anymore.

2 The ISFSI (Independent Spent Fuel Storage
3 Installation) Project we're going to talk about more
4 specifically. We are in the engineering and permitting
5 phase at this point. A lot of the focus in 2015 shifts
6 away from NRC submittals to California permitting
7 activities with the Coastal Commission particularly as
8 we look at the ISFSI expansion. So a lot of work going
9 on in the permitting arena at -- at the state level at
10 this point.

11 The Irradiated Fuel Manage Plan,
12 Decommissioning Cost Estimate, and Post-Shutdown
13 Decommissioning Activities Report; these are unique
14 submittals the NRC requires for decommissioning.

15 The Decommissioning Cost Estimate has been
16 done, submitted to the NRC, and submitted to the Public
17 Utility Commission, and they're starting the proceeding
18 to review the appropriateness of the Decommissioning
19 Cost Estimate.

20 The NRC has accepted the estimate; their
21 90-day review period completed at the end of December
22 2014. We now will be on an annual update process with
23 the NRC. The Public Utility Commission is just
24 starting their review process.

25 The Post-Shutdown Decommissioning Activities

1 Report -- some of you were here last year, we had a
2 couple of meetings on this -- it's a fairly high-level
3 document, about a 40-to-50 page document, outlining the
4 20-year decommissioning plan and the plan to manage
5 spent fuel through the longer term on site until it's
6 removed from the site. So those two documents have
7 been accepted by the NRC at the end of the 90-day
8 period.

9 The Irradiated Fuel Management Plan is a
10 document which describes the Irradiated Fuel Management
11 Plan, in particular how we're going to fund that, that
12 is, completed its review. And I expect, at the end of
13 July or early August, the NRC will actually approve
14 that and issue a Safety Evaluation Report because
15 that's about spent fuel, so they actually take a more
16 involved role in approving that plan.

17 The rest of the activities are really
18 activities on site: Historical Site Assessment & Site
19 Characterization, characterizing what's on the site
20 after 30 or 40 years of operation, preparing for the
21 Remediation Plan and the Decommissioning Plan.

22 And we're in the middle of the process of
23 selecting a General Decommissioning Contractor who will
24 actually plan and execute the overall decommissioning
25 under our -- our oversight.

1 So with that, that's a quick update on
2 decommissioning. Any questions on that?

3 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Questions? Can you just let
4 us know, is there anything that's not going according
5 to schedule that we -- to which we should be
6 attentive?

7 MR. PALMISANO: Right now everything is going to
8 schedule. What I would tell you to be attentive to is
9 the Coastal Commission work over the next two to three
10 months. We've got several key discussions coming up in
11 August and October and they're important and I know a
12 number of people on the distribution list for that, so
13 that's what I'd draw your attention to.

14 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. And the schedule right
15 now calls for the spent fuel to be offloaded into
16 canisters, starting in early 2017 and then finish by
17 2019. Is that, more or less, the --

18 MR. PALMISANO: That --

19 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- the position?

20 MR. PALMISANO: That is the current schedule, so
21 when the permitting is done, we're doing our
22 engineering, our off-site fabrication currently, and
23 that will continue. On-site construction will start
24 after the Coastal Commission permit is approved and
25 issued.

1 And then, anticipating about a year for
2 on-site construction, we would offload the pool
3 somewhere, starting in 2017 to be complete by mid-2019
4 or earlier, just depending on when we get started on
5 the activity.

6 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. I just asked because
7 we're going to have a segment of the meeting later --

8 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

9 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- where we talk about
10 Consolidated Interim Storage, which would involve
11 moving the fuel out of here completely, and that could
12 then potentially begin as early as 2019 or so.

13 MR. PALMISANO: Certainly. It could -- could begin
14 as soon as really an off-site facility is available,
15 but I'll touch more on that in a minute.

16 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Right. Thank you. Any other
17 questions?

18 (Brief pause.)

19 MR. PALMISANO: Okay. You've seen this slide at
20 every meeting. I'm just showing you. These are the
21 NRC Submittals. We are now complete with the emergency
22 plan since the last meeting and the defuel tech specs.

23 The PSDAR (Post-Shutdown Decommissioning
24 Activities Report), the Decommissioning Cost
25 Estimate -- again, I apologize for the acronyms -- have

1 been accepted as of December 26, so we're really down
2 to just a couple NRC submittals that we'll be
3 completing over the next three -- three months or so.

4 Industry Initiatives: This is important
5 because part of what we're going to talk about today is
6 not only on-site spent fuel storage, but Consolidated
7 Interim Storage off site.

8 Now, the Department of Energy -- I think we've
9 all talked about this -- under the Nuclear Waste Policy
10 Act, is responsible for removing spent nuclear fuel
11 from all the commercial nuclear sites and disposing of
12 it. They've had that responsibility since 1982.

13 We're all frustrated that they haven't done
14 that yet. And, quite frankly, that's an important
15 element for all of us to push forward.

16 Now, as part of this, though, every several
17 years they publish a report that is looking at a
18 preliminary evaluation of removing fuel from shutdown
19 nuclear sites. Now that we've permanently closed units
20 2 and 3 and notified them, they made a visit in June to
21 update their report. They had previously looked at
22 San Onofre 1 since that had been closed many years
23 earlier.

24 So we hosted a DOE visit and they spent a day
25 on site; more importantly, they spent two days in the

1 area. So there were DOE officials, up to an assistant,
2 under Secretary of the Department of Energy, Department
3 of Transportation Officials, Federal Rail -- Railway
4 Administration officers, technical staff, DOE National
5 Labs Personnel.

6 The California Energy Staff Commission
7 participated in all the days because they're certainly
8 very interested in what is going to take to remove fuel
9 from the San Onofre site. I think it was a very
10 productive visit.

11 They met -- not only they spent a day touring
12 the site, understanding our infrastructure and rail
13 access and highway access, they then met with some of
14 the CEP officers to get some public perspective. They
15 met with local officials. They met with railroad
16 representatives and heavy haul company to understand.

17 And we are fortunate in this area. We have
18 some pretty good access to rail and highway compared to
19 some sites. So they came away with a lot of good
20 information. They looked at the on-site fuel storage,
21 our infrastructure, and the transportation
22 infrastructure in the area.

23 They expect their revised draft to be done in
24 the fall of 2015. This is what the cover page looks
25 like (indicating). I believe this was the 2014 report.

1 We can easily put on this our website. You know, it's
2 a bit dated. This would be updated and probably
3 publicly available early 2016 once they get through
4 their draft-review process. So this was an important
5 visit and I was pleased to see them come out when they
6 did.

7 Let me go on and talk about Consolidated
8 Interim Storage. So there is a couple of things going
9 on in the industry that I think it's important the
10 Panel and public know about. Really, there is three
11 possibilities, if you will, right now that appear to be
12 on the horizon:

13 First is in the Skull Valley, Utah, on the
14 Goshute Indian Reservation. This is private fuel
15 storage. And, actually, we are a very small part-owner
16 over this limited liability company that actually
17 license this facility.

18 So this facility is owned by utilities,
19 including us. We actually have an NRC license that was
20 issued in 2007 to build an interim off-site used fuel
21 storage facility. You'll see my bottom bullet, it's
22 "Unlikely ever to be constructed."

23 This really never had the appropriate support
24 at the state level in Utah. There was a lot of local
25 support from the Indian ba -- band, some support from

1 the counties, but a lot of resistance at a state level,
2 and this truly highlights what has come to be known
3 today as "Consent-Based Siting."

4 That lacking consent-based siting you can get
5 this license, but the reality is you probably never get
6 it built. We were never able to secure rail access to
7 the site due to opposition. So this one really will
8 not come to fruition. The good thing about it, it
9 really laid out the template, though, for a private
10 entity to be licensed for off-site fuel storage.

11 So then the next thing, and this is fairly
12 new, in Andrews County, Texas, which is in West Texas,
13 a company called Waste Control Specialists, with a
14 couple of other companies, have announced the intent to
15 build and license a Consolidated Interim Storage
16 facility. They've partnered with -- with AREVA.
17 There's significant local and state support for the
18 facility, both local counties as well as state level,
19 the Governor has weighed in.

20 So this appears to be on a positive track in
21 terms of consent-based support for that -- for that
22 location. They've actually commenced their initial
23 licensing activities and filed with the NRC with the
24 intent to submit a license application.

25 So this is a promising development for

1 off-site interim storage in the much nearer term than
2 Department of Energy functioning. In addition, in
3 Eastern New Mexico, Holtec and the Eddy -- Eddy Lea
4 Energy Alliance -- Eddy Lea are two counties in this
5 area. This, again, is an area where there is a lot of
6 local and state support for continuing -- for
7 Consolidated Interim Storage. It is based on the
8 Holtec UMAX System.

9 As I said, a lot of local and state support.
10 And initial licensing activities will commence
11 relatively soon. They've announced this to the
12 industry and are preparing to inform the NRC of their
13 plans for licensing. So I see these as two very viable
14 options.

15 Now, what both options need beyond what these
16 companies can do is they need some work at the federal
17 level with some changes to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act
18 to authorize DOE to work with private companies for
19 interim storage, and they need funding lined up through
20 the Nuclear Waste Fund, which has been collected from
21 all of us for many years. So there's some things that
22 we need to urge federal legislators to make happen.

23 The companies, the states are active in that
24 scheme, but I think these are two very viable things
25 that will provide us an interim solution much sooner

1 than a permanent solution from the Department of
2 Energy. So I'm encouraged by that.

3 And I would say, though, that I was talking to
4 a couple of CEP panel members, we really need to send
5 the message clearly to Congress related to this, of the
6 interest in Consolidated Interim Storage as a solution
7 for a plan, like San Onofre, which has no need to keep
8 fuel on site anymore.

9 And with that, David, questions before I turn
10 it back to you?

11 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Great. Thank you very much.
12 We'll have a chance to talk later in this meeting about
13 Consolidated Interim Storage.

14 Let me ask Dan Stetson. Do you want to
15 comment on the visit from the Department of Energy?
16 You and Tim Brown and I met with them at a ridiculously
17 early hour of the morning and it was so early I don't
18 remember what happened, but maybe you could tell us
19 what happened.

20 MR. STETSON: That's right, David. I think it was
21 because of you that we had to meet at six o'clock in
22 the morning, but the folks from the East Coast,
23 certainly, that was on their schedule.

24 I thought it was a very interesting meeting,
25 to come and be able to ask questions of these folks,

1 and I think so much of it revolved around
2 transportation. And, once we have a place, when can we
3 move it?

4 So my question that I really took away was, if
5 we had a place to move it tomorrow, does the DOE have
6 legal authority to move it? And the gentleman there
7 looked at me and he smiled and he said, "We have legal
8 authority, but we don't really have realistic
9 authority."

10 And I said "Well, what do you mean by that?"
11 He said "Well, we, under the statute, we have the
12 authority to do it, but realistically all the
13 jurisdictions that we would have to move it through we
14 would need to get their buy-in at some level before we
15 would be able to move it through there." So I thought
16 that that was really interesting to -- to come away
17 with that, a big take-away.

18 The other one was that there are two bills,
19 one in the Senate and one in the House, that are moving
20 forward. And really on the basis of that, that'll be
21 the marching orders for the DOE.

22 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Excellent. Thank you very
23 much. Let me see if there are any other comments. I
24 will say that I asked the DOE to send us, CEP and,
25 therefore, the community, a letter outlining what their

1 next steps are here and they are going to send that
2 letter. And so as soon as we have it, we'll circulate
3 it along with, as Tom mentioned, the new report on the
4 status of spent fuel. Any other comments or questions?

5 MR. ALPAY: I just have --

6 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: John?

7 MR. ALPAY: I just have a quick question. Where in
8 New Mexico is this proposed facility?

9 DR. SINGH: Southeast New Mexico.

10 MR. ALPAY: I'm sorry. Where?

11 MR. PALMISANO: Kris. Kris --

12 DR. SINGH: The southeast corner.

13 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Kris. Kris. Let me ask Tom
14 to -- it's in the southeast corner of New Mexico.

15 MR. PALMISANO: Northeast of New Mexico, Kris.

16 DR. SINGH: No, the southeast.

17 MR. PALMISANO: Southeast. Thank you. Southeast
18 corner of New Mexico. Eddy Lea County is just across
19 the Texas line.

20 MR. ALPAY: Okay. Thank you.

21 MR. CAUGHLAN: I have -- Mr. Chairman, I have one
22 quick question of Dan. When you say jurisdictional
23 permission, do we have to get permission from every
24 single county this goes through or is it state? Or
25 how -- I see a nightmare coming.

1 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I think, yeah, this --

2 MR. CAUGHLAN: By nodding yes, I think you agree
3 with this.

4 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: You know, I think we've
5 heard -- the idea of moving the fuel permanently to
6 Yucca Mountain is becoming more and more distant as a
7 serious prospect, but not completely gone. And so now
8 there is a lot of excitement about Consolidated Interim
9 Storage. It makes a whole lot of sense. And we, in
10 this community, really should be pushing for this.

11 I came away from the meeting with DOE really
12 struck, as Dan said, that the real problems are going
13 to be transport-related, that they're going to need to
14 have multiple routes and figure out what local consent
15 really means and how do you engage those communities.

16 And if that doesn't get done properly, then
17 we're going to be stuck with the waste here. So I
18 think this is a lot of spadework that needs to be done
19 on that. And we'll come back later in this meeting to
20 talk about how we would help push along that spade --
21 spadework.

22 Ted Quinn, did you want to comment?

23 MR. QUINN: Well, you said we were coming back
24 later in the meeting. I think the benefit is, as part
25 of those Senate and House bill that Dan talked about

1 is -- is part of the transportation is being addressed
2 as part of those bills with funding towards looking at
3 procedural and program support to make that work.

4 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much. Any
5 other comments or questions about this?

6 (Brief pause).

7 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: This is an extremely helpful
8 update. Thank you. Thank you very much, Tom.

9 Let's move on now to the first and the main
10 topic of today's meeting, which is the New Emergency
11 Plan for San Onofre. It may be slightly mistitled in
12 the agenda. What's happened recently is that the
13 emergency -- parts of the Emergency Plan have shifted.
14 And this has been on the news quite a lot. We thought
15 it would be valuable to have a serious discussion about
16 this right now.

17 So, Tom, I know you're going to lead this, but
18 then bring in some other folks to comment along the
19 way.

20 MR. PALMISANO: Right. Right. What I will do is,
21 I will introduce kind of give a high-level summary,
22 turn it over to Kelli Gallion, our Emergency Planning
23 Manager, and then Sara Kaminske will talk from an
24 off-site perspective. And we appreciate both of you
25 being here to help us with this.

1 This is a discussion we have had periodically
2 through the last year, going back every meeting, with
3 status of the submittal. We submitted these Emergency
4 Plan changes in March of 2014. So, starting the first
5 meeting, we've talked about this. We had an in-depth
6 meeting back -- do you remember when that was, Kelli,
7 when we had the deep dive into the emergency plan? I
8 think that was in July?

9 MS. GALLION: It would've been in -- in May.

10 MR. PALMISANO: May? May. Thank you. So we've
11 had a regular discussion about Emergency Plan changes.
12 But it's important, and now that it's been approved and
13 implemented, I want to just recap for everybody.

14 Again, our decommissioning principles; I won't
15 repeat that, but this is built really on safety and our
16 discussion on engagement.

17 So, why is emergency planning changing?
18 You've heard this before, but just I'll be redundant
19 quite frankly, you know. In an operating plant, the
20 full scale emergency plan with the 10-mile emergency
21 planning zone, the four levels of emergency from
22 unusual event to alert the site area emergency to
23 general emergency are based really on the accidents
24 that can occur on an operating nuclear plant that can
25 happen relatively quickly and, in bad accidents,

1 release significant radioactivity that can affect
2 off-site population. Okay?

3 What's different in a permanently shutdown
4 decommissioning plant, first there's no fuel in the
5 reactors. These reactors are not operating at full
6 power of 2,000 pounds and 600 degrees. The fuels --
7 the reactors are permanently defueled.

8 In our case, the fuel has decayed greater than
9 three years. These reactors last operated on
10 January 31st, 2012, for Unit 3, and Unit 2 had shut
11 down in early January 2012. So, the fuel is decayed.
12 There is significantly lower decay heat and
13 radioactivity levels.

14 Now, there is significant long-term
15 radioactivity. There is no doubt about that in the
16 fuel, but it doesn't present the same hazard that the
17 short-lived radioactivity does in an operating plant.

18 Most potential scenarios related to an
19 operating plant are no longer possible simply because
20 the reactors are no longer in service. And there is
21 much more time to respond and mitigate -- mitigate
22 potential issues before they could affect on-site
23 employees or the public. That's kind of the
24 fundamental basis that the NRC and we look at in terms
25 of why it's appropriate to change an emergency plan.

1 This just gives you a little more detail:
2 "Operating reactor, on the left, potential accidents
3 that dominate risk and create radiological --" things
4 like reactor coolant system line breaks. Again, the
5 reactor cool -- coolant system is no longer in service.
6 It simply can't occur.

7 "Loss of steam generator feedwater." Steam
8 generators are no longer in service, so the serious
9 accidents that can happen quickly and release
10 significant radioactivity are no longer possible.

11 In a permanently defueled reactor the hazards
12 are reduced; primary risk is related really to fuel
13 stored in the spent fuel pool to a lesser degree in dry
14 cask storage, mainly the spent fuel pool.

15 And, in fact, the accident -- the emergency
16 plan requirements for dry cask storage in the shutdown
17 plan are the same as they are in the operating plan.
18 And the spent fuel pool is at atmospheric temperature
19 and low pressure. Again, there is a low-heat source
20 and we don't have a high-energy system that can release
21 radioactivity.

22 This -- this curve we had our folks develop
23 just to show you. This would show you back at February
24 2012 when we first shut down Unit 3, and Unit 2 had
25 been shut down just three weeks. Don't worry about,

1 you know, millions of BTU's per hour, but that's a
2 high-heat load, for example.

3 You can see within about 15 to 18 months that
4 decays to 10 percent of what it was when we first shut
5 down and then you have a slow decay after that. So
6 this is principally what changes in terms of the hazard
7 in the spent fuel pool.

8 The Emergency Plan changes impacts only part
9 of the original plan; much of the plan remains the
10 same. We have noted unusual events and alerts. We
11 have an on-site staff that's robust, able to deal with
12 emergencies. We have requirements to notify off-site
13 authorities and cooperate and train. So, much of the
14 plan remains the same.

15 The NRC spent 15 months reviewing, approving
16 this. This is not something we could do unilaterally.
17 This went through 15 months of review, including public
18 comment periods.

19 So, "What remains?" The dedicated Emergency
20 Response Organization. We continue the coordination
21 with off-site emergency responders and the
22 Interjurisdictional Planning Committee. And there is
23 one point here, there has been some discussion about
24 ongoing funding. So, you know, as an operating plant,
25 there is a state law that requires us to fund off-site

1 emergency planning, okay, and through the
2 Interjurisdictional Planning Commission.

3 After we shut down, we were asked the question
4 "Would we lobby for a change of the law?" And we said
5 no. We -- in fact, we said through 2019 until the fuel
6 is out of the fuel pools, we will continue the same
7 level of funding. It doesn't matter if the plan is the
8 defuel plan or the operating plan, we have committed to
9 continue the same level of funding.

10 Cal OES recently decided that they can no
11 longer charge us that because we're no longer an
12 operating plant. We have told the counties and the
13 cities we'll continue the funding and we've offered to
14 work out Memorandums Of Understanding with all the
15 appropriate jurisdictions to assure that funding for
16 that period of time. So I just want everybody to
17 understand we are committed to that.

18 You see some numbers when we look at the local
19 and the county agencies, it's about 1.7 million a year.
20 And after 2019 when all the fuel is in the independent
21 fuel storage installation or dry cask storage, we're
22 willing to continue some appropriate level of funding
23 then because we recognize it's important. Okay. And
24 we'll work that out after we're down the road farther
25 on that.

1 This just -- I just want to kind of reiterate
2 the timeline. We submitted this in March 2014.
3 Actually, it was October. We had an in-depth
4 presentation, as Kelli mentioned, May. In every
5 meeting I status the NRC's submittals and talked about
6 this.

7 But if you remember in October, we brought in
8 the NRC to talk about emergency planning and their
9 process for reviewing plan changes and exemptions and
10 license amendments. We brought in the chair of
11 Interjurisdictional Planning Committee at that point in
12 time, and then we talked, as well, explaining emergency
13 planning and how it was going to change many months
14 before it was approved.

15 And we wanted -- we had a very good
16 discussion, I think, with the panel and the public
17 about what was changing, the basis for the change in
18 the process, and we've continued to status that
19 throughout. You see some additional things.

20 The NRC commissioners had to approve a series
21 of exemptions to the rules and then they did that in
22 March. And why are exemptions necessary? Because all
23 the rules were written for an operating reactor and the
24 NRC has recognized that and decided to start
25 rule-making.

1 But in the interim, for San Onofre and other
2 decommissioning plants, the NRC has an approved process
3 to say for us to propose these rules should not apply
4 and request exemptions; took them a year to approve
5 those. It's not a trivial decision. They had
6 extensive review time and they actually had some very
7 good staff guidance that we and the other utilities
8 follow. That's available on our website, and we've
9 shared this before.

10 And then the NRC then completed their work and
11 issued the changes in June and we implemented on
12 June 8, so we've now implemented the Defueled Emergency
13 Plan.

14 And with that, let me take it -- turn it over
15 to Kelli for a little more discussion.

16 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Are there any burning
17 questions for Tom before we shift to Kelli? Lisa?

18 MS. BARTLETT: I want to thank Southern California
19 Edison for its commitment to offer funding through
20 2019, that's really important. I know, in July 1st, it
21 came as a real surprise from the state level that they
22 were going to -- to stop the funding level. So, we
23 appreciate the -- the commitment from Southern
24 California Edison.

25 You know, public safety is our number one

1 priority. And even though the Nuclear Regulatory
2 Commission has reduced, in the event of an emergency,
3 because of the levels of activity at the nuclear power
4 plant, that you only have to have a -- an emergency
5 plan for a 2-mile radius, I want everyone to know that
6 the county and Southern California Edison have been
7 committed to not have the 2-mile radius but the
8 10-miles radius around the SONGS facility.

9 I have a number of cities in my district of
10 South Orange County, San Clemente, San Juan Capistrano,
11 Dana Point, that are within that 10-mile radius, so
12 it's really critical that we have that -- that radius
13 to ensure safety of the residents in those cities.

14 MR. PALMISANO: And I -- and I appreciate that. I
15 think we were all surprised, those of us involved, on
16 Cal OES's decision that the funding couldn't continue
17 under that mechanism. But, again, you know our
18 commitment and we're pleased to be here.

19 MS. BARTLETT: And it's actually better to keep the
20 state out of it at this point.

21 MR. PALMISANO: Yes.

22 MS. BARTLETT: It takes out the middle man and we
23 just deal directly with Southern California Edison, so
24 I think we'll be a lot more efficient.

25 MR. PALMISANO: Very good. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much. Any
2 other comments before we -- okay. Why don't we move
3 on? Thank you very much.

4 MR. PALMISANO: It advances slide and that's --
5 (Hands controller to Ms. Gallion.)

6 MS. GALLION: Okay. Thanks.

7 First, I want to start out by thanking you
8 guys for allowing me to come and talk about our
9 Emergency Preparedness Program at SONGS.

10 A little bit about myself: I am a native, a
11 San Clementian, actually born and raised. I've been at
12 SONGS for almost 29 years; 25 of those years have been
13 in radiation protection.

14 I'm going to talk about our mission, which has
15 not changed. Our mission continues to be to protect
16 the health and safety of the public. Some of the ways
17 that we accomplish that mission is by having a
18 dedicated Emergency Response Organization.

19 We also have good partnership with our
20 off-site jurisdiction, which was previously mentioned
21 by Tom. So we continue to have routine meetings and we
22 also do drill and training together as well. And, as
23 Tom already mentioned, we are committed to funding our
24 local county and our local cities for emergency
25 funding.

1 On this -- the next couple of slides, I'm
2 going to kind of talk about and get into more detail
3 about the emergency plan and what our capabilities
4 currently are compared to what they were before we
5 implemented our Permanently Defueled E-Plan. You'll
6 see largely that a lot of our capabilities remain the
7 same, that they have not changed.

8 So I'll go over those: The first one, which
9 is a high priority, is Dose Assessment. You'll see
10 that during the operating plan that it was a
11 requirement to have off-site Dose Assessment.

12 And, although, it's no longer a requirement,
13 it is something we still continue to do both on site
14 and both off site by San Onofre and also by the local
15 jurisdictions.

16 We also continue to provide our notification
17 to Orange County, San Diego County, California
18 Operate -- Office of Emergency Services, Camp
19 Pendleton, and the NRC. We notify them within 15
20 minutes and we provide a verbal notification within 60
21 minutes.

22 And we still have public information. We
23 disseminate public information via our public
24 information officers, via our corporate office instead
25 of the Joint Information Center. So we no long -- we

1 no longer have a Joint Information Center, but we do
2 have our corporate offices that still disseminates
3 public information.

4 Law Enforcement Response: You can see there
5 that there's been no change in the level of support
6 from the local law enforcement agencies. We do
7 maintain a Law Enforcement Response Plan that's
8 maintained by our security department. They also
9 participate in exercises with us on an annual basis.

10 Hospitals and Medical Treatment: You'll see
11 that we went from two hospitals to four hospitals --
12 or, I'm sorry -- from four hospitals to two hospitals.

13 We have agreements with all of these agencies
14 that are listed up on the screen. Our two hospitals
15 are Mission, which is to the north of the plant, and
16 then Tri-City, which is to the south of the plant.

17 There's no -- have been no changes in
18 transportation or our fire fighting capabilities. You
19 can see what they are up on the board. Again, there is
20 no change in capabilities for those two areas.

21 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Lisa, do you want to ask a
22 question?

23 MS. BARTLETT: Yes. I know you're going from four
24 hospitals to two. I would think you would want to have
25 as many hospitals as possible. I know that the

1 Saddleback Memorial Hospital right now in San Clemente
2 has an uncertain status. But with regard to Mission
3 and Laguna Beach, why would that not be included?

4 MS. GALLION: Mission is included -- or not Mission
5 Laguna Beach --

6 MS. BARTLETT: Laguna Beach.

7 MS. GALLION: But Mission Regional is included, and
8 their requirement was to have a primary and a backup
9 hospital, so we went with the primary and the backup
10 and having one north and one south; and then Mission
11 Regional, in Mission Viejo, had the trauma -- the
12 trauma unit, so that's why we chose those two
13 hospitals.

14 MS. BARTLETT: Even though you're only required to
15 have a primary and a backup, I would still think you
16 would want to have as many available hospitals in the
17 region as possible and have those designated.

18 MS. GALLION: Yeah, and we have during our IPC and
19 communication with Camp Pendleton, in the event of a --
20 you know, a large event where required multiple
21 transportation of injured workers, we would be able to
22 take them to any hospital that would be available and
23 willing to receive patients.

24 MS. BARTLETT: That's why I think they'd be listed
25 on the emergency plan.

1 MS. GALLION: Yeah, these were -- yeah, these were
2 the two hospitals. I can't go back. Manuel, do you
3 want to --

4 MR. PALMISANO: (Inaudible.) And take that --

5 MS. GALLION: Right. Thanks, Tom.

6 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yeah, so let's -- let's get
7 back to the CEP with some more articulation of what the
8 game plan is here because it seems like you still have
9 relationships with the larger number of hospitals, but
10 you have special relationships with two of them, and I
11 think we should understand that and why that was done.

12 MS. GALLION: Yeah. Based on the number of events,
13 we went down to the two hospitals, but we'll get back
14 to you on that.

15 MR. BAKER: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, before you
16 move on from that.

17 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Please.

18 MR. BAKER: Why -- I'd like to know why San
19 Clemente Hospital was left out? I mean, as part of the
20 fact-finding, I'd like an answer to that.

21 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very much.
22 By the way, for the streaming, that was Bob Baker.

23 MS. GALLION: Okay. Like Tom said, I'll have to
24 look into that and get back to you with an answer as
25 far as how we chose the two hospitals that were chosen.

1 I'm sharing with you as much as I know as far as why we
2 chose the two. My honest opinion was, there was no
3 specific reason why we didn't go with more hospitals
4 other than the regulatory requirement required us to
5 have a primary and a backup hospital.

6 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. We'll get more
7 information and we'll share it with the CEP and then we
8 can have a further discussion, because I think it's an
9 important issue.

10 MS. GALLION: Lastly, we recognize the importance
11 of -- we still have some risk, albeit a low risk. We
12 still have a risk and we recognize the importance of
13 maintaining collaboration with our off-site
14 communities.

15 Some of the examples that I can share with you
16 how we maintain collaboration with our off-site
17 jurisdictions is, one, we have a common goal of
18 ensuring protection, health and safety of the public
19 and our plant workers; that's our number one priority.

20 We've also committed to maintaining the 50
21 sirens that are within our 10-mile emergency planning
22 zone. We've also made provisions to allow a member of
23 the off-site Dose Assessment Center team to be able to
24 come into the command center if there was any kind of a
25 radiological event at the plant where they would be a

1 source of information to our off-site jurisdictions.

2 We've also -- I already said this several
3 times. But we're committed to funding through 2019 and
4 we're also discussing funding beyond 2019. So, again,
5 we continue to work together and make sure that our
6 number one priority together as a team is to protect
7 the health and safety of the public.

8 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Great. Thank you very much.
9 Let me just see if there are other questions for Kelli.
10 I know that some people are going to be interested in
11 the question of what the criteria are for deciding
12 around continued funding post-2019, so maybe we could
13 also include that in the list of things to report back
14 to CEP on. Other questions for Kelli or Tom related to
15 this? Bob?

16 MR. BAKER: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Bob
17 Baker from San Clemente. Are the parameters the same
18 for the sirens as they have been in the past? Will
19 they be -- will there be some different parameters when
20 the sirens will be activated?

21 MS. GALLION: Yeah, there'll be different
22 parameters. We're developing a maintenance plan right
23 now, but we're going to work with the jurisdiction that
24 have sirens within their jurisdiction. So the -- the
25 maintenance and testing will change somewhat, they

1 won't be held to FEMA requirements, but we'll still
2 continue to do maintenance and testing of those sirens.

3 It'll be up to the jurisdictions to establish
4 expectations and response requirements from the public,
5 but we'll continue to maintain the sirens themselves,
6 the equipment.

7 MR. BAKER: I'm not talking about the maintenance
8 of the sirens, I'm talking about when the sirens really
9 alert you to something dangerous. Are the parameters
10 when those sirens are going to be --

11 MS. GALLION: Yes.

12 MR. BAKER: -- activated different than with an
13 operating plant?

14 MS. GALLION: Right. So, under the operating
15 plant, they were activated -- first of all, San Onofre
16 never activated the sirens. We gave protective action
17 recommendations to the jurisdictions who would then
18 make the decision to sound the sirens.

19 So our procedure guidance at the time was you
20 would sound the sirens at a general emergency. But,
21 again, that was a decision that was made on behalf of
22 the jurisdictions. Does that answer your question?

23 MR. BAKER: Yes.

24 MS. GALLION: Okay.

25 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And Lisa, again. And then, I

1 think, John, you wanted to --

2 MS. BARTLETT: With regard to the sirens, because
3 now you've got the 2-mile radius, so are you going to
4 have the sirens activated then on an emergency basis
5 within the 2-mile radius only or within the 10-mile
6 radius that was previous?

7 MS. GALLION: So, again, we will maintain the
8 sirens that are within the 10-mile emergency planning
9 zone.

10 MS. BARTLETT: Okay.

11 MS. GALLION: That's 50 sirens. And, again, it's
12 going to be up to the jurisdictions to determine when
13 they would activate the sirens and for what type of
14 events.

15 MS. BARTLETT: Okay.

16 MS. GALLION: Sirens can be used for, you know,
17 different disaster-type situations. But we would not
18 provide or provide any protective action
19 recommendations that would warrant siren activation.

20 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And I think I understood,
21 from Tom's presentation, that there is now no scenario
22 in which there would be radiological release outside
23 the plant boundaries. So is that -- is that the right
24 interpretation?

25 MS. GALLION: It's --

1 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: So you don't see any scenario
2 in which the sirens would be activated for San Onofre
3 purposes?

4 MS. GALLION: That's correct. We would not exceed
5 in an alert.

6 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: John? John Alpay?

7 MR. ALPAY: Yeah. I knew you're going to give us
8 more information on the hospitals but, I mean, just to
9 emphasize the point for San Clemente, being a
10 San Clemente resident myself, just based on proximity,
11 it seems to be a gaping hole there. I mean, Mission
12 Hospital and Tri-City are both obviously qualified
13 facilities but, again, geography plays a role and it's
14 right there. So I would just emphasize a point, I
15 think that it's probably a deficiency.

16 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Jerry Kern and then Dan and
17 I --

18 MR. KERN: Just --

19 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- do need to move on.

20 MR. KERN: Just one quick follow up on this
21 hospital thing. Today, if you had an industrial
22 accident, a one-off, one person gets hurt, wouldn't you
23 transport to the closest hospital? It's not that you
24 would pick these. If there is some event that would
25 trigger a multiple transport to these hospitals, who

1 determines that multiple transport and who calls the
2 shots?

3 MS. GALLION: So let me -- let me clarify, maybe I
4 wasn't clear on that.

5 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. I think, maybe Donna
6 Boston? Do you want to answer this? And then I do --
7 we're going to get a full answer to this question back
8 in front of the CEP. So let me ask Donna Boston and
9 Dan and then we're going to move on.

10 MS. BOSTON: So I think that the difference that
11 we're seeing here is what's required for Edison to put
12 in their NRC required PETA(Plutonium Equipment Transfer
13 Area) Plan and what our emergency response activities
14 would actually include.

15 And so responding fire fighting assets or
16 firefighters, paramedics will respond into a situation
17 and they will employ the normal triage system that they
18 do for every single event and they will look at their
19 regional medical area hospitals and they will transport
20 the traumas to the trauma center that have open-bed
21 space and they will triage it in such a way that they
22 are sending the patients that need the most acute care
23 to the right places right away and then the lesser
24 injured or lesser affected individual go to the lesser
25 hospitals. So in our response portfolio we will

1 include all of those hospitals.

2 Edison may be following their plan, but the
3 off-site response agencies will follow our normal
4 protocols and that will include all of our medical
5 assets, and we will rapidly push them to the hospitals
6 and get them cared as quickly as possible.

7 MS. GALLION: Thanks, Donna.

8 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you. Thank you
9 very much.

10 MS. GALLION: One -- one important point that I
11 would add is that our agreements are for transportation
12 of contaminated injured workers; that's kind of the big
13 differences. Our agreements are for the hospitals to
14 receive contaminated injured workers; that's what the
15 agreement is. They're acknowledging that they will
16 care for a contaminated individual.

17 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very much.

18 MS. GALLION: So that could be the difference.

19 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yeah. Last comment, Dan
20 Stetson.

21 MR. STETSON: Thanks. Will there be a change in
22 this plan a few years down the road when all of the
23 fuel has been moved into the casks?

24 MS. GALLION: Yes, there will be.

25 MR. PALMISANO: Yeah, the next anticipated change

1 will be when the pools are offloaded and all the fuel
2 is in dry cask storage will trigger yet another review
3 in change to the plan.

4 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay.

5 MR. PALMISANO: David, one last comment. I
6 should've clarified up front, none of this affects the
7 Site Security Plan. The Security Plan remains
8 unchanged. And remember the meeting we had last year,
9 we went in depth on that. None of this affects the
10 Site Security Plan. There is no change or exemptions
11 to the security requirements. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Great. Thank you very much,
13 Kelli. Let me now give the floor to Sara Kaminske from
14 the Interjurisdictional Planning Committee known as the
15 IPC.

16 MS. KAMINSKE: Thank you. Can everybody hear me
17 okay? Okay. First of all, I'd like to thank the panel
18 for giving me sometime to speak today about off-site
19 emergency planing. The second thank you is, allowing
20 me to present from my seat because I'm recovering from
21 a little hip, and they're saving me the embarrassment
22 of hobbling around stage. So, thank you for that.

23 Again, I'm Sara Kaminske. I'm an assistant
24 emergency manager with the County of Orange. I work
25 for the Orange County Sheriff's Department Emergency

1 Management Division. I'm currently the chair of the
2 SONGS Interjurisdictional Planning Committee. I'll
3 talk about that in a minute.

4 I've been a chair since 2011, and it's been
5 one heck of a journey. We all know what happened since
6 then. Now the decommissioning has thrown us into a new
7 realm of emergency planning. Things will change, some
8 things will not change, and I'll explain that in a
9 minute.

10 I do want to acknowledge that I know there are
11 people in this room, maybe you've heard me present
12 before on emergency planning for an operating nuclear
13 plant, and now I'm going to present for decommissioning
14 nuclear plant. But I understand there is concerns from
15 the community members and we respect that, we
16 acknowledge that. We, in Emergency Management, worry
17 about stuff all the time, so that's what we do. So
18 with that -- oh, I need my clicker.

19 Okay. So the SONGS Interjurisdictional
20 Planning Committee, if you've been coming to these --
21 the CEP meetings, Jeremy Kirchner, who was the chair in
22 2013, did a presentation on the IPC.

23 But planning for SONGS has always been
24 complex. You know, it's not in Orange County, it's in
25 San Diego County, on federal lands, surrounded by state

1 parks, et cetera, so it takes a multi-agency
2 coordination system in place to plan for emergencies,
3 that includes an operating a nuclear plant and it
4 includes the decommissioning nuclear plant.

5 So the Interjurisdictional Planning
6 Committee -- I'll refer to it as IPC, if that's okay to
7 use that acronym to speed things up a little bit. But
8 it's actually codified in the California Health and
9 Safety Code. And even though SONGS is not an operating
10 nuclear power plant, the IPC will remain intact and we
11 will conduct radiological specific emergency planning
12 for San Onofre.

13 So I'm going to talk about a couple of areas
14 here and I'm going to go back to risk and
15 responsibility. So we, as emergency managers, know
16 that if there is a risk, then we have a responsibility
17 to the communities that we serve to have that
18 responsibility for emergency planning.

19 If there is a risk, we have a responsibility.
20 We take that responsibility seriously. I know people
21 have concerns about "Will our plans really work?" You
22 know, but we hope we are very, very thoughtful in our
23 emergency planning and they can be implemented.

24 So I'm going to touch on these areas: Public
25 Perception, Emergency Planning, and off-site Dose

1 Assessment Capability, Public Information and
2 Communication, and I'll touch a little bit on Funding.

3 So we know there is still the capability of an
4 emergency happening at San Onofre nuclear generating
5 station. We understand there is a lot less things that
6 can go wrong, but we understand that there are still
7 things that go wrong, and we want to have appropriate
8 emergency plans in place to address those issues.

9 So we know that there is a perceived risk in
10 the community. We know that there are still things
11 that can go wrong. It's not imaginary. So, what can
12 we do as off-site jurisdiction that support the
13 community?

14 Can we do something better as an
15 Interjurisdictional Planning Committee as we move
16 through the decommissioning process? You know, we work
17 for you and we want to continue to offer our support.
18 Every city has an emergency manager, so if you have
19 questions, reach out to your emergency manager.

20 I'll have my contact information at the end of
21 the presentation. You can reach out to me as well.
22 But we do want people to know what to do. We want
23 people to know what to do for an all-hazards event.

24 We're going to stick to nuclear planning. But
25 when we talk about evacuation -- evacuation plan moving

1 forward, some people say, "Oh, the evacuation plan go
2 away," and it doesn't. Because we, as local
3 authorities, might order evacuations for a number of
4 other reasons; it could be fires, it could be a Hazmat.
5 Just know what hazards are in and around your community
6 and follow the instructions of local authority.

7 Evacuations are very complicated and it's the
8 last resort. We don't want to move people out of their
9 homes, if we don't have to. But we want you to listen
10 to local authorities if we do order evacuations. So
11 just keep that in mind.

12 There are educational opportunities where
13 members of the community can learn about SONGS
14 Decommissioning as well as Emergency Planning, and so I
15 support those events on behalf of the IPC and welcome
16 people to come up to our table and ask questions and
17 learn about what our ongoing responsibilities are going
18 to be. But, again, we maintain that responsibility to
19 our communities to have appropriate emergency plans in
20 place.

21 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: We probably need to cover
22 these next few slides a little faster. Just be mindful
23 of time.

24 MS. KAMINSKE: Okay. And there's some things that
25 we touched on. So, when we talk about emergency

1 planning, when we say that the local jurisdictions are
2 going to maintain SONGS -- SONGS specific emergency
3 plans, that statement really isn't enough, so I'm going
4 to touch on some of those key things that we're going
5 to continue to provide, and Kelli touched on some of
6 them.

7 We need to maintain dedicated trained and well
8 equipped law, fire and health care personnel as well as
9 emergency operations and their personnel. So we need
10 trained people, we need the personnel and equipment
11 needed for independent off-site dose assessment.

12 And what that means is, if there's an
13 emergency situation at the plant and they're conducting
14 radiological monitoring, then the off-site
15 jurisdiction, which is the cities in the counties, will
16 maintain an independent dose assessment capabilities so
17 we can mobilize Orange County and San Diego teams to do
18 that independent off-site dose assessment to verify
19 what's happening.

20 And then the Orange County liaison in the
21 Command Center is a -- is a real benefit to us because
22 then we have that person linked into the Command Center
23 that can provide information to the off-sites, so it
24 opens up that line of communication.

25 At an alert level, that's the highest level

1 currently that SONGS can declare, all the off-sites
2 will activate their emergency operations center. But,
3 again, we're going to continue to need training and
4 exercises and drills and we will communicate with SONGS
5 during their communication drills and they'll invite us
6 to participate in their exercises as well.

7 And then we touched on the community sirens
8 system. The challenge with that, and we have to be
9 careful because we've done a huge public education
10 campaign, that if you hear the sirens, it's related to
11 SONGS and so go turn on the television. So we have to
12 be careful how we are going to use that system in the
13 future.

14 The Joint Information Center, SONGS used to be
15 responsible for establishing the Joint Information
16 Center; that's a place where the media can go and hear
17 from local authorities as to what's happening at the
18 plant. Some of these things will change.

19 One of the things that will be important for
20 us if we do activate, we will activate the Public
21 Information Hotline. It's a very, very important
22 component and it's a very, very effective component to
23 open the lines of communication with members of the
24 public and our EOC(Emergency Operations Center). It
25 takes the -- drain off the 911 system but it allows you

1 to get verified bedded information directly from the
2 county.

3 We touched on Funding. Edison has agreed to
4 that in the near term and maybe long term as well and
5 we're currently working with them on the MOU. There
6 are changes in state and federal legislation that are
7 driving us what we do. We touched on some of those.

8 But there is also justification for our
9 continuing Emergency Planning because there is a shift
10 in some responsibilities from SONGS onto the county and
11 local jurisdictions, one of those is the Joint
12 Information Center. SONGS had a dedicated facility
13 locally. They'll now communicate out of corporate, so
14 that responsibility will shift to the county. We'll
15 need to maintain a local SONGS specific Joint
16 Information Center.

17 The other thing that has changed is the
18 Emergency Operations Facility. That was the facility
19 that was co-located at San Onofre with San Onofre
20 personnel. We could provide liaisons right to the
21 plant to communicate what was going on. That
22 facility -- they no longer maintain that facility, so
23 we have to find a new location for that. So the
24 emergency operation facility function also shifts to
25 us.

1 And then the other change is in the
2 notifications. So SONGS notifies four jurisdictions
3 and, then, and one of those is Orange County, and so
4 Orange County then has the responsibility of
5 communicating with the other jurisdictions. Before it
6 was kind of a "one call reaches all," so that emergency
7 notification is also shift as well. But we're going to
8 maintain our emergency plans, including SONGS specific.

9 Here's my plug. Get prepared. There are a
10 couple of things that you probably know about and, if
11 you don't, here you go. Mass notification systems.
12 The county and cities, we use mass notification
13 systems. It's an effective way to get a message out to
14 a large number of people. Alert OC is for Orange
15 County; Alert San Diego, San Diego County; and then
16 there's also two important websites, Ready OC and Ready
17 San Diego where you can learn more about getting
18 prepared. So we'll continue to share that message.

19 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And we put your slides up on
20 the website, so these addresses will be available on
21 the website.

22 MS. KAMINSKE: Absolutely. Absolutely. So to sum
23 it up, changes are going to be made to local emergency
24 plans. There are less things that can go wrong. There
25 are only two emergency alert classifications. So we're

1 going to adjust our plans accordingly.

2 Again, this is all going to be coordinated
3 through the efforts of the IPC. It's -- we're taking
4 everything -- it's not a fast break-in event for us.
5 We want to be very thoughtful in our emergency plans,
6 we want to make sure they're appropriate, make sure
7 they're implemented, and make sure we're communicating
8 with members of the public.

9 You know, we've established really great
10 relationships with local, state, and federal partners.
11 We want to continue with that as well. They may say,
12 "Hey, we're no longer requiring you to do this," but we
13 have the responsibility to do that. And then
14 SONGScommunity.com is another website.

15 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Excellent. Thank you very
16 much. And your contact information up here as well is
17 quite helpful. Let me see very quickly if there are
18 any questions for Sara? Jerry Kern?

19 MR. KERN: I just have one question and actually
20 relates not to Oceanside, because I don't think we're
21 at much risk, but the city -- the town of Fallbrook,
22 which is directly east, which is the onshore breeze,
23 notification to them because if an event happens and
24 the breeze will take it directly into Fallbrook. Is
25 there some way to notify them or is that through the

1 County of San Diego?

2 MS. KAMINSKE: That would be through the County of
3 San Diego. And so we're communicating with each other
4 and then also with the jurisdictions that rest within
5 the boundaries of our responsibility.

6 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: So, but just to make it --
7 there is a system in place whereby San Diego County,
8 County of San Diego is notified; is that correct?

9 MS. KAMINSKE: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Or not correct?

11 MS. KAMINSKE: Correct.

12 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay.

13 MR. PASCALL: David?

14 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Glenn Pascall.

15 MR. PASCALL: Thank you, to Tom and the other
16 presenters for an excellent presentation. Tom, I
17 really appreciate it you drawing the distinctions
18 between an operating and a decommissioned plant.

19 It was an area of clarification, I think, we
20 badly needed. And I'm impressed with the dedication of
21 our -- our public safety and emergency response people.

22 I wanted to flag one point and I want to just
23 put it on the table. I don't want it to delay or
24 divert tonight's meeting at all. A previous
25 presentation by Edison really showed a very complete

1 plan to deal with terrorism that was land based, and
2 then we got the whole issue of a sea attack, a seaborne
3 attack or an airborne attack.

4 Now, obviously, once everything is in the
5 ISFSI, that's a pretty highly strengthened target, but
6 there is still fuel in the pools. And I just wanted to
7 flag, I think there was a general feeling that Edison
8 needed to flesh out its terrorist scenario with
9 seaborne and airborne dimensions that was thorough at
10 the land born dimension. And I'm only raising this
11 issue. I don't want to take time tonight.

12 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Glenn, that's an important --
13 I'm going to talk briefly about that because it leads
14 into our next conversation. But let me just see if
15 there's anything else directly on the topics of the
16 emergency plan before we move on. Okay. Thank you
17 very much.

18 So the topic that Glenn Pascall raised is one
19 of many dimensions to what the Defense in Depth is
20 going to look like for this site. And of the things
21 I've learned in the last year and a half is that people
22 are understandably concerned to very upset that the
23 fuel is going to stay here as opposed to going to Yucca
24 Mountain or some other place.

25 And so we need to really understand what the

1 layers of defense are going to look like and as they
2 evolve as opposed to just being just kind of something
3 that gets done and then the community is told about it,
4 and we have -- as a Community Engagement Panel, have
5 requested that information as it evolves to have the
6 opportunity to discuss it.

7 Parts of that Defense in Depth are now the
8 next subject of our meeting tonight, so it won't be --
9 it won't be as much about the seaborne attack and
10 airborne attack and so on, but later, as this evolves,
11 we will learn more about those kinds of scenarios.

12 But instead tonight we're going to -- we're
13 going to learn about the arrangements of Defense in
14 Depth as they pertain to the cask system, so these
15 stainless steel casks that are going to be stored on
16 the fuel pads and so-called ISFSI.

17 We have two presentations on this topic:
18 First from Tom Palmisano and then from Kris Singh. So,
19 Tom, do you want to help set the scene for what we're
20 doing tonight? And this conversation -- and, frankly,
21 this conversation is going to go on for several years.

22 And so there are going to be some things that
23 we can't -- that Edison, Holtec, and others can't
24 answer tonight, but the purpose is to have a discussion
25 early as opposed to later. Tom?

1 MR. PALMISANO: Okay. Thank you very much. So as
2 David said, we're going to start talking about Defense
3 in Depth as it applies to dry fuel storage. This has
4 been a comment from the public and the panel and now
5 that we have selected Holtec and starting down the road
6 of the new system and looking at the existing system
7 and well -- as well we need to start talking about
8 Defense in Depth.

9 Now, this is an evolving topic. The NRC has
10 also heard feedback from us, from the Community
11 Engagement Panel, through some of David's work and
12 testimony and they are working on refining their view
13 of Defense in Depth as it applies to dry fuel storage.

14 Historically, it's been applied -- the concept
15 and the principles have been applied to reactors and
16 safety systems reactors not as exclusively applied to
17 dry fuel storage; that is changing now, and it's
18 changing part as a result of the work of the Community
19 Engagement Panel and the public here in San Onofre.

20 So a couple of things. I wanted -- now is the
21 feedback from the Community Engagement Panel and the
22 public. This has been important. And it's difficult
23 because there are some things we will agree on, some
24 things we will never agree on realistically. And I
25 understand that, I can appreciate that, but we are

1 going to stand up and engage and transparently talk
2 about it. Okay?

3 We are partnering with Holtec. And I want to
4 make a comment on this. You know, we have the AREVA
5 NUHOMS system, a good company, a fine system. We went
6 through a selection process as we looked at the need
7 for decommissioning and we selected Holtec, a good
8 system, a fine company. But quite frankly -- and I'm
9 largely the one who made the decision or recommendation
10 is, I simply didn't want a contractor to build the
11 system, deliver a product and leave. Okay?

12 You've heard me talk about this fuel is going
13 to be on site till 2049, under the current DOE plan.
14 And now we all know -- we're all somewhat skeptical
15 about that. Okay? So this fuel is going to be there
16 for a while.

17 We need to work harder on interim storage, but
18 we need -- we collectively need a partner who is going
19 to be here every step of the way with us. Holtec knows
20 exactly what I expect for the long-term and we are
21 partnering not just executing a contract because we're
22 going to need support for the long-term to maintain
23 this system, to monitor this system, and to manage this
24 system and, eventually, to transfer the fuel off site.

25 So I think that's an important concept that

1 you're going to hear me and Holtec start talking about
2 tonight, is that partnership.

3 Dry cask systems, and I'll apply this
4 generically, are robust and we're going to start
5 talking about how we're applying defense-in-depth
6 principles to the new system and applying it to the
7 existing system as well.

8 And I want to point out this is a long-term
9 effort. I should point out -- I didn't bring up a
10 slide with regulatory requirements. Some of you have
11 done extensive research. You know, under the NRC
12 rules, they license canisters in 20-year increments.

13 And in the first 20 years, there's some basic
14 monitoring requirements but there's not inspection
15 requirements; that's one of the possible flaws in the
16 current regulation on inspection.

17 Inspections are typically required in the
18 second 20-year interval and then going forward. We are
19 not going to wait for the existing system until we've
20 got to re-license it for 20 more years nor are we going
21 to wait for the new system for 20 years out.

22 We have decided with Holtec and EPRI (Electric
23 Power Research Institute) that we're going to lead the
24 industry in developing the aging management program,
25 the inspection, and the remediation capability, and

1 that's part of the partnership that we need to do that
2 going forward.

3 So by a long-term effort, this isn't something
4 that's done in three months top to bottom and put to
5 bed. We're going to be talking about this regularly
6 with the panel and the public.

7 So, some of the things I've heard from the CEP
8 and, collectively, these are public comments that we've
9 collected through the CEP directly:

10 How long will the cask be on site? Why do
11 they have to be on site that long? How is
12 Defense-in-Depth concept applied? How will we monitor
13 the cask? How can we direct/detect corrosion? How
14 will we mitigate a crack? How do we protect against
15 physical threats? That'll be a topic we talk more.

16 And some of these we aren't going to have all
17 the answers tonight and I would ask you not to expect
18 them. We will talk about these overtime.

19 Just to recap, for those of you who may be
20 joining us for the first time or for a while, the
21 current on-site situation, up in the yellow boxes -- I
22 won't read the numbers -- those are the Unit 2 and 3
23 spent fuel pools, about 2,600 assemblies, a little
24 more.

25 What's in green is already on the Independent

1 Spent Fuel Storage Installation; our acronym is ISFSI.
2 We have Unit 1 fuel and some Unit 2 and 3 fuel, and we
3 actually own 270 assemblies in GE -- of GE (General
4 Electric) pool in Morris, Illinois. We actually
5 shipped spent fuel out of San Onofre in the mid-70s to
6 the early 80s.

7 Okay. So, what has to happen over the next
8 several years after we expand the ISFSI is we empty the
9 pools into a roughly 73 to 75 additional canisters and
10 at the end we'll have 3,855 assemblies stored in dry
11 cask storage, the rest in GE Illinois. And they'll --
12 the ones in Illinois will not return to the site.
13 Department Energy will take title to them there.

14 This is not an acceptable situation to anybody
15 to have this fuel stored on site for an indefinite
16 period of time. We all recognize that. I think we're
17 aligned on that. It's a matter of taking care of it
18 while it's here and getting it off site as soon as we
19 can reasonably, safely get it off site.

20 So, Existing ISFSI: I'm not going to hit all
21 the bullets. Many of you've seen this before. This is
22 all available on our website. This is the existing
23 NUHOMS, the AREVA product, a very robust above-ground,
24 horizontal storage system. We have can -- 50 canisters
25 loaded with fuel and one loaded with what's called

1 "greater than class-C" waste, that's the Unit 1 reactor
2 vessel internals.

3 The system we have selected that we're going
4 through some of the permitting activities on and the
5 design and off-site fabrication is a below-ground
6 system. Some people like to say we're burying
7 canisters in the sand; we're not.

8 This is a large concrete monolith that's got a
9 reinforced concrete pad at the bottom, the cavity
10 enclosure shown in yellow, the steel canister that's
11 sealed in there, concrete poured around it, then a
12 reinforced concrete top pad on it. So, basically, it's
13 two ISFSI pads on top of a large concrete monolith.
14 And you can see the rest of the bullets.

15 This is actually the picture of the completed
16 installation at a nuclear plant in the Midwest. We
17 have visited this plant during construction. You're
18 seeing what amounts to the very top pad those
19 rectangular covers under each one of those is a
20 canister and a cavity enclosure container where the --
21 the canister will be located.

22 We will go observe them, loading canisters
23 into the system in the next year or two. So that --
24 that's what their situation looks like. Ours will be a
25 bit more elevated above grade.

1 So, Defense in Depth: So now I'm going to
2 shift over and really start defining Defense in Depth.
3 Now, some of this has gone from the developing NRC
4 work, so I'm going to use some -- unfortunately, some
5 technical jargon as we talk about engineered controls
6 and programmatic controls.

7 I'm trying to stay consistent with how the NRC
8 is describing this for the industry, how we're
9 describing this in the industry, so bear with me.

10 So, first of all, Defense in Depth, designing
11 and operating facilities in a way that prevents and
12 mitigates accidents; that's the generic definition
13 applied to reactors. Okay?

14 Creating multiple independent redundant layers
15 of defense, and this just might -- might not be
16 physical. Security is a layer of defense, for example.
17 Access controls; people who have access to the search
18 screen. They go through background checks regularly,
19 FBI background checks.

20 They go through a metal detector to go into
21 the plant; that's a layer of a control. And then
22 minimizing the reliance on any single feature.

23 So, Three Principal Functions: Now, this is
24 dry cask storage specific. There's three things the
25 system needs to do: Maintain sub-criticality. In

1 other words, this is used nuclear fuel. It's got to be
2 controlled such that it cannot go critical again.
3 Okay? That's relatively easy to deal within the design
4 and loading phase.

5 Prevent radiation exposure from exceeding
6 limits. This is radiation exposure through the
7 canister. And then, prevent a release of radioactive
8 materials from exceeding limits. This would be leakage
9 from the canister. Those are the three key functions
10 the system has to do.

11 So as we look at Defense-in-Depth strategies,
12 we think of engineered controls, so this may be design
13 and materials, and we'll elaborate on this. And when
14 Kris Singh talks, we'll get a little more specific.

15 We'll talk about programmatic controls. This
16 is an example, fabrication. So I pick a material that
17 is highly resistant and very strong, highly resistant
18 of the various corrosion phenomenas, very strong, but
19 then I make sure I weld it properly, I make sure I
20 inspect the welds properly, so I've got controls in the
21 fabrication phase.

22 And then what's called Mitigating Controls,
23 this gets more into the operational phase, and don't
24 think of operating reactors, think of operating the
25 ISFSI, managing the canisters, after they're loaded.

1 Testing, Inspection, and Surveillance: What
2 are we doing to make the canisters retain their
3 integrity? So at SONGS, the program includes
4 Engineered, Programmatic, Mitigating Controls,
5 Prevention.

6 We're using a higher grade of stainless steel.
7 The typical grade used in many installations is a grade
8 called 304. We, from the start, with the first system
9 used a higher more resistant grade.

10 We also used a thicker canister. Okay. The
11 typical thickness is 1/2 inch. We went from 5/8 -- to
12 5/8s inch early on with the first system; that will
13 continue. So that's an example of using programmatic
14 or engineered controls to help mitigate the likelihood
15 of a problem.

16 Prediction/Detection: We're going to put in
17 place test canisters and test coupons. We're going to
18 buy extra canisters, seal them up with no fuel in so we
19 can monitor them for salt deposition, corrosion. We
20 can pull them out and inspect them without any
21 radiation, exposure, or remote tooling, and we're going
22 to spend the time and the money to do that as a way to
23 monitor these as they perform in the same environment
24 as -- as a loaded canister.

25 We're developing inspection tools. The

1 industry has developed technology to inspect and -- and
2 exam stainless steel to do that, examine welds. We do
3 that remotely, we do it in high radiation areas, we do
4 that under water in reactors.

5 That tooling does need to be adapted to do it
6 on dry cask storage, so that tooling does have to be
7 developed. It's based on technology that exists, but
8 the tooling has got to be developed.

9 And then, Remediation, Repair Techniques or
10 Use of an Overpack. You heard in the October
11 discussion, and we had both the AREVA and Holtec, there
12 is different views on how you might remediate an
13 indication or a potential crack in a canister, it
14 depends if it's a surface blemish, if it's partly
15 through a wall, if it's completely through a wall.

16 AREVA, as a company, may elect to -- to look
17 at repairing a crack. Holtec, as a company, may
18 recommend an overpack. There are many options when it
19 comes to dealing with something like that.

20 The key thing on something like a dry cask is
21 there is no internal driving pressure to drive a lot of
22 radioactivity out quickly, like in an operating
23 reactor. Okay? So, a crack, you have time to examine
24 it, assess it, and decide how to remediate it on site.

25 So with that, I've gone fairly quick in the

1 interest of time. I wanted to give an overview. But I
2 really want to turn it over to Holtec so they can pick
3 up and elaborate a bit further, but I will --

4 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay.

5 MR. PALMISANO: -- leave you with that this is work
6 in progress, we're going to have this well in place,
7 leading up the industry, and we'll be talking about
8 this regularly to the Panel.

9 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Excellent. Thank you very
10 much, Tom. And I think one of the many important
11 features of this being a work in progress is we've
12 already had over the last year pretty extensive
13 conversations about this.

14 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

15 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And it's nice to see those
16 concerns reflected in the fact that you're building
17 extra layers of defense and that you're also running,
18 it sounds like, a pretty big research project in
19 parallel to really understand how these things age.

20 Let me ask if there are any members of the CEP
21 who have specific questions to Tom before we move on to
22 the Holtec presentation. Ted Quinn?

23 MR. QUINN: Yes. Tom, the question is, what's the
24 Electric Power Research Institute doing to help?
25 What's the coordination you're doing with them?

1 MR. PALMISANO: Well -- and thank you very much. I
2 did mention EPRI, the Electric Power Research
3 Institute, heavily. We have partnered with them and
4 Holtec. We are leading several of their subcommittees
5 on the inspection technology first and some of the
6 tooling development. And Kris will talk a little more
7 about that.

8 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: You know, this was -- just to
9 pick up on that, when we looked at the various cask
10 options last year, the issue of using technology that
11 is being widely used in the industry was very, very
12 important because it allows us here in San Onofre to
13 learn from what's going on in other sites and
14 vice versa, and I think if we had chosen a technology
15 that was an orphan, then we would not be in that
16 position. Let me see if there are any other comments.

17 Tom, can you just define, what is a coupon? I
18 know what a coupon is at Safeway, but I don't --

19 MR. PALMISANO: A coupon, a test specimen. When we
20 talk in terms of a material coupon, think of it as a
21 piece of test material. In this case, we're going to
22 take a coupon of the same material --

23 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay.

24 MR. PALMISANO: -- as the canister and stress it
25 more heavily, which would make it an early warning

1 system, if you will, for any stress --

2 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Great. Thank you.

3 MR. PALMISANO: -- corrosion crack.

4 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Because I saw that in Kris's
5 presentation.

6 MR. PALMISANO: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Let me give the floor
8 now to Kris Singh, CEO at Holtec.

9 DR. SINGH: How much time do I have?

10 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: You have about 12 to 13 and a
11 half minutes.

12 DR. SINGH: I'll be fast. Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
13 Members of the Panel, and members of the public. I
14 appreciate your time to come, join in this
15 conversation. I wouldn't call it a presentation, it's
16 a conversation with you.

17 And my expectation and my hope is that the
18 information I share with you will -- will give you the
19 confidence that Edison and Holtec are doing the right
20 thing for the community here.

21 We have 73, I think, latest count, nuclear
22 plants with our dry storage systems are being deployed
23 or have been deployed, and many of these sites have --

24 I'm sorry. Is this a right-hand clicker?

25 Okay. Good. Great.

1 -- many of these sites have community panels
2 in various forms, like you, and they invariably make a
3 great contribution to our program of establishing a dry
4 storage system around -- in the community.

5 Your concern here is canister integrity. I
6 can tell you that, in the past, another community was
7 concerned about getting the fuel from wet storage to
8 dry storage as rapidly as possible, and we responded to
9 that request by developing appropriate technology
10 changes to enable that to happen at the earliest
11 possible date. Another community was interested in
12 making the plant more rugged against, say, an airp -- a
13 crashing aircraft. We did that for the community.

14 And at each site, as we worked, we developed
15 technologies and we bring them to other sites, to other
16 places. So you would be the beneficiary of scores of
17 plans where we have worked and have, in the process,
18 continuously improved our technology.

19 Now, this particular effort here is called
20 Defense in Depth. "Defense in Depth" is a term that
21 was coined by the NRC over 50 years ago and it was
22 really first applied to cranes, cranes in a power
23 plant.

24 If you're carrying a heavy load in a crane,
25 you want to make sure the load doesn't drop, under any

1 condition, any conceivable condition. And the term was
2 defined to basically transmit to the designers,
3 operators, to the entire industry that you must have
4 measures in place that will make an accidental lowering
5 of the load impossible.

6 Well, here the same term is being applied,
7 Defense in Depth. Defense in Depth here means the
8 canister, under no conditions of -- of normal or
9 abnormal event, will cause its content to be released
10 to the atmosphere. That is the challenge. That's the
11 problem we have.

12 And we have partnered with Edison to work on
13 it, to make sure that all, every possible measure that
14 can be implemented, reasonably implemented, to make the
15 canister absolutely safe and invulnerable to -- to
16 release of radioactivity is adopted. And I'm going to
17 give you, basically, the areas in which we're working
18 in the next, I suppose, 11 minutes I have left now, so
19 I'll make sure that I give you --

20 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I have a slightly different
21 math, but we can keep going.

22 DR. SINGH: Okay. Our -- our plan is to -- to
23 expand the -- add the UMAX Storage System with all the
24 Defense-in-Depth features that can be -- that can be
25 implemented in the near term and, of course, during

1 operation of the plant.

2 Our Defense-in-Depth initiatives and measures
3 that we will develop will also be used with NUHOMS
4 canisters, which are already operating at the site, so
5 it's not limited just to -- just to UMAX.

6 And as Tom told you earlier, that we -- our
7 plan is not to wait for 20 years. We're going to
8 implement these measures. Actually, in UMAX we'll be
9 implementing these measures. We're doing them now and
10 you we forward, we keep implementing them in the design
11 phase and then, of course, in the installation phase
12 and operations phase. We will introduce these features
13 in NUHOMS also at the site as we go forward.

14 Now, the Defense in Depth -- I think this
15 slide "Tom Pageni" did already, so I'm not going to go
16 over this again with you, except the summary is that
17 the canister should not release radioactivity.

18 Of course, we have designed the UMAX System to
19 minimize radiation dose, that's why we put it under
20 ground, so you have minimum radiation scattered in the
21 environment. And the Defense in Depth, that basic
22 concept, that you would have multiple barriers against
23 any of the things that -- that you consider inimical to
24 local population, keep them from happening.

25 No single failure will cause a release of

1 radioactivity, will cause excessive exposure, exceeding
2 the regulatory limits or will cause release of
3 radioactivity -- or will cause criticality event at the
4 plant.

5 The term in use is Aging Management, canister
6 -- the canister ages as the system ages, the measures
7 that you implement that keep it youthful and
8 functioning is the -- is the object of aging
9 management, if you were to look at the canister as a
10 human.

11 The measures begin in the engineering phase,
12 they -- they're applied in the fabrication phase, and
13 they're applied in the operation phase to inspections,
14 surveillance, testing and, of course, remedial measures
15 if the unthinkable happens and, indeed, a hypothetical
16 situation actually becomes real, have -- have measures
17 in place to deal with them.

18 Now, the main challenge as we get down to
19 the -- to what they really all mean in case of dry
20 storage, it means for a canister stress corrosion
21 cracking; that's the defining term. How do you keep
22 the material from undergoing stress corrosion cracking?

23 Now, I should tell you, Austenitic stainless
24 steel, which is what we use and I'll explain in a
25 second why, Austenitic stainless steel is a wonderful

1 material; it has the highest ductility of any material
2 used in a power plant. You can hit stainless steel
3 with a hammer and you will need to stretch it by about
4 80 percent before it would break on you, stretch it by
5 80.

6 That's better than elastic band. That's
7 how -- that's how resistant it is to failure to
8 developing a crack. Austenitic stainless steel, under
9 normal steady-state conditions, would have to stretch
10 for about 40 percent before it will crack on you. It's
11 a highly ductile material, that's why we use it.

12 And it is -- it's extremely weldable material.
13 It works very, very well in welding, it responds to
14 welding extremely well. But the problem is that under
15 certain sets of conditions, a very narrow band of
16 conditions, stainless steel becomes vulnerable to
17 stress corrosion cracking; not immediately.

18 Don't think it is that happens within 10
19 minutes or 10 years, but it can. For example, in a
20 canister, under a storage canister, under proper
21 confluence of events and conditions, you can begin to
22 get surface degradation in, say, a hundred years.

23 The challenge here is that we know well before
24 such an event might occur and take remedial measures,
25 preventive measures to keep it from occurring at all;

1 that's the challenge of the Aging Management Program.

2 Let's talk about Engineered Controls, that's
3 the phase that we are in for UMAX right now. By the
4 way, a lot of UMAX components are being manufactured in
5 our plant in Pittsburgh. So the project here is
6 employing good American workers in Pittsburgh. They're
7 working right now.

8 The engineered controls that we -- that we
9 have introduced, for example, are canister vertical.
10 But vertical canister keeps deposits from accumulating,
11 soil deposits from accumulating, and makes the -- takes
12 away one important variable and that can induce stress
13 corrosion cracking.

14 We have selected, at Edison's insistence,
15 personally I think 304 stainless is an excellent
16 material for this environment, but Edison insisted that
17 we upgrade the material to 316L; 316L is substantially
18 more expensive and it is known to be substantially more
19 resistant to stress corrosion cracking.

20 We have increased the thickness of the
21 canister from 1/2 inch to 5/8 inch, as Tom told you
22 earlier. We have replaced the foundation around
23 these -- the underground canister. We have replaced it
24 with -- it could be engineered fail, but we have
25 replaced it with solid concrete. The idea, again,

1 being to basically sequester the storage facility
2 entirely from the surrounding environment.

3 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Just for planning purposes,
4 Kris, you have a couple of minutes left.

5 DR. SINGH: I'm sorry?

6 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Just -- you have a couple of
7 minutes left, so we should --

8 DR. SINGH: Okay. Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- probably go to the other
10 dimensions.

11 DR. SINGH: All right. All right. And we are --
12 we have changed the -- the CEC(Cavity Enclosure
13 Container), the container, from carbon steel to
14 stainless steel, also at Edison's request.

15 In fabrication space, we are developing,
16 manufacturing approaches that would make the canister
17 even more robust against stress corrosion cracking. We
18 are making -- we're going to be making changes in
19 welding processes, welding materials, and possibly
20 surface improvements that further inoculates the
21 canister against stress corrosion cracking.

22 Moving on to Aging Management, I'm not going
23 to go through all the bullets here. You can -- you
24 read them. They're fairly easy to understand. But our
25 goal again is in the -- in this Aging Program is to

1 develop measures so, first, we can predict with
2 significant reliability when a crack might initiate
3 under worst conditions that may -- that may obtain at
4 the plant.

5 In other words, all of a sudden, Southern
6 California begins to have rainfall every day and your
7 humidity goes up, which, of course, acts -- is a
8 contributor to stress corrosion cracking if you have
9 high humidity alone with stress.

10 So we take all these worst set of conditions
11 and we will determine how long the canister can -- will
12 absolutely see no -- no effects before incubation of
13 nuc -- nucleation of stress-corrosion cracking might
14 begin.

15 We have developed and we are developing
16 several measures to deal with conditions if the
17 unexpected were to happen. In other words, all our
18 predictions, the laws of science got suspended and we
19 did -- we did find a case where the canister is
20 developing a leak. The remedial measures to deal with
21 that, we are develop -- we are actively working on
22 developing it.

23 They are -- they're going to be, I assure you,
24 they'll be sound and they'll be elegant and they will
25 be easily implemented without exposing workers to

1 significant dose. Those are the criteria we employ.

2 I had mentioned last October when I spoke to
3 you that we would use a transfer cask and use that to
4 sequester. There are other ways to sequester the
5 canister also and those are being developed. But I can
6 assure you that they will be developed and deployed
7 here.

8 We have been working with EPRI to answer prior
9 questions here. We're working with EPRI to develop
10 tools to, for example, quantify the amount of soil that
11 has deposited on a surface, to deal with means to
12 eliminate the source of crevice corrosion around the
13 canister and so on. We expect to have these tools
14 ready for deployment here.

15 In summary, to conclude, our Defense-in-Depth
16 strategy for Engineered, pragmatic -- Programmatic, I'm
17 sorry, and mitigating controls are being developed. We
18 expect the program to be a solid sentinel to protect
19 these canisters if they have to be here for a hundred
20 years, that you will not -- your local public health
21 and safety will not be in jeopardy.

22 This program will be implemented -- is being
23 implemented now and it is being implemented on UMAX
24 canisters are canisters that we are manufacturing.
25 Later, as we go into the implementation phase, we will

1 also implement it on the -- on the NUHOMS canisters.

2 That is all I can tell you within the very
3 short time that the chairman gave me. So I will now --

4 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: The Chairman, I hear, is a
5 tyrant. So I want to thank you for helping start this
6 conversation. I want to leave some time for us to ask
7 some questions and then I want to summarize, I think,
8 some action points. I see Ted Quinn, Jerry Kern and
9 Lisa Bartlett.

10 MR. QUINN: Very quickly, for Dr. Singh and for
11 Tom, maybe. I'd like to see a chart that shows the
12 industry and programs and/or Aging Management Programs
13 and NRC programs. And the history is, in industry
14 we've always come up -- industry came up with programs,
15 NRC came up with review of those programs, of safety
16 evaluation reports, some form of approval process, and
17 I understand that NRC has a significant effort working
18 on this now, the industry has a significant effort.

19 And I'd like to see the timeline of what
20 you're doing and industry is doing and then what the
21 NRC is doing in parallel to review and approve your
22 improved processes for detection and prevention of any
23 form of cracks. Is that fair?

24 DR. SINGH: Yes, that's a fair question. I tell
25 ya, the -- the wheels of the NRC turn, but they turn

1 slowly. It's a government agency. Of course, it takes
2 time to get ideas and things implemented. We cannot
3 wait for the institutional overseers we have, the NRC,
4 the national laboratories, to all get together and
5 finalize and tell us what they will find acceptable.

6 We have decided, we seriously have decided,
7 with Edison's partnership to lead the industry, to lead
8 in the sense to -- to intellectually lead the NRC.

9 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Well, Kris, I think this is
10 an action point for Edison and for Holtec together --

11 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

12 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- to respond to this because
13 we need some sense of what the industry programs are,
14 the NRC programs, to kind of how this is going to
15 unfold, mindful that you've got your own program that
16 goes above and beyond that, I think that's important.

17 But we need to articulate this in plain
18 English so that then the CEP and the communities can
19 understand what the game plan is here.

20 Let me ask Jerry Kern.

21 MR. KERN: I have one question, to be really frank,
22 the idea of 1/2 inch to 5/8s, what drove that decision?
23 Was it strength? Was it corrosion resistance? I -- I
24 just wanted to know why that change happened.

25 MR. PALMISANO. Go ahead, Kris, and I'll fill in

1 some background from Edison's perspective. You know,
2 that was a decision made with the first current system,
3 the NUHOMS system, to go from 1/2 inch to 5/8s.

4 And I think is a recognition of both the
5 seismic capability as well as the corrosion resistance,
6 more thickness, and that's what we've continued in with
7 the Holtec UMAX design, insisting on the highest-grade
8 stainless steel and the thicker material.

9 MR. QUINN: Just a quick follow up, so that
10 decision are they still evaluating it? Do they say,
11 "Well, maybe we should go 3/4s? Or, like that, or have
12 you decided that 5/8 after --

13 MR. PALMISANO: 5/8 has been decided.

14 MR. QUINN: Okay.

15 MR. PALMISANO: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Lisa Bartlett?

17 MS. BARTLETT: I appreciate the fact that the
18 canisters can withstand a salted environment for up to
19 a hundred years under, you know, regular conditions.
20 But what about a major earthquake? Have you -- have
21 you done any testing with regard to earthquakes?

22 DR. SINGH: Well, we have done testing, shake-table
23 test, on -- on structures that emulate racks and
24 canisters, but today most of these predictions are done
25 by dynamics codes, computer codes, that have been

1 benchmarked against actual test data.

2 In other words, if you drop a canister from 18
3 feet height, which we have done the actual testing
4 computer simulations, the shape of the canister after
5 the impact checked against the predicted shape from the
6 program, and these programs today are so accurate that
7 they will give you precisely the weight.

8 If you drop it, break, and -- or you hit it,
9 you have an earthquake and you end up with large
10 inertia forces, you can predict the response with great
11 accuracy.

12 And, yes, we have analyzed. The main
13 question -- information to give you here is that we
14 have analyzed these canisters and, actually, NRC has
15 reviewed it, and inertly had NRC on it, to a level of
16 earthquake that has never occurred in the history,
17 recorded history, on this earth. That's the level at
18 which we have analyzed these canisters, and it shows
19 that there will be no breach of confinement boundary.
20 These calculations are available for you to look at.

21 But I repeat, the strongest earthquake that
22 ever occurred on the history of this planet that we
23 recorded was in Lisbon, Portugal, back in 1560 or
24 something, and the earthquakes that we have imposed are
25 substantially stronger than that on these canisters

1 that will be deployed here.

2 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Let me ask, as another action
3 item, maybe we could summarize what we know about the
4 seismic integrity of the system. I mean, it strikes me
5 as just absolutely open and shut that for seismic
6 purposes and many other purposes we want the fuel in
7 these casks as quickly as possible.

8 Can you tell us, Kris Singh, also, what is the
9 status of getting your system approved with the seismic
10 approval that would be necessary? Because I understand
11 there's been a variation in the design and so it's not
12 finally approved yet. Where do we stand on that?

13 DR. SINGH: Yes. We submitted -- see, our -- our
14 original license approval by the NRC was for all
15 earthquakes across the country of nuclear power plants.
16 We took the most bounding earthquake, which was your
17 earthquake at San -- San Onofre, we used that. That
18 was the design-basis earthquake. And we qualified and
19 we received the license.

20 Then we were told by Edison to -- to up the
21 earthquake. We call it "Most Severe Earthquake," which
22 is stronger than the earthquake that was in
23 UFSAR(Updated Final Safety Analysis Report).

24 So we, in order to get that certified, we had
25 to re-qualify the canister, we had to submit the

1 application again to the NRC for an amendment to the
2 license, and we also made some internal structural
3 reinforcements to meet the stronger earthquake.

4 That was submitted. NRC has written a safety
5 evaluation report. In other words, NRC agrees with our
6 safety findings and I believe that the public comment
7 period ended yesterday.

8 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay.

9 MR. SINGH: Today? Okay. You're keeping track of
10 it, Donna.

11 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I am confident that Donna is
12 keeping track of that in lieu you jump up to go make
13 comments, we know why. Okay. So the reason for this
14 delay was because Edison had asked for a more robust
15 system?

16 DR. SINGH: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very much.

18 DR. SINGH: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I don't see any other -- Bill
20 Parker and, then, last then I want to move on to the
21 next segment.

22 MR. PARKER: Not so much a question but a comment,
23 many of the analytical tools, monitoring tools, the
24 potential correction tools you described as
25 technologies in development, which mean they do not

1 exist today, and I understand that and I appreciate
2 that. But what it does mean is that the status of the
3 development of those tools should come back for
4 periodic presentation in an open session.

5 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Absolutely.

6 MR. PARKER: And to peer review so we can feel
7 confident that these developments are proceeding in a
8 schedule that is commensurate with the construction. I
9 fully understand and appreciate that the tools don't
10 exist today but they do highlight the need for
11 monitoring in a public setting.

12 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yeah, thank you very much.
13 And that's -- I just want to summarize what I've heard
14 today in terms of action items next. I think it's
15 clear that Defense in Depth is a lot more than an Aging
16 Management Program and I think the industry, my sense
17 of the industry overall is focusing a lot on aging
18 management programs and that's important. But what
19 we're talking about here is a lot more, many more
20 layers and a bigger game plan.

21 We have Tom's list of questions from your
22 presentation, questions that you have heard us want
23 answers for. We should, as CEP and as community,
24 should look at that list and see if there are more or
25 fewer questions and kind of -- that should be an

1 evergreen list that should evolve.

2 I think sometime soon we should be in the
3 position, and Edison and Holtec should be in a position
4 to make a draft of what this Defense in Depth looks
5 like in plain English, so not all the terms that makes
6 sense to you guys, but terms that make sense to us
7 folks in plain English and we should -- I don't know --
8 at the end of this year, beginning of next year, be
9 able to review that draft. And

10 Then, as part of that, I think Bill Parker's
11 comment is exactly right, with some tables or
12 information about where the status is for the different
13 parts because technology is being developed and that's
14 awesome, that's to our advantage, but we need to
15 understand kind of where that stands.

16 And so I think those would be very helpful
17 action items in addition to the other items that were
18 called out along the way. So I want to thank both of
19 you for this conversation.

20 I want to switch gears and talk about
21 Consolidated Interim Storage. We said we would come
22 and give CEP members another opportunity to talk more
23 about this today and so I just want to give you that
24 opportunity now.

25 To help make that process as efficient as

1 possible, Tim Brown, Dad Stetson, and I did a survey of
2 CEP members. We didn't talk to everybody yet, but
3 we've talked to most of you, and I sent around an
4 email, which has also been posted on the website, that
5 summarizes what we've learned from that.

6 Those questions included questions about how
7 the CEP overall is working for which overall impress --
8 impressions are positive, although a lot of people were
9 upset about the website. So, I said that before, you
10 know, declare your upsetness heard and the website will
11 be improved. But I think we -- makes sense for us to
12 focus on Consolidated Interim Storage in particular.

13 At our last meeting, Tim, Dan, and I put a
14 memo in front of you, it was about a California
15 strategy and it wasn't a strategy saying the waste
16 should be stored in California, but it was a strategy
17 where the California Energy Commission, in particular,
18 would help start the spadework that we've already
19 talked some about -- how a transport work, what would
20 sequence and shipments look like.

21 There is a lot of really important stuff that
22 if people don't pay attention to it, we're going to be
23 stuck with the waste here longer than we would want
24 otherwise.

25 We talked with CEP members about this. We

1 heard, I want to say, three things: First we heard a
2 lot of support for this California strategy and we
3 heard no support, as far as I can tell, for the idea
4 that the waste should only be stored in California or
5 stay in California.

6 I know Tom Caughlan would like to make some
7 comments about that since people seem to be very
8 enthusiastic about putting the waste on military basis,
9 and Tom knows quite a lot about that.

10 The second thing that I've heard -- we've
11 heard is that we want to make sure that there's
12 long-term program for management of the site, for
13 high-quality management by Edison of the site over
14 decades while we're getting Consolidated Interim
15 Storage in place, so Edison does not lose -- lose focus
16 on that.

17 And the third thing in the area where I would
18 welcome any additional comments is we've heard a lot of
19 different ideas about what needs to be done politically
20 right now to help make this a reality. Some people
21 want us to put pressure on the federal government, some
22 people think we need a little more attention in
23 Sacramento.

24 I'm quite persuaded, actually, that we need
25 some more support in Sacramento for this. Some people

1 are very enthusiastic about the various resolutions
2 that have been adopted or considered at various local
3 councils and political groups.

4 And so I want to hear from CEP members if
5 there are other views as to what we should be doing and
6 what Dan, Tim, and I should make sure happens on behalf
7 of the CEP as we try and make Consolidated Interim
8 Storage a reality. This is our best bet for getting
9 the fuel out of here as quickly as possible.

10 So let me see if there are any comments that
11 people would like to make about this. Jerry Kern.

12 MR. KERN: Well, we've -- I've been having this
13 discussion with the Chairman off and on. I'm trying to
14 coordinate a meeting with Senator Pat Bates's office,
15 Assembly Member Rocky Chavez's office, and Assembly
16 Member Bill Brough's office, because those are the
17 jurisdictions that overlie that, you know, that's right
18 in the center of all their districts.

19 And then, actually, getting Congressman Issa's
20 office involved because that's right at the center of
21 his district. We were having some difficulty
22 coordinating the meeting, but I think that's going to
23 happen probably within the next month, and the Chairman
24 and whoever else he feels should come, at least we can
25 get that on the table in front of these elected

1 representatives and see if we can actually start having
2 a champion up in Sacramento.

3 Politically, the problem is, all of them are
4 Republicans in a Democratic-controlled legislature. So
5 somehow we're going to have to draw in the other side
6 of the aisle, but I think we should start with our
7 local elected officials first.

8 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yeah, I think that makes a
9 lot of sense. It would be helpful. Maybe, Jerry, you
10 can help me articulate a list of things we're asking
11 for as well. So, addition, to be nice, we have a list
12 of things we want them to try and do in Sacramento.

13 Glenn Pascall, did you want to comment on
14 this?

15 MR. PASCALL: I wanted to commend the Chair and the
16 Secretary and others who've taken the lead on this.
17 They've just really done a great job of surfacing this
18 option and bringing it to the floor.

19 And a couple of supporting comments: The CEP
20 is an advisory body or you could even say a body just
21 to ventilate the depth of the topic. It is not a
22 decision-making body and that was one of the first
23 things that was said today.

24 So when we get into these deep, dark issues of
25 the detail design features of Defense in Depth, at some

1 point we have to recognize that those who are
2 decision-makers will make those decisions, and we can
3 express our views passionately and hopefully in an
4 informed way, but the final call is not ours.

5 However, when you get onto an issue like
6 Defense in Depth -- pardon me -- interim storage, which
7 is primarily a political issue, it's an issue of
8 sign-off and consent, we are much more effective and we
9 have a much more significant role to play in the sense
10 we have a substantive contribution to the process
11 that's very serious because we are broad-based, we're
12 broadly represented, we have become deeply informed on
13 this.

14 And if we speak out on an option like this, on
15 an political issue that does not drown in technical
16 detail, it's easy to understand, it's a matter of will,
17 not a matter of technology and design, we have a much
18 greater potential for impact in an area like that.

19 And the final comment I want to make is, to me
20 it's not either/or, it's not a matter of demonizing or
21 writing off Yucca Mountain or demonizing or writing off
22 privately operated sites that we negotiate with. It's
23 not either/or, it's both/and.

24 There's no reason why any of these potential
25 approaches to remove the waste from San Onofre should

1 preclude the attempt to move forward on any of the
2 other approaches. And so let's move forward on all of
3 them, recognizing these are essentially political
4 issues and we are political body with the potential for
5 political impact.

6 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you. I just want to
7 underscore -- I agree with what you said -- it's
8 really, really important that we never create the
9 impression that we are speaking on behalf of the
10 community or that we, as a CEP, are speaking with a
11 single voice about these things. We're just trying to
12 help focus and corral energies in the right -- in the
13 right direction.

14 And in this case, this is a tremendous
15 opportunity for us now at these consolidated sites and
16 we've seen three, there may be more sites -- sites that
17 have emerged.

18 Let me just see if there are other comments
19 people want to make about the political strategy. I
20 take -- I think Jerry and I will work -- Jerry Kern and
21 I will work on articulating what it is we might want to
22 be asking for in Sacramento and also maybe how we'd
23 reach across the aisle. Why don't we share that once
24 we have some sense of what that might look like with
25 the CEP and get any other input?

1 Let me just ask Tom Caughlan. If you wanted
2 to say anything about the idea that has surfaced at
3 previous meetings about putting the waste in your
4 garage, I guess.

5 MR. CAUGHLAN. Well, it's the people's garage. But
6 thank you very much. So, we've got a couple of slides,
7 I think, to pop up here. First, I think you'll all
8 recognize this as North America. The point of this
9 slide is that, if you look at the East Coast, you see
10 two things: You see coast and flat.

11 If you look at the West Coast, you see
12 mountains, deserts, flat, coasts. In other words,
13 every kind of terrain in which your military service
14 is, and the one I speak for is the Marine Corps, has to
15 train with, the fable words are "Every climb and
16 place," except triple-canopy jungle, you can do that
17 within an hour's drive or hour's flying time from the
18 bases in which these folks live and train every day;
19 that's a very important reason that you find yourself
20 with a Marine Corps, Navy, Army, Air Force on the West
21 Coast based here.

22 Essentially, since World War II when the land
23 was unoccupied and when we could create live-fire
24 training areas, 85 percent of the live-fire ranges are
25 on the West Coast and that's because they're in the

1 desert where they can do things that they need to do
2 without damaging other people or disturbing too many
3 people. They're also greatly off shore.

4 So instead of hearing sonic booms, all that
5 happens so distantly over the ocean horizon. It all
6 has to be done. These ladies and gentlemen that wear
7 the cloth of the Country are charged to be ready when
8 the Nation is least ready to go forward and do the
9 kinds of things that are necessary to protect our
10 security.

11 That means that at that moment of execution
12 order, they don't get any better trained. As a matter
13 of fact, they only get worse trained. And so that's
14 why they have to be most ready all the time and they
15 have to use the terrain and land that's been given to
16 accomplish that.

17 Next slide, please.

18 Okay. So this is the complex of bases that
19 live on the West Coast. I've heard various member of
20 the audience propose the use of various pieces of
21 military terrain for interim storage, most commonly is
22 the Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, which is
23 out there to the -- to the east and north of El Centro.

24 Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range has
25 been a live-fire bombing range since 1941 or '42,

1 rather. It is open and rolling desert and pretty much
2 badlands, which have collected armaments all the days
3 of those years. There's lots of stuff out there, most
4 of which has exploded, some of which has not.

5 The clearing of it to make it safe for
6 anything else would be almost -- it would not be an
7 impossibility. It would take a very, very, very long
8 time to make sure that it's safe.

9 And if it were used for any other purpose, it
10 couldn't be used for a live-fire bombing range and it
11 is the largest and only one left since the loss of
12 Vieques in Puerto Rico has made it necessary for all
13 the services on all the coasts to use it.

14 My point is simply this: The military ranges
15 are used to train almost 365 days. At Camp Pendleton
16 we shoot live fire, everything from small arms to
17 artillery, 363 days a year. We don't shoot Christmas,
18 we don't shoot New Year's, and we usually don't shoot
19 on Thanksgiving.

20 Every other day there's things going boom and
21 bang there; that's how much those ranges are used,
22 that's the demand signal, and that's why there is not
23 any available land on military installations that isn't
24 needed either for maneuver training, mitigation for
25 maneuver training, meaning honoring the environmental

1 regulation and stewardship that is the law of the land
2 or live-fire training. It simply is fully committed.

3 And at many other times we seek the
4 partnership of the Bureau of Land Management for
5 service and even private communities to do the kind of
6 gradual level training that we need to do to be ready
7 and ready to go.

8 And I will tell you one short story: An
9 example, my experience as a helicopter pilot, one of
10 the things we had to be prepared to do was evacuate
11 embassies. How do you plan to evacuate an embassy?
12 The answer was, in the dark of the night, off the coast
13 of California, in the USS Tarawa, 24 Aircraft of my
14 squad, and evacuated Parker Center in Downtown
15 Los Angeles of a thousand people.

16 Now, we don't own Parker Center. We certainly
17 don't hope to own Parker Center. But it allowed us, in
18 partnership with the people of City of Los Angeles and
19 the Los Angeles Police Department, to execute this
20 vital mission that has to be done right the first time
21 without using -- without owning things that we don't
22 need to own, but we were able to do that because good
23 relationship, good stewardship, good partnership, and
24 some understanding in the community.

25 I would offer you that that is the reason that

1 we were ready to go and ready to do it and that's the
2 reason your military is as successful as it is. But
3 all of that comes back to training and all that
4 training comes back to the need for real estate.

5 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay.

6 MR. CAUGHLAN: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Excellent. Thank you very
8 much for that comment. I think we have to focus on how
9 California and other states with similar situations,
10 specially for plants like San Onofre that are -- that
11 are now in the process of decommissioning how we get
12 the fuel out of here, these two new sites that have
13 emerged are a really an interesting possibility.

14 And let me commit that we're going to update
15 the Panel on discussions that have been had around this
16 every meeting or almost every meeting and, if there are
17 people in various city councils and other governing
18 bodies who are themselves kind of putting things and
19 want to try and coordinate, let's -- let's all row in
20 the same direction on this. This is a tremendous
21 opportunity for us. So thank you very much.

22 We have on the agenda right now a break, which
23 we will take, but I'm going to sit in my chair the
24 whole time. And in five minutes exactly, on my time
25 zone, which is the Apple clock, we're going to start

1 again and have the public comment period.

2 (Break taken from 7:56 p.m. to 8:02 p.m.)

3 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: We have two city council
4 members who asked to speak as well as several members
5 of the community. And I very much look forward to this
6 conversation. The game plan is, we have three-minute
7 public comments and Dan Stetson is going to keep notes
8 about questions that get raised that can have answers
9 from the people in the room here or action items.

10 And so we're going to hear the public comment
11 periodic as normal and then he's going to put those
12 questions to Tom, to Kris, to Kelli, to Sara, and
13 others, and hopefully none to me, and we'll see how
14 that process works. We're just trying to make this
15 efficient and representative as possible.

16 MR. STETSON: And if I might just add that if, by
17 chance, you would like to follow up with a written
18 comment that you would like to be part of the public
19 record, you could give that to us today, you could also
20 send it to us via email.

21 There is an opportunity, a way to do it on our
22 website. You could put it in writing. As long as we
23 -- as long as we, actually, Edison, receives that
24 within the next five days, it will become part of the
25 public record. Thank you, David.

1 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very much.
2 And if you have ideas about how we can better organize
3 the public comment periods, send those as well.

4 So first, Lori Donchack and then Daryl Gale.
5 Lori Donchak is San Clemente City Council.

6 MS. DONCHAK: Okay. First of all, thank you for
7 writing the safety of long-term storage checks.
8 Excellently done. My name is Lori Donchak. I'm
9 San Clemente City Council member and I was also mayor
10 during the Fukushima Daiichi tragedy, so I have a deep
11 history with nuclear energy in Southern California.

12 I'm here tonight because in the past month our
13 city council has received upwards of a hundred emails
14 from concerned citizens about the decommissioning
15 process. And for a small town like San Clemente to
16 have a hundred folks weigh in on a quality of life
17 issue it's important. So I'm hoping to give our small
18 town a big voice tonight.

19 My big message is that I urge this panel to be
20 a force or, at least, a focus that keeps San Clemente's
21 Saddleback Memorial Care Hospital open both registered
22 and essential to the new emergency plan.

23 I want to read you an excerpt from a July 2011
24 FEMA(Federal Emergency Management Agency) scenario
25 summary: "A loud crash and an individual screaming

1 emanates from unit 3, Penetration Building, room 209.
2 Upon investigation, workers find an individual lying in
3 water that may be contaminated. The individual is
4 bleeding and has significant injuries to the lower --
5 to the face and lower legs."

6 This is an excerpt from a medical services
7 drill conducted by FEMA at Saddleback Memorial Medical
8 Center in San Clemente to assess state and local
9 emergency preparedness for RERPs, which are
10 Radiological Emergency Response Plans:

11 "Clearly the hospital had been viewed as
12 critical at that time, yet the new proposed plan is
13 silent on the role or even the existence of
14 San Clemente Hospital."

15 How can it be? It is a 41-mile hospital
16 desert between Tri-Cities in Oceanside to Mission
17 Hospital in Mission Viejo and SONGS is smack in the
18 middle of that desert. Why wouldn't San Clemente
19 Hospital be part of the plan?

20 Please, please ensure that there is emergency
21 care near the plant for the workers, for the residents;
22 and use your considerable focus and weight to keep
23 San Clemente Hospital a resource and make sure that
24 hospital is there for the life of decommissioning.

25 You spoke about funding commensurate with a

1 retired plant, what that appropriate level might be.
2 And I encourage you to think about that appropriate
3 level as including the support it might need to take to
4 keep that hospital viable and also as an important
5 reso -- resource to your decommissioning.

6 I was going to talk about the earthquake
7 because that's seismic stability as a geological
8 concept, it's important in our community. And my final
9 comment is on page 6 of your report. You talk about
10 the importance of a long-term trust fund and I think
11 that's essential to a successful decommissioning.

12 Thank you for listening.

13 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very much.
14 So we ought to include in Tom's list of questions what
15 the long-term funding strategy is and how it's going to
16 be funded. Let me also mention, Lori, that -- later, I
17 see Gary Headrick is on the list and Gary's
18 organization's organized many of those comments, and so
19 we'll have a chance to hear also from him and his
20 organization about the questions and concerns that they
21 have. Daryl Gale is next and then Rita Conn.

22 MS. GALE: Hello, good evening. I'm Daryl Gale. I
23 live in Los Angeles. And my friend and I, we drove the
24 approximately 90 miles down here to come to this
25 engagement panel. We are both very concerned about the

1 safety of the local residents and the waste, they --
2 both safety-wise and time-wise. I will be reporting
3 back to a big environmental coalition, that I belong
4 to, about what's going on with this progress.

5 Many Angelinos, we come down here for
6 recreation and because we have family members down
7 right, you know, in these beautiful beach communities.
8 I'm very happy about these regular public meetings and
9 all the information I've learned tonight. It was very
10 interesting. But I'm still very concerned about these
11 casks, 5/8s of an inch of steel, it just doesn't make
12 me feel comfortable. And, remember, I live about 88
13 miles away.

14 I just really want to think that after
15 Fukushima companies and governing bod -- bodies in
16 America will bend over backwards and spend enormous
17 amount of money, time, and studies to prove that we're
18 not going to be like TEPCO. I know Edison isn't like
19 TEPCO and we're not going to be like the Japanese
20 government. So I will continue to come to these
21 meetings and I thank you for having them and I'm very
22 much open to keeping up with the progress. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much for your
24 comments. Next is Rita Conn and then Toni Iseman.

25 MS. CONN: Good evening. Rita Conn, Chairman of

1 Let Laguna Vote. And I would just like to thank and
2 congratulate this panel for the tremendous amount of
3 work and progress that you have made in getting the
4 stuff out of our backyards.

5 I know you would like us to feel safe and we
6 would like to feel safe. We have a big stake in this.
7 It's our communities and it's our families.

8 And to this end, I would just like to talk to
9 Dr. Singh about what he considers the integrity of your
10 cask system. It's important we believe you, but when I
11 read things, such as the 210 Department of Justice
12 Summary, which was based on the results of a criminal
13 investigation of Holtec, we find that Holtec was fined
14 2 million dollars and you lost your status as a U.S.
15 contractor.

16 Yet, today we know that Holtec has the NRC's
17 current quality assurance approval, but we all know
18 that the NRC simply relies on Holtec's written promise
19 to correct dangerous designs and fabrication problems
20 and does nothing to follow up to see if indeed they
21 were corrected.

22 In 2007 the manager of the Tennessee Valley
23 Authority Nuclear Power Plant pleaded guilty to
24 accepting a bribe from Holtec despite Holtec's clever
25 scheme to camouflage the bribe.

1 Dr. Ross Landsman, Chicago's Ex-Chief dry cask
2 inspector, had this to say about your quality
3 assurance, and that was: "As far as I'm concerned,
4 Holtec has no quality assurance." Dr. Landsman was
5 asked by the NRC to sign off on your cask and he
6 refused, saying that "This is the same kind of thinking
7 that led to the NASA's space shuttle disaster."

8 In Fact, Dr. Ross Landsman and, whistleblower,
9 Oscar Shirani, both believe that the Holtec nuclear
10 spent fuel dry casks are nothing but -- I hate to say
11 this -- garbage cans, with dangerous welding,
12 manufacturing, and design flaws that threaten public
13 safety in our backyards.

14 Perhaps, this is why Edison refers to your
15 system as experimental and it's an experiment that we,
16 the residents, did not sign up to be guinea pigs.

17 Sorry to bring this up, but in order for us to
18 believe that we really are safe these issues need to be
19 addressed.

20 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very much --

21 MS. CONN: Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- for your comment. We will
23 put that to -- to Holtec at the end of the public
24 comment period along with all other questions that
25 arise.

1 Next is Toni Iseman, from the Laguna Beach
2 City Council, and then Lea Vasquez.

3 MS. ISEMAN: Good evening. I'm serving my 5th term
4 on the Laguna Beach City Council, glutton for
5 punishment. For those of you who were elected, you'd
6 appreciate what I'm saying. I appreciate all of your
7 service. (Indicating) This bag contains signa --
8 signatures on paper that are people in my area that are
9 very concerned about the fact that we have a very
10 dangerous situation there even though the plant closed.

11 And I appreciate the tough questions that
12 you've been asking today, but I also was very concerned
13 what to listen to Edison presenting something that,
14 cavalier may be a little too big a word or to -- to --
15 but I had a gut feeling that things were rather not as
16 serious as they really are.

17 I would appreciate this being addressed. I
18 mean, if we're talking about how dangerous it is, it's
19 like, "Okay, before, you could die instantly." But
20 now, you know, "If we have it, it'll be a long, slow
21 death and you'll be radiated and we won't be able to
22 live here anymore, but it won't be quite as fast."

23 We have something that is so dangerous. And
24 please continue to answer or ask those questions and
25 follow up and know that the public is very nervous,

1 very nervous about what's there.

2 And -- and thank you for being on this panel,
3 and continue to ask the tough questions.

4 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much for your
5 comment. Next we have Lea Vasquez. And then after
6 that I believe it says Charlotte "Mazak," from Village
7 Laguna, but my -- the handwriting is hard for me to
8 determine. So, Lea Vasquez.

9 MS. VASQUEZ: Thank you very much. And, again,
10 thank you for all your time, attention, your expertise.
11 My name is Lea Vasquez. I've been involved with the
12 City of Laguna Beach for many years.

13 And I have a personal stake, my mother was one
14 of the victims in 1950s of a nuclear test that occurred
15 outside of St. George, Utah. And tons of irradiated
16 material was brought back onto the stage set and the
17 result was that everybody got cancer.

18 And the Native Americans had lawsuits. And
19 I'm sure people here, who know the history of all of
20 this, know how serious it was. And it's been buried
21 for many years, literally buried.

22 So this is very concerning. This is not a
23 situation that is 2 miles or 10 miles of potential
24 disaster, it's 150 miles, at least. And -- and we're
25 sitting in a very, you know -- our -- our physical zone

1 here is subject to, as you showed on the map, all kinds
2 of different natural occurrences. And if it's going to
3 happen, it will happen. So, you know, we know, we --
4 we're hearing it.

5 Anyway, a Department of Energy letter came to
6 Let Laguna Vote and it basically thanks us for
7 expressing our concerns about the safety and storage
8 and the handling of the San Onofre Nuclear Generating
9 Station.

10 And it goes on to say that "This applies to a
11 pilot interim storage facility and while legislative
12 authority will be required to fully implement the
13 strategy, the Secretary of Energy announced that the
14 Department of Energy is moving forward to begin
15 deciding if one or more interim storage facilities that
16 could accept the spent fuel from shutdown commercial
17 reactors."

18 "Looking ahead, they plan to take steps, all
19 used in the process consistent with phase, adaptive
20 consent-based approach. The DOE believes that we must
21 solve the issue of nuclear waste disposal and we must
22 do it in a way that ensures the public trust and
23 confidence in the decision-making throughout the
24 process."

25 In addition to this, and although all that

1 sounds fine, the DOE is considering two interim
2 locations per letter received by the Let Laguna Vote to
3 secure the nuclear waste and the time is of essence to
4 have tested and tried transportable canisters if we
5 were to be considered for these two interim locations
6 that are being proposed.

7 I don't have time to speak much more, but I
8 will say that the concerns are very great and your
9 attention to this and listening to the public is
10 extremely important and we know there are great
11 concerns about Holtec and you've heard those already.

12 So, thank you very much, and we look forward
13 to more hearings and appreciate the questions that have
14 been brought up also --

15 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank -- thank you.

16 MS. VASQUEZ: -- by the Panel. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you for your comments.

18 Next is Char -- Charlotte?

19 MS. MAZURIK: Mazurik.

20 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Mazurik?

21 MS. MAZURIK: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Charlotte Mazurik. I'm sorry
23 for not getting your name correct. And then after that
24 is Marni Magda.

25 MS. MAZURIK: Thank you very much. Good evening,

1 everyone. Charlotte Mazurik of Laguna Beach, a Village
2 Laguna Board Member, and in conjunction with Rita Conn
3 and Let Laguna Vote. And earlier you saw Council
4 Member Toni Iseman show you a bag with some petitions.

5 I would like to say that we have close to
6 2,000 petitions now that have been signed, and I would
7 like to just read a couple of quick paragraphs to you
8 of the petition:

9 "We call on you to demand the Nuclear
10 Regulatory Commission and the Department of Energy work
11 with the Department of Defense and California
12 legislators to immediately create a California interim
13 storage facility on or near an existing isolated,
14 sparsely populated, guarded military base so that it
15 can be protected from the growing threat of nuclear
16 terrorism."

17 And the last paragraph:

18 "We call on you to demand that any dry storage
19 system for radioactive spent fuel that Edison purchases
20 must have fully developed available transport casks are
21 available to be inspected for cracks that would lead to
22 radioactive leaks and able to be repaired before such a
23 disaster occurs and to be above ground in a steel and
24 concrete building and carefully guarded while it awaits
25 transportation." Thank you very much.

1 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much. And
2 thank you also for quoting from those petitions because
3 I think it's very helpful to hear what people are
4 asking for and we'll have a chance to respond, to -- to
5 get some responses in just a little bit.

6 Next on the list is Marni Magda and then
7 Lorraine Auger.

8 MS. MAGDA: Thank you tonight. And, Dr. Singh, I
9 was very pleased to hear that you will be taking over
10 AREVA for us and watching it carefully since we don't
11 have a crane here to protect those canisters anymore,
12 and we have -- I've learned we have some fuel that
13 is -- still needs many more years of cooling before we
14 can move it.

15 I have been heartened by what the Department
16 of Energy has started to finally wake up to what should
17 have been 50 years ago begun. They have just starting
18 to -- they had -- their last site visit had been 1991
19 and now, thank goodness, Melissa Bates has been to 12
20 of the 13 stranded field sites, and we've heard John
21 Hertzeg, of the DOE, say that "The Congress is very
22 interested in getting stranded fuel off the Pacific
23 Coast of the United States."

24 We must focus on that new focus. I know that
25 Tom Palmisano and Southern California Edison want this

1 fuel out of here. I'm horrified that I heard tonight
2 that date of leaving at 2049, I'll be 103. We cannot
3 do that. I would love to be 103. But I want that fuel
4 out of here in 10 years and we can do it if we all work
5 together, and we must.

6 We finally have the Department of Energy that
7 will need legislation. Dianne Feinstein and Lamar
8 Alexander, a very unusual combination, in my mind, but
9 it is essential that that kind of combination work
10 together to begin to create the legislation that allows
11 interim storage. We don't -- we can't even put it
12 anywhere until the law changes.

13 So I have changed from believing it could go
14 to a military base. Thank you. And I am so thankful
15 for all of those Marines and I do believe that there is
16 hope, that we can get it to interim -- to a private
17 hundred-year contracted, private storage in New Mexico
18 and in West Texas.

19 We don't have any of the rights to put it
20 across states right now, we're going to need to have
21 everyone working on all angles of this if we are to get
22 this fuel out of San Onofre in the next 10 years. I
23 cannot stand the idea of 35.

24 And I don't want to see a study that creates
25 leaving it here, so we can see if it's safe. Let's get

1 it out. And that demands that all of us meet with all
2 of our California and our congressional contacts around
3 the United States. We absolutely cannot hold back on
4 this and pretend that it's safe.

5 In 2006, we had a fire that hit the south
6 parking lot of San Onofre and the NRC was up all night
7 in their Ready-Room. We have an El Nino coming that'll
8 blast the asphalt in Oak Street into the sky. We
9 cannot depend on the climate to work for us leaving
10 that fuel here. It must be moved.

11 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very much
12 for your comment. Next is Lorraine Auger and then Gary
13 Headrick.

14 MS. AUGER: Good evening, Panel. Lorraine Auger,
15 stakeholder. And I'm very concerned. I spoke with
16 Mr. Singh a little earlier today because I'm very
17 concerned about the 3,000 PSI strength -- tensile
18 strength concrete that's being projected.

19 In my opinion, that's not adequate. We need
20 45. We need to discuss what type of aggregate is being
21 used. He claimed Portland Cement. I'd like to see
22 Gunite, but I'd like to see also the specifications,
23 which Mr. Singh said he would send to me.

24 My involvement is in design-build. The DOE is
25 responsible for developing energy and the NRC's charge

1 is more nuclear power plants and their motivation is to
2 expedite their agenda. Edison is motivated by profit.

3 Edison's VP has confirmed that we uncovered in
4 DC that they collected 100 million dollars last year
5 from the DOE and the NRC as a result of the lawsuit
6 filed against by Edison against the DOE for partial
7 breach of contract for not removing the waste.

8 Let Laguna Vote has met with them and learned
9 how the State of Nevada protected their people from the
10 dangerous of Yucca Mountain. The state hired their own
11 biologists and experts to uncover the state -- unstable
12 contamination of ground water.

13 The state controls Water Rights. And although
14 the NRC dug the hole in the mountain with false
15 promises by NRC that the ground was stable, the state's
16 expert told quite a different story and revealed the
17 unstable ground and contamination of ground water.

18 The CEP is Edison's panel and has several
19 members hand-selected by Edison to continue to shore up
20 their promise, to protect their 14 years in a row of
21 increased profit, for share -- annual shareholders
22 report to the tune of billions.

23 I urge the county representatives here to call
24 on Edison and the NRC for -- for extended time to study
25 the safety of the experimental containers and the true

1 risk and cost that Southern California's economy and
2 people would be left with.

3 I urge our county and state representatives to
4 hire your own experts, just as Nevada did, to assess
5 our own risk. Many pronuclear advocates in DC are
6 conceiving that dealing with the removal of stockpiles
7 of nuclear spent fuel rods must take priority.

8 Recently, Senator Lamar Alexander, of
9 Tennessee, signed onto our state or senator's bill to
10 call for community consensus of handling the waste in
11 their community.

12 Senator Alexander chairs the Appropriations
13 Committee for the Department of Energy and funding to
14 move the waste to an interim location, such as a
15 military base, and it must be driven by him, that is
16 why we are calling for a California interim location
17 for California's waste on more stable ground and a more
18 sparsely populated area.

19 With the support of our officials, this can be
20 accomplished, but we cannot allow it to be buried in
21 unsafe canisters that are not transportable.

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

24 MS. AUGER: Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Next is Gary Headrick and

1 then Lori Headrick.

2 MR. HEADRICK: Could I ask a favor and if I could
3 go last? I know public perception is important to you,
4 and it actually turned out --

5 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: It's really important that we
6 keep the order as -- because then the person who signed
7 up last is signed up last, so. Why don't you make your
8 comment? And --

9 MR. HEADRICK: Well, it's nine minutes long if you
10 want to hear the whole thing, but --

11 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Well, may I suggest that --

12 MRS. HEADRICK: An mine is the same time.

13 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: May I suggest -- we can't do
14 that because then we're going to end up with -- why
15 don't you make a comment for three minutes and then
16 submit via email the full text, which I see is written
17 out, and then we'll make sure that ends up as part of
18 the full record of the meeting?

19 MR. HEADRICK: Well, I'll take my chances at the
20 end. Thank you. It's okay.

21 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Lori Headrick, are you
22 going to the end?

23 MRS. HEADRICK: I was going to -- (Inaudible.)

24 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: It's not how the system
25 works. So, would you like to make a comment now?

1 MRS. HEADRICK: (Inaudible.)

2 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Donna Gilmore, do you
3 want to talk now or do you want to go at the end?
4 Because, we're going to have a competition to -- for
5 who speaks last.

6 MS. GILMORE: Donna Gilmore. I have a website,
7 San Onofre Safety, where I put the facts. So, if
8 anybody in the room wants to know what's really going
9 on, please check my website.

10 Fact No. 1: There is a Koeberg nuclear plant
11 that has a component made out of sim -- similar
12 materials, in a similar fashion, according to the NRC.
13 It had a through-wall crack, meaning it leaked, in 17
14 years. It was located in a similar environment, on
15 shore winds, surf, frequent fog, 17 years.

16 We have -- it was at a more ambient
17 temperature. However, the Diablo Canyon, EPRI
18 inspected a canister there, a two-year old canister had
19 all the conditions for stress corrosion cracking in two
20 years. The temperature was low enough for the salt to
21 dissolve on the canister, salts were found in two
22 years.

23 We've had canisters loaded since 2003 at
24 San Onofre. If we have the same luck as Koeberg, we're
25 talking five more years before one of those canisters

1 will leak. That is the reality. That is the facts.
2 That is what we need to deal with here. All the other
3 stuff is speculation.

4 And why are we buying vaporware? You don't
5 buy a product that doesn't exist. I've researched for
6 the world market. We're not a little, tiny world here
7 in the United States; we're part of the world. Most of
8 the rest of the world uses thick, 20-inch thick cask.
9 They do not crack. You don't need three quarters of
10 those slides because you don't have the cracking
11 issues. They put them in reinforced building. Maybe
12 it'll -- maybe that will give us the 100 years.

13 And in terms of moving the fuel, that's going
14 to take many more years because, Glenn, it's not just
15 politics, it's technology, railroad systems, legal
16 lawsuits. Yucca Mountain has, at least, 200 pending
17 lawsuits.

18 So, you know, I wish the fuel could be gone
19 right away, like everyone else. But the reality is,
20 we're just not in control of that. So, Tom, I want to
21 know what you're going to do if one of those canisters
22 cracks all the way through. What -- what is in place?
23 There's no approvals, there's no process that I've seen
24 to deal with that.

25 Do I need to put my house on the market now or

1 move in five years, if that happens? That's what I'm
2 concerned about right now. And I think that's what
3 everybody needs to be concerned about. This is not a
4 game. This is real. Even Dr. Singh says they're not
5 repairable; on that we agree with.

6 He even says there's millions of curies of
7 radiation from those -- from those leaks. I have yet
8 to get a good answer as exactly what's going to happen
9 when once of those leaks all the way through. I'd like
10 to have that in writing.

11 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay.

12 MS. GILMORE: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much. And I
14 think that's on Tom's list, but we'll hear more from
15 him at the end. Joanna Field and then Roger Johnson.

16 MS. FIELD: I yield my time.

17 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you. Roger
18 Johnson and then after Roger Johnson will be Vinny
19 Arora.

20 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. I think we need to put
21 some perspective on our choices, and it's only if you
22 want us to remain a nuclear waste dump for the rest of
23 the century. That's completely unacceptable. I know
24 you said that, unacceptable, but I wish you'd make your
25 voice louder and clearer, that -- that this is not

1 possible. Another is to give the impression that this
2 a survivable, manageable RAD event, it's a manageable
3 crisis, and that's not poss -- that's not acceptable
4 either, it is not.

5 The chairman of the NRC in October of 2013
6 made a speech in which he said there is no possible way
7 to protect the public in a RAD emergency, a serious RAD
8 emergency, and now we hear people in the emergency plan
9 are saying the opposite. They're doing it as service
10 to the public, to give them that impression. It's not
11 manageable.

12 So I think the only solution is to get it out
13 of here and I'd like to hear that louder and I do agree
14 with Glenn that it is a political issue, and so let's
15 get busy with doing it.

16 Tonight I saw four major problems with the
17 presentations: The first was to focus narrowly on
18 minor, slow-moving accidents and most of these
19 accidents were assumed to be manmade accidents at the
20 plant. So that's one possible thing: Human error.

21 I'd like to see planning for worst-case
22 scenarios. I didn't hear any talk about worst-case
23 scenarios, so we should do that.

24 I'm thinking about high explosive, direct
25 attacks, hits by missiles, truck bombs -- all kinds of

1 terrible things are possible, very, very possible, and
2 they could happen very quickly, escalate very quickly.

3 And so they --

4 The second problem is the bureaucratic
5 solutions. I see most of the discussions of the
6 emergency plan is -- is based around bureaucratic
7 solutions. Bureaucratic solutions are not solutions,
8 so, making a list of agencies involved is not a
9 solution.

10 We need to advise the homeowners and the
11 businesses, and I don't -- I didn't see any of that.
12 They tell you "Turn on your TV set." That's not a
13 solution. Homeowners need to know more.

14 The third one is the reliance on authority. I
15 hear that over and over. "Turn on your TV set. Trust
16 authority. Do what you're told." This is a big
17 mistake. There have been hundreds of nuclear accidents
18 and 33 major ones, according to the IAEA(International
19 Atomic Energy Agency); two of the worst were in
20 California, the meltdown in Rancho Seco in 1978 and in
21 Santa Susana 1959.

22 If we look at what authority said, look at our
23 nuclear testing program, for half a century the
24 government lies systematically, all of these things.
25 And it's completely unrealistic about radiation.

1 That's my last one; alpha, beta, gamma
2 radiation. Nobody's going to go anywhere. All police
3 cars, fire engines, ambulances are going to be hopeless
4 and contaminated. My car today was 115 degrees. You
5 shut off all the air-conditioning --

6 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very much.

7 MR. JOHNSON: You've have to strip-naked to enter a
8 building and being hose down to get your clothes.

9 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much for that
10 -- for your comment. Vinny Arora is next and then Gary
11 Headrick.

12 MR. ARORA: Since I have an accent, I will be very
13 slow so everybody can understand me. Good evening,
14 ladies and gentlemen. My name is Vinny Arora. I'm the
15 CEO of a public charity dedicated to nuclear safety. I
16 work with consultants all over the world, including
17 retired NRC inspectors.

18 My emergency plan teacher is Robert Taylor,
19 NRC, Emergency Plan Chief. And my practical teacher
20 Lee Kelly, with whom I work for six years at SONGS and
21 I interface with Sara also.

22 I'm going to ask you a question. You don't
23 have to give an answer today. What kind of actual
24 radiological accident you're postulating? And what are
25 your radiological assumptions for doing that? And what

1 kind of a protective action recommendations are you
2 going to tell the off-site agencies? That's all.

3 Thank you very much.

4 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much for your
5 comment. Garry Headrick.

6 MR. HEADRICK: Thank you. And then if -- may I
7 read my nine minutes? Is that --

8 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: No, you can read -- why don't
9 you make the essence of the comment for three minutes
10 and then send us by email the full text? And we will
11 make sure that's part of the public record.

12 MR. HEADRICK: Yeah, I can try to --

13 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Because --

14 MR. HEADRICK: -- speak off the top of my head.

15 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Because we need time for the
16 questions that people have raised to be answered so
17 that we can, you know, keep the conduit open in both
18 directions; that's the reason for the three-minute
19 rule.

20 MR. HEADRICK: Okay. Well, I thought, you know,
21 going at the end, it would allow the 60-minute period
22 before that's over. But basically -- it's hard to talk
23 off the top of my head, but I just wanted to commend
24 the CEP for the job you're doing.

25 But I also think this has to be reviewed in

1 context with the history, and that's rather brief
2 history for myself, about a five-year period. And as
3 much as I'd like to believe all the things that I've
4 heard tonight and how well-spoken they were and
5 well-researched, and I had not known some of the things
6 I experienced in the past five years, I would be
7 totally on board and so supportive of this action.

8 But the truth is, Edison does not deserve our
9 trust and there's been several instances where I can
10 point to, and I guess that's why this is a nine-minute
11 speech I can't really say in three minutes.

12 But probably the biggest offense was the steam
13 generator fiasco, not just that Edison put us at risk
14 in the design phase and they relied on a computer
15 model. As we heard, computer models, you know, are
16 reliable, except in that case it was 400 percent wrong.

17 And the second part of that fiasco was what
18 we've discovered recently through emails that were
19 discovered as an investigation in CPUC occurred,
20 indicating that Edison has been doing backroom deals so
21 that the ratepayers would get stuck with most of the 5
22 billion dollar loss in the gamble they took with the
23 steam generators.

24 Not only that, the way they managed that
25 behind-the-scene negotiation was they skipped the

1 investigation that went into what went wrong at
2 San Onofre and jumped right to the settlement, and the
3 problem with that is, if we did the investigation, I'm
4 pretty convinced that the NRC, Edison, and the CPUC
5 would all be culpable in why that steam generator
6 project went bad. And they're protecting themselves by
7 not allowing that investigation. And that was the
8 president of Edison who became the president of the
9 CPUC that prevented that investigation from happening.

10 So in that background, along with a lot of
11 other poor experiences, I think the public perception
12 that you're seeking to gain is not going to be handled
13 when Edison is controlling. We need to have a
14 blue-ribbon panel and we need to have the public have
15 some authority over what the decisions are made.

16 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very much
17 for those very important comments about trust. Please
18 do send me the full text so that I can be sure to share
19 that with the full CEP and get it posted on our
20 website.

21 Dan Stetson, can you -- some of the questions
22 that have been raised, such as about the hospitals, are
23 already action items for us. But can you flag
24 particular items and then help identify who on the
25 panel should -- should address them?

1 MR. STETSON: Sure. Thank you, David. And -- and
2 some of these actually came up prior to this meeting.
3 And, Kris, the question came up about the 3,000 PSI
4 with the concrete. There's been a lot of discussion
5 about the cask, quite a bit less about the concrete.

6 First of all, could you tell us what that
7 means, 3,000 PSI? And then, also, connected onto that,
8 if there was a significant seismic activity, could it
9 be such that we would not -- you would not be able to
10 remove the canisters from their silos?

11 DR. SINGH: I'll be glad to answer it. The 3,000
12 PSI compressive strength concrete is a minimum
13 requirement placed on the filler concrete that is below
14 the ground between the top ISFSI pad and the bottom
15 support foundation pad.

16 Typically, typically that space would be
17 occupied by engineered fill, which is not concrete. We
18 have upgraded that fill to a CLSM (Controlled
19 Low-Strength Material) material, controlled contraction
20 material that has strength of about 1,500 PSI
21 compressive strength.

22 Subsequently, for -- for this plan, for
23 San Onofre, we increased that to 3,000 PSI minimum.
24 Now, that doesn't mean that it will be a 3,000 PSI
25 concrete. That's the minimum acceptable requirement.

1 We qualified it for the earthquake.

2 And I told you earlier the earthquake is
3 substantially stronger than anything experienced by
4 men. Under that, the canister remains fully
5 retrievable. You can take the canister out after the
6 earthquake has occurred and there is no damage to the
7 canister in the sense that there will be release of
8 radioactivity with substantial margins.

9 So, that is, this 3,000, unfortunately, there
10 was one sentence in the presentation and it gave --
11 perhaps, it gave some wrong impression. But I have
12 promised the young lady that I'll send her material on
13 the -- on the concrete, its characteristics, and how --
14 how it will be used at the site.

15 Most likely, the concrete compressive
16 strength, the actual measure strength, will be in the
17 order of four-to five-thousand PSI. But when we do
18 calculations, we use the minimum permissible value.
19 Anything above that, of course, is additional margin.

20 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: When you do, could please
21 copy me, so I can make sure the whole CEP can see it,
22 too?

23 DR. SINGH: Oh, I intended to send it through you.

24 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you. Dan?

25 MR. STETSON: Another question, this one is for

1 Tom. Tom, there were some comments made that some
2 cracks have been appearing on some canisters after 17
3 years and that the ones that are currently at SONGS are
4 at risk within the next five years.

5 If a leak was to occur with the current
6 canisters that you have, how would you detect it? And
7 I know you've spoken a little bit more about what you
8 might do to repair it.

9 MR. PALMISANO: Well, we've talked about this
10 briefly before. I'll address it briefly tonight. And
11 I think we're going to have to talk more in-depth on
12 this because it's certainly an important subject and I
13 don't want to give it just a two-second or a two-minute
14 answer.

15 You know, the current monitoring that goes on
16 is generally radiation and contamination around the
17 modules and the outside of the concrete storage modules
18 that exist today.

19 What is being developed, and it's required by
20 the NRC for the license renewal period, we'll develop
21 it earlier is more inspection inside the modules and
22 around the canister peri -- you know, boundary itself.
23 So those requirements are coming. It is some of the
24 tooling that is being developed by Holtec for us based
25 on technology.

1 So in terms of inspecting for the early
2 indication of a crack, that tooling has to be
3 developed. If one were to occur today and leakage
4 developed, you know, as we talked earlier, with both
5 the AREVA and Holtec options range from repair to
6 encapsulation.

7 Practically, as, I think, Dr. Singh said in
8 the previous session the last year, one of the simplest
9 and quickest things would be to put it in a transfer
10 cask or a transportation overpack. Okay? We would
11 stage those on site and have those available for both
12 systems.

13 And one comment, it was a good comment about
14 the Koeberg in South Africa, that was not a dry storage
15 canister that was written up in an NRC information
16 notice, it's a lower grade of stainless steel. It is
17 stress corrosion grade, it's 304 stainless, which is
18 one reason these are higher grade stainless steel.

19 So, these are real issues that need to be
20 evaluated and figured in, you know, included in the
21 formulated plan, recognizing the sensitivity. But it's
22 also what drove us to thicker steel and higher grade
23 steel. So I appreciate the comment.

24 MS. GILMORE: Yeah, I appreciate that but the --
25 (Inaudible.)

1 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: We -- we -- we really need to
2 allow Dan to do what Dan said he was going to do. This
3 issue has come up several times now. It is addressed
4 even in the white paper that's come out of -- that I
5 wrote on behalf of the process that we had and I've
6 checked all of this information with, in fact, the same
7 people at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, they say
8 quite different things.

9 Dan, could you continue on, please?

10 MR. STETSON: Certainly. Tom, actual, this kind of
11 moves right along into the next question. The question
12 was brought up: If there was a radiological accident
13 scenario that you might be postulating, what would your
14 response be? Is this right in alignment with that?

15 MR. PALMISANO: What, a canister?

16 MR. PASCALL: The question is, what scenario is
17 most probable or is the one that you're sort of using
18 as a paradigm?

19 MR. PALMISANO: Oh, okay. So, scenarios. So, as
20 part of shutting down the plant we had to redo the
21 accident analyses. I alluded to earlier there are many
22 accidents that can no longer occur. There are some
23 accidents that still can occur. The ones of most
24 concern would be around the spent fuel pools more so
25 than the dry storage canisters.

1 A spent fuel pool holds 1,300 fuel assemblies,
2 the canisters hold 24 to 37 assemblies. So this is one
3 reason we are interested in emptying the pool sooner
4 rather than later in this decommissioning plan. Quite
5 frankly, it's a way to minimize risk.

6 So the scenarios we've analyzed, generally,
7 are in the spent fuel pool related to an item dropping
8 on a fuel, damaging fuel and releasing radioactivity
9 out of fuel assemblies, dropping the fuel assembly
10 itself; those are the scenarios analyzed in the
11 Emergency -- the Defuel Emergency Plan.

12 When we do those projections and then that --
13 that show that any radiologically release with this
14 older fuel not operated greater than three years would
15 not provide a Dose off-site that would challenge public
16 health and safety.

17 And then the plan also requires us to look at
18 what's called a design -- beyond-design basis accident
19 in the case of a fuel pool zirconium fire and we had to
20 show that a zirconium fire would not occur in the event
21 of a drain pool with more than 10 hours margin to add
22 water to it, and we showed 17 hours and that's a very
23 conservative analysis.

24 A more realistic analysis crediting air
25 cooling shows we never reach those temperatures. So

1 those are bounded in the NRC's 15-month review and
2 approval. We had to demonstrate that.

3 MR. STETSON: And, basically, those are the
4 scenarios that went from over 50 down to 11?

5 MR. PALMISANO: Right. And those are the scenarios
6 that are analyzed in the emergency plan and the basis
7 for the approval for the defuel plan.

8 MR. STETSON: Great. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Can I ask, the answer to this
10 question is going to be complicated so I don't know, as
11 a practical matter, how much progress we can make on
12 this tonight.

13 But perhaps Rita Conn could -- I'll ask the
14 staff at Edison to make a transcript of what you said,
15 but maybe you could just send me that, and I want to
16 share that with Kris Singh and I'd like to get a letter
17 back from Holtec so that we understand what the
18 concerns and allegations are here and I'm sure the
19 details matter a lot and they're complex.

20 And so, Kris, I want to give you the
21 opportunity to make a brief response on this question,
22 but I think we need a fuller record that won't happen
23 in the 14 minutes we have left tonight.

24 DR. SINGH: Thank you. Thank you, David.

25 Look, normally, if somebody makes such an

1 allegation, as you did, to me, I would not dignify it
2 with an answer. But being that you have asked it and
3 made the allegations in a public forum, I'm going to
4 give you direct, straight answers.

5 Holtec has never paid a penny, a single cent,
6 in fines to anybody. You cited some code, 200 or
7 whatever, I didn't really take notes, but I can tell
8 you, categorically, Holtec International has never paid
9 a dollar in fine to anybody.

10 And if you can find evidence, then I will give
11 you a check for 2 million dollars -- okay? -- the
12 amount that I'm supposed to have been fined. And, if
13 that's not true, then you should have the decency to
14 apologize. Okay?

15 The second item, you stated that somebody
16 tried to bribe us in TVA(Tennessee Valley Authority).
17 Explaining the entire circumstances, of course, it
18 would take time. Let me cut to the chase, TVA is a
19 federal entity, has its own office, OIG they call them,
20 Inspector General. The Inspector General would bar
21 Holtec from any business if we had actually given bribe
22 to anybody.

23 Holtec currently provides dry storage services
24 to all of TVA's plans, has 300 million dollars in
25 standing business with TVA. If we had engaged in any

1 behavior of the kind that you so blithely alleged, then
2 we will be banned from doing business.

3 The second two people that you quoted,
4 Landsman, from NRC, used to be an NRC employee, and
5 another employee of Exelon, Oscar Shirani, these people
6 have their own visions to make allegations.

7 The Exelon, which is our customer -- was our
8 customer, ignored them because they were absolutely
9 vacuous. They had no substance to them. They could
10 not produce any proof.

11 They were, by the way, looking for employment
12 with us, both of them, and we denied and then we got --
13 we ended up with these allegations. Nobody believed
14 them. And I suggest that you look for some
15 substantiation before you take a person's casual
16 comments and make a public allegation to --

17 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay.

18 DR. SINGH: -- to -- to blacken somebody's
19 reputation.

20 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you.

21 DR. SINGH: I don't think anybody would appreciate
22 it.

23 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much.

24 DR. SINGH: And your last comment.

25 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Very briefly, Kris.

1 DR. SINGH: Well, you -- well, now I -- yeah, you
2 said Holtec has no quality. It's wonderful to say
3 that. Holtec gets audited by different organizations
4 from around the world -- people should know this -- at
5 least five times a year. NRC, of course, audits us,
6 continuously.

7 Holtec has not been cited a violation. The
8 most recent audits occurred only a few months -- a few
9 months ago by the NRC. We get audited by NUPIC(Nuclear
10 Procurement Issues Committee), which is a utility
11 group. No one, no one has ever withdrawn a contract
12 from Holtec for lack of quality.

13 Now you take those facts and ask yourself did
14 you make a reckless allegation of all the facts here?

15 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you.

16 Let me just jump in here. Let me suggest that
17 if the responses weren't adequate, that you send me a
18 note and I will work with Holtec, and within -- within
19 the bounds of what's reasonable, and I'll canvas the
20 CEP on that issue, we'll see if additional information
21 is necessary.

22 But I thank you for your concern, but I also
23 want to thank Kris Singh for the very direct responses
24 to the questions you raised.

25 My understanding is that Dan has been over

1 some of the main topics. We can't go through every
2 single comment in that ping-pong, back and forth. But
3 I want to ask the members of the CEP before we adjourn
4 tonight whether you have other questions that you want
5 to put back to other people who have spoken tonight in
6 the comment period or other concerns that you want to
7 raise right now to fill out the conversation. Glenn
8 Pascall?

9 MR. PASCALL: The Sierra Club has been very
10 involved in the cost-sharing issues connected with the
11 premature shut down of the plant, the economic loss of
12 a 10-year premature shutdown, which is actually a
13 little more than 3 billion dollars in play right now in
14 terms of ratepayer liability.

15 And I just want to clarify, the California PUC
16 is the responsible party in that area and its president
17 got in great difficulty because of discussions. But
18 they have no role with regards to safety and, by the
19 same token, the NRC has no role with regards to
20 cost-sharing issues, and so we have to clarify that.
21 It's all important stuff. But we shouldn't
22 miss-allocate blame.

23 And I also want to say that the question has
24 arisen Edison has explicitly been charged with not
25 being worthy of trust. And I want to raise a question,

1 can that ever change? Can behaviors be shown that are
2 such that the prospect of an era has begun that might
3 merit trust?

4 And I may be exposing myself horribly here,
5 but, in my view, Tom Palmisano has won my trust. And
6 if there are great concerns that remain, I think they
7 are due to imponderable technological questions that
8 may not have been properly resolved. They were not due
9 to profit motives or irresponsibility.

10 And, to me, Tom is an example of why you've
11 got to keep the books open and create an environment
12 which trust is possible going forward regardless of
13 troubling experiences in the past.

14 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much. I think
15 this ongoing discussion about Defense in Depth and the
16 evidence that's already accumulated about Edison and
17 Holtec going above and beyond what would be required
18 from the regulatory point of view, I think this is part
19 of that process. I think that's very important.

20 Let me see if there are other comments people
21 would like to make? Ted Quinn?

22 MR. QUINN: Yeah, I'd like to -- I'd like to say I
23 thought that the meeting went very well. I appreciate
24 the speakers doing their -- their time. I'd like to
25 say that I'm disappointed that this item 7 on the

1 agenda, Mr. Chairman, the strategic approach to making
2 interim consolidated storage a reality, we didn't give
3 it enough time.

4 And I'd like to ask that in the next agenda
5 that you prepare we have more time on it. There were
6 many comments tonight in sync with this process of --
7 of general consensus. We all need to work on this. We
8 all feel this way. So if we could do that more.

9 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Right. Thank you very
10 much. I think in between now and the next meeting -- I
11 don't have that date in front of me -- Jerry Kern and I
12 are going to do some work on the Sacramento side, we're
13 going to cycle with the CEP to understand what we're
14 actually looking for in Sacramento.

15 We really need to understand what, if
16 anything, is feasible at the federal level and what we
17 should be doing. Did you want to make additional
18 comments about places we should be focusing between now
19 and the next meeting, Ted?

20 MR. QUINN: No, not really. Just other people,
21 like Per Peterson, and others that want to participate
22 in on this consensus gathering. I mean, you had them
23 come speak before. They want to come again.

24 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yeah, exactly. And I think
25 it's encouraging to see that the Bipartisan Policy

1 Commission that, that organization which co-sponsored
2 the meeting we had in January, is moving full speed
3 ahead on this question.

4 The Department of Energy now is moving. I'm
5 not sure what "full speed ahead" means for the
6 Department of Energy, but it's moving ahead on this
7 question. I think all of that is very encouraging.

8 I do want to make one comment: I'm very
9 encouraged by the number of people here tonight from
10 Laguna Beach, including Toni Iseman. And I want to --
11 I appreciate the petitions. I love to work with you
12 and understand the people who are organizing the
13 petition, to understand how we work on solutions that
14 are not just California restricted.

15 Because if we do that, we will narrow the list
16 of feasible sites to zero and that's not in our
17 interest. Whereas we have real players, real
18 jurisdictions in other states, we have real companies
19 putting money on the table that are looking at other
20 sites, so we've got to find a way to build a bigger
21 tent here or have a broader approach.

22 And so I really look forward to looking to
23 working with Laguna Beach to understand how there, in
24 San Clemente and other places where these issues have
25 arisen how we -- how we kind of grow strongly in the

1 same direction here, if I can mix up my metaphors. And
2 I'm going to stop with the metaphors there and see if
3 there are any other comments. Bob Baker?

4 MR. BAKER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. And I would like --
5 I would like to hear more about the transportation
6 aspect. Maybe it's too soon to talk about that, but I
7 would like to hear some more about that and what's
8 being done, what some of the scenarios can be.

9 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Excellent. Yeah.
10 Let's -- let's -- let's take Ted Quinn's advise that we
11 have, not just one, but several periodic meetings where
12 we continue to layer in what are we doing in terms of
13 strategic approach to consolidated storage -- storage,
14 let's make sure the transport issue is a part of that.

15 The Department of Energy Report that we expect
16 this fall should include some significant attention to
17 the transport issue because that's what we heard from
18 them when they were here. So let's see what's in that
19 report and that might be a way to start the discussion.

20 Any other comments people would like to make?

21 MS. BARTLETT: I know we want to work with some of
22 our legislators in Sacramento and we've identified,
23 Senator Monroe, Senator Pat Bates, and -- what's the
24 other one?

25 MR. KERN: Rocky Chavez.

1 MS. BARTLETT: Oh, and Rocky Chavez, yes, in the
2 assembly. And they are all republicans. The county
3 has some great lobbyists that we use up in Sacramento
4 and I think they can help us identify some folks on the
5 democratic side, just some legislators that we can
6 partner with because this has to be a Bipartisan effort
7 if we're going to get anything done up in Sacramento.
8 So, I'll take that task on.

9 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you. That would be
10 enormously helpful. Thank you very much for that.

11 Any other comments people would like to make?

12 Okay. I want to -- just before we adjourn, I
13 want to recognize Dan Stetson, who has just retired as
14 the operational head of the Ocean Institute, and much
15 to my pleasure is able to continue to serve with us on
16 the Community Engagement Panel.

17 But I want to congratulate you on retiring as
18 head of the Ocean Institute, which I gather gives you
19 more time to swim with the sharks, and I'm not sure
20 that that's a good thing or a bad thing. But thank
21 you, Dan, for all your service and I'm delighted that
22 you're able to continue working with us even in your
23 new role.

24 (Applause)

25 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And with that, let me adjourn

1 and thank all of you for spending the evening with us
2 here in Oceanside.

3

4 (Whereupon, the Community Engagement Panel
5 meeting concluded at 8:58 p.m.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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 the foregoing proceedings were taken down by me at the time and place therein set forth; that the foregoing is a true record of the proceedings and of all the comments made at the time of the proceedings.

I further certify that I am neither counsel for nor related to any party to said action, nor in any way interested in the outcome thereof.

The dismantling, unsealing, or unbinding of the original transcript will render the Reporter's certificate null and void.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name on this date, FRIDAY, AUGUST 7, 2015.



CARLOS R. HICHO
CSR NO. 13111