

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, November 5, 2015, from 6:00-9:00 p.m. PDT in Oceanside, California

Meeting Minutes and Action Items

1) Community Engagement Panel (CEP) Member Attendance

- a) Present: Dr. David Victor (CEP Chairman/University of California, San Diego), Hon. Tim Brown (CEP Vice Chairman/San Clemente City Council), Hon. John Alpay (President, Capistrano Unified School District Board of Trustees), Donna Boston (Orange County Sheriff's Department), Ted Quinn (American Nuclear Society), Garry Brown (Orange County Coastkeeper), Hon. Jerome "Jerry" M. Kern (Oceanside City Council), Dr. William Parker (University of California, Irvine), Tom Caughlan (Camp Pendleton), Hon. Carlos Olvera (Mayor, Dana Point), Glenn Pascall (Sierra Club), Hon. Pam Patterson (Mayor Pro Tem, San Juan Capistrano)
- b) Absent: Dan Stetson (CEP Secretary/Ocean Institute), Hon. Lisa Bartlett (Supervisor, Orange County, 5th District), Valentine "Val" Macedo (Laborers' International Union of North America, Local 89), Hon. Bill Horn (Supervisor, San Diego County), Jim Leach (South Orange County Economic Coalition), Rich Haydon (California State Parks)
- c) Guests: Dustin Schrader (Public Policy Manager, Beacon Economics)
- d) Southern California Edison (SCE) Representative: Tom Palmisano (VP of Decommissioning and Chief Nuclear Officer)

2) Meeting Convened by Chairman David Victor at 6:10 p.m.:

- a) Chairman David Victor opened the meeting by reiterating that the role of the CEP is not a decision making body, but is designed as a communication conduit between the local communities and SCE, as well as a forum to educate the public on the decommissioning process.
- b) SCE has set up an education fair, staffed by SCE personnel, that includes a number of interesting booths; the education fair will be open during the 10-minute break.
- c) Tonight's principal focus is on the Economic Impact of the Decommissioning Project. Tom Palmisano will provide an update on the progress being made on the project. Making consolidated interim storage a reality will be discussed.
- d) The presentation from tonight can be found on SONGScommunity.com, as well as live streaming, and links for signing up for public walking tours. The next tour is scheduled for Saturday, December 12.
- e) A structured public comment period will follow the presentations. Comments may be submitted prior to the meetings on nuccomm@songs.sce.com within 5 business days of the meeting.

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

- a) SONGS principles are safety, stewardship, and engagement (including transparency and an open dialogue).
- b) Decommissioning Update:
 1. Tom Palmisano provided a review of the 20-Year Decommissioning Plan which included a variety of topics related to current decommissioning, site activities, Emergency Plan Funding and Trust Fund Status. Permanently Defueled Technical Specifications have been approved. The Defueled Emergency Plan has been approved and is in place. The Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (ISFSI) project is underway. Holtec was selected a year ago and the California Coastal Commission approved the permit to put in Holtec systems. Work is prepared to start once the permit is issued. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) documents unique to decommissioning, the Decommissioning Cost Estimate (DCE), the Irradiated Fuel Management Plan (IFMP), and the Post-Shutdown Decommissioning Activities Report (PSDAR), have been submitted and accepted by the NRC.

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, November 5, 2015, from 6:00-9:00 p.m. PDT in Oceanside, California

Meeting Minutes and Action Items

2. Tom Palmisano provided the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Submittal Status. Remaining approvals include a) the License Amendment Request for Spent Fuel Pool cooling System, forecast for March 2016, b) the Records Retention Exemption Request Submittal, expected in August 2016, c) the Insurance Exemption Request Submittal, expected in September 2016, and d) the Insurance Exemption (onsite) Request Submittal, expected in October 2016.
3. Cold & Dark:
 1. Cold & Dark (C&D) means de-energizing the plant and draining and isolating plant systems not required for shutdown condition. Cold & Dark removes remaining hazards from the plant, places the plant in a safe condition for non-operating configuration, and prepares the plant for its eventual safe decommissioning while protecting the used fuel.
 2. All permitting is approved and all major equipment is on-site. Cold & Dark will be complete in the 2nd quarter, 2016.
4. ISFSI Offload – Fuel Readiness for Transportation
 1. Timeline of current loaded and future loaded canisters 2015-2030.
 - (a) Some fuel is qualified for transport now, other fuel qualifies over time and full transfer is estimated at 10 years.
 - (i) Units 2&3 Dry – 33 AREVA Canisters are licensed for storage and transport. Unit 1 Dry – 17 Canisters are licensed for storage and transport, but the older design takes longer for the fuel to cool. The first half of the 17 will not be eligible to ship until 2018 and the second half will be eligible by 2028-2030.
 - (ii) Units 2&3 Wet – 73 Canisters will be loaded in the new Holtec system, are currently licensed for storage and will be eligible to ship by 2020. The transport license has been submitted to the NRC for approval.
 - (b) Ted Quinn raised a question regarding environmental permitting, and commented on the amount of activities involved and stressed their importance.
 - (i) Tom Palmisano stated that environmental permitting is being done by Edison on behalf of the Co-participants. Tom added that permitting is one of the focus topics and he plans to devote a CEP meeting to permitting. California environmental permitting is governed by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), estimated as an 18-24 month process, and will be addressed early so the panel and the public understand what is to come.
 - (c) Tom Palmisano stated that of the Units 2&3 canisters, 14 could be moved today, the remaining in 2020. If a facility opened tomorrow SCE would request AREVA to redesign the canister, perform analysis, and attempt to relicense the transport cask to move fuel sooner, but this all must be approved. Mr. Palmisano also stated that if a facility was to open tomorrow it would take about ten years to move all of the fuel off-site. That is based on talking to the Department of Energy (DOE) and vendors and depending upon how many transport canisters and trains are available. If something were to open tomorrow and more equipment and trains were available, we could possibly reduce that time. This is why our dialogue continues to advocate for action at the federal level.
 - (d) Hon. Jerry Kern voiced concerns over costs to relicense canisters.
 - (e) Tom Palmisano reiterated that most fuel would be ready to transport by the time a site opens.

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, November 5, 2015, from 6:00-9:00 p.m. PDT in Oceanside, California

Meeting Minutes and Action Items

5. Environmental Permitting
 1. California Coastal Commission milestones were presented.
 2. California Environmental Quality Act and status on the State Lands Commission application were provided.
 3. Tom Palmisano – stated that the Scripps Seismic Study is expected to be complete by mid-2016.
 4. Chairman David Victor suggested getting that report circulated to the panel and to provide a briefing of conclusions with the panel.
6. Decommissioning Cost Estimate
 1. Tom Palmisano provided a breakdown of the Decommissioning Cost Estimate (DCE).
7. Trust Fund and Regulatory Oversight
 1. Regulatory Oversight of Decommissioning Trusts
 - (a) CPUC regulates all spending from the Nuclear Decommissioning Trusts, including review, approval and reasonableness. Also oversees trust fund management.
 - (b) NRC regulates all radiological decommissioning and spent fuel management.
 - (c) Unused funds will be returned to ratepayers.
 2. Tom Palmisano explained that by federal law, the Department of Energy (DOE) takes title and liability for the waste removed from the site. By law, the DOE is currently not authorized to set up an interim facility. Federal law has to be changed.
 3. Chairman David Victor discussed consolidated interim storage as a window of opportunity and having title transferred to DOE.
 4. Garry Brown requested clarification regarding trust fund of \$4.4 billion by ratepayers for spent fuel transfers, and does this include construction of an interim storage facility.
 - (a) Tom Palmisano responded that the funding is for onsite. It does not include building interim storage in Texas or New Mexico. Tom discussed what SCE has been able to do to recover money for customers. All the money spent for the Dry Fuel Storage for current and future is regained by suing the DOE. All of the utilities are suing the DOE. SCE was awarded close to \$100 million dollars and refunded the customers. Our 2nd lawsuit is in progress. Money spent on the customers' behalf will be recovered in this process.
8. Emergency Planning Funding
 1. Tom Palmisano discussed entering a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for a 7-year term with 2-year glide-down, which was fully approved by 10/30/2015 and effective retroactively to 7/1/2015.
9. Transmission System Upgrade
 1. Tom Palmisano discussed the SDG&E Synchronous Condensers project, which are required due to SONGS retirement, planned retirements of coastal power plants, and the increase in renewable energy. The directive by the California Independent System Operator (CAISO) is for grid stability and voltage support. The machines inject/absorb reactive power. There are a total of 8 units in 5 locations. Tom stated that the site activity is not related to decommissioning, and provided milestones for the San Onofre switchyard location.
 2. Hon. Tim Brown asked for locations of other synchronous condensers.

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel
REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, November 5, 2015, from 6:00-9:00 p.m. PDT in Oceanside, California
Meeting Minutes and Action Items

- (a) Brad Carter, (SDG&E) provided locations; 1 in Talega, 2 in San Luis Rey substation, 2 in the Miguel substation, 1 at San Onofre, and SCE is placing 1 in the Santiago substation.
- 3. Tom Palmisano – reiterated that the switchyard and transmission lines will remain in place as they provide an important interconnection between the SDG&E and SCE systems.
- 10. 2016 CEP Curriculum Preferred Topics
 - 1. Tom Palmisano and the panel members discussed topics for the 2016 CEP Curriculum.
 - 2. Manuel Camargo will send CEP members an e-mail request for future topics.
 - 3. Tom Caughlan provided information regarding the Navy’s Southwest Engineering Facilities Command (the Commercial Real Estate Operator for all of the installations around the world) regarding land use.
 - 4. Chairman David Victor suggested that some constructive dialogue with the Navy would be helpful and asked Tom Caughlan to convey the message, with the right engagement/format to be determined.
 - 5. Tom Caughlan took the action to speak with the Navy.
 - 6. Tom Palmisano reminded the panel that the SONGScommunity.com website provides the ability for the public to provide topics for a more detailed discussion.
- 11. Public Meetings:
 - 1. Tom Palmisano provided a description and timing of upcoming public meetings.

4) San Onofre Economic Impact Study – Tom Palmisano

- a) Purpose of Analysis - SCE contracted Beacon Economics, LLC. to perform the study
 - 1. Local interest in decommissioning jobs
 - 2. Project jobs/“trade work” going to localized labor
 - 3. Quantify near term economic output
- b) Background - Output during operations
 - 1. Estimated at \$3.3 billion/year in California (in 2010)
 - 2. Higher employment and more “permanent” jobs
 - 3. Average of 500 contract employees
 - 4. San Onofre Staffing
 - 1. Phase – During Operation:
 - (a) \$775 million Average Annual Budget
 - (b) 2,200 Core Staffing
 - (c) \$410 million Staffing Budget
 - 2. Phase – Decommissioning:
 - (a) \$242 million Average Annual Budget
 - (b) 375 Core Staffing
 - (c) \$80 million Staffing Budget
- c) Decommissioning Output
 - 1. Estimated at \$293 million/year in California (~1/10th of operating output)
 - 2. Lower employment and more temporary jobs
 - 3. Current average 100 contract employees
 - 1. Phase – During Operation:
 - (a) \$775 million Average Annual Budget

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, November 5, 2015, from 6:00-9:00 p.m. PDT in Oceanside, California

Meeting Minutes and Action Items

- (b) 2,200 Core Staffing
- (c) \$410 million Staffing Budget
- 2. Phase – Decommissioning:
 - (a) \$242 million Average Annual Budget
 - (b) 375 Core Staffing
 - (c) \$80 million Staffing Budget
- d) Introduction of Dustin Schrader, Beacon Economics, LLC
 - 1. Retained Beacon Economics
 - 2. Focus of study – Major work from 2013 to 2026
 - 3. Assessed primary impacts:
 - 1. Employment – jobs for region’s residents
 - 2. Output – goods and services
 - 3. Tax revenues – state and local
 - 4. Boost to economic activity

5) Economic Impact Analysis SONGS Decommissioning Project – Dustin Schrader (Public Policy Manager, Beacon Economics, LLC.)

- (a) Overview:
 - 2. Economic Impact Study:
 - 1. \$3.2 billion spend
 - 2. Major work phase from 2013 - 2026
 - 3. 2 primary sources of impact
 - 4. De-construction project and effects on regional growth
 - (ii) Benefits:
 - 1. Employment - jobs for region’s residents
 - 2. Economic output – demand for goods and services
 - 3. State and local tax revenues
 - 4. Boost to economic activity in the region of focus
- (b) Types of Economic Impact
 - (i) Direct Impact – (Business to business spending)
 - 1. Expenditures to dismantle the nuclear generation station (e.g. de-construction)
 - 2. Provides jobs for city and county residents
 - (ii) Indirect Impact
 - 1. Purchase of building materials
 - 2. New real estate
 - (iii) Induced Economic Impact
 - 1. Worker spending
 - 2. Tax revenues (Sales tax on goods purchased)
- (c) Overview of IMPLAN
 - (i) Used to estimate a project’s economic impact on a particular geography
 - (ii) Typically constructed at the county level
 - 1. This analysis was done at county, state, and U.S. level
 - (iii) Based on multipliers
 - 1. \$X invested in the local economy
 - 2. Generates \$Y in output and Z jobs

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, November 5, 2015, from 6:00-9:00 p.m. PDT in Oceanside, California

Meeting Minutes and Action Items

- (d) IMPLAN Multipliers
 - (i) Multipliers vary by industry and geography
 - 1. California vs. San Bernardino County -Example
 - 1. California has larger multipliers. Why?
 - 2. Leakage into other regions
 - 2. Example: PC manufacturing in San Bernardino County
 - 1. Requires silicon chips as major input
 - 2. County is not major chip manufacturing area
 - 3. PC manufacturer has to buy chips from another county
 - 4. PC purchases do not impact SB County (“leak out”) – represents spending that leaks out of the region
 - 3. General rule of thumb
 - 1. Larger geography = less leakage
 - 2. More diverse local economy = less leakage
- (e) Project Expenditures by Category were provided
- (f) Expenditures by Major Group
 - (i) Project Spending
 - 1. 31% - Waste Management Remediation
 - 2. 22% - Energy
 - 3. 20% - Construction (Hard Costs)
 - 4. 27% - Other Costs (e.g., Architecture)
- (g) Note on Impacts
 - (i) Jobs aren’t permanent; most will end when the project is finished (i.e., spending stops)
 - (ii) Output reflects revenues or business opportunities for local vendors in each geographical region, not for SONGS partners
 - (iii) Labor income isn’t only for SONGS workers
- (h) A Summary of Economic Impacts by region for 2013-2026 was provided
- (i) Secondary Impacts – Two Examples
 - (i) \$1.9 billion in California output through secondary effects alone
 - 1. Real Estate (6th highest tot. output)
 - 1. \$5.3 mil direct; \$53.9 mil indirect; \$55.7 mil induced
 - 2. Petroleum Refineries (7th highest tot. output)
 - 1. \$0 direct; \$84.1 mil indirect; \$11.1 mil induced
 - (ii) Companies almost always need to increase energy consumption and expand facilities in response to a big increase in business activity
- (j) California Fiscal Impacts
 - (i) \$185.0 million in state and local tax revenue generated across California
 - (ii) Major sources:
 - 1. Sales tax: \$45.5 million
 - (a) Personal income tax: \$44.2 million
 - (b) Business property tax: \$36.2 million
 - i. Increase in income generates state tax revenue, while increase in spending generates local tax revenue
- (k) Orange County Impacts
 - (i) Orange County will see the largest output impacts of any county

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, November 5, 2015, from 6:00-9:00 p.m. PDT in Oceanside, California

Meeting Minutes and Action Items

1. Driven by largest direct spending in any county (\$293.1 mil)
- (ii) Major sectors impacted:
 1. Utilities (\$229.0 mil)
 2. Waste/Remediation (\$152.4 mil)
 3. Arch./Engineering (\$151.1 mil)
- (iii) More jobs supported in Investigation/Security than any other sector (1,739; 1,711 dir)
- (iv) Food Services (175), Real Estate (161) benefit from secondary job impact
- (l) San Diego County Impacts
 - (i) SD County will see the largest employment impacts of any county
 - (ii) Less labor income but more jobs than Orange County. Why?
 1. High-wage vs. low-wage jobs
 2. Orange County spending will support more workers in high-wage sectors (Arch./Engineering, Utilities)
- (m) Real Estate Impacts
 - (i) Some studies claim removal of nuclear facilities increases nearby home values
 1. Roughly 6.4%, homes < 10 miles from site
 - (ii) 3 cities in S. Orange County within range
 1. Dana Point, San Clemente, San Juan Capistrano
 - (iii) Assume 6.4% increase in assessed valuation
 1. Over long-run; short-run limited by Prop 13
 - (iv) Assume 20% of prop. tax revenue goes to 3 cities
 1. Dana Point: ~\$900,000
 2. San Clemente: ~\$1.3 million
 3. San Juan Capistrano: ~\$600,000
- (n) Key Findings
 - (i) \$9 billion in output in U.S.
 1. \$4.1 billion in output in California, with \$1.9 billion through secondary effects
 - (ii) Much of the economic activity will come in Southern California
 1. Orange County: ~6,300 jobs, \$1.2 billion output, \$436 mil labor income
 2. San Diego County: ~6,600 jobs, \$1.2 bil output, \$409 mil labor income
 - (iii) \$185 million in state and local tax revenue in California
- (o) Questions from the panel:
 - (i) Dr. William Parker asked about the total impact of the decommissioning of SONGS, the net impact and lost revenue, i.e., the sum of what is lost vs. what is gained.
 - (ii) Dustin Schrader responded by referencing the information in Tom Palmisano's earlier slides.
 - (iii) Chairman David Victor requested that Beacon Economics present a simple "Present Discount of Value" (PDV) calculation with the multiplier Tom used of the flow of benefits expected over the lifetime of the plant compared with discounted value of the lifetime of decommissioning – a discount flow analysis.
 1. Tom Palmisano took the action to review SCE's previous information and Beacon's information with economists and financial people to come up with that analysis.
 - (iv) Tim Brown raised questions about real estate impacts and architectural and engineering (A&E) soft work.
 1. Tom Palmisano explained decommissioning is deconstructing with less need for engineering and requires more trade labor. The Decommissioning General Contractor will be using local union labor. A&E can be done on-site or offsite. The plant will be

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, November 5, 2015, from 6:00-9:00 p.m. PDT in Oceanside, California

Meeting Minutes and Action Items

dismantled and the waste shipped away. Tom suggested the need to discuss what the local effects looks like in the future. The DGC is expected to be announced in May 2016 and will be discussed at a future CEP meeting.

- (v) Chairman David Victor requested to meet the awarded contractor once announced, perhaps 4th quarter time frame.
- (vi) Ted Quinn – Asked about supply chains and local equipment, if Edison has a “buy local” policy, and about the use of local goods and services in Edison’s term and conditions.
 - 1. Tom Palmisano explained that the study did not go into such detail and when the DGC is selected more information will be available. SCE does have a “buy local” policy. Tom also stated that that labor expectations were being discussed but he would have to look into local goods and services. Tom re-iterated that current vendors are using locals and former employees with their knowledge of the plant which helps the vendors. To view or download this presentation or for further information, visit www.SONGScommunity.com.

6) Making Consolidated Interim Storage a Reality

- a) Speakers Chairman David Victor, Tim Brown Jerry Kern, and Garry Brown discussed making Consolidated Interim Storage (CIS) a reality. Topics included common goals, private CIS as a promising option, key elements for advancing CIS, building support with local, state and federal officials, new federal legislation, logistical priorities for transportation, and public interest.
- b) Comments by panel members;
 - 1. Jerry Kern discussed House Bill 3643 went to committee, having the Department of Energy’s take taking control of CIS is the goal, what the state can do, and transportation.
 - 2. Tim Brown discussed the local community perspective, acting now to align everything, and the waste should be moved as soon as possible.
 - 3. Garry Brown discussed the ultimate solution is not to have the fuel stored on site, but the need for federal support and legislation. Garry also discussed a testimony given before congress by Geoffrey H. Fettus, Sr. Project Attorney for the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) – “All Things Nuclear,” regarding Yucca Mountain. He discussed concerns regarding CIS becoming long term repositories and suggested the CIS pilot program and the need to fix the federal repository resting place, adding that the Federal repository is fixable and the Nuclear Waste Policy Act needs to be amended. Garry will forward an electronic copy of the testimony to Manuel Camargo.
 - 4. Pam Patterson discussed the lack of long term planning similar to the states drought planning, the no fly zone, the earthquake zone, safety, emergency planning, evacuation plans, the NRC, the CPUC, and an independent 3rd party emergency plan.
 - a. Chairman David Victor discussed the importance of emergency planning and will share the emergency planning briefing information previously discussed, including the evacuation plan with Pam Patterson.

7) Chairman David Victor Facilitated the Public Comment Period

- a) Public Comments made by the following:
 - 1. Donna Gilmore, San Onofre Safety - California Coastal Permit & Canister Integrity
 - 2. Roger Johnson – National Academy of Science Cancer Study
 - 3. Rob Howard, Business Manager Representing Local 246 - Local Contractors

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, November 5, 2015, from 6:00-9:00 p.m. PDT in Oceanside, California

Meeting Minutes and Action Items

4. Ray Lutz, Citizens of Oversight – Nuclear Storage Facility/Dry Cask Storage
 5. Jenifer Massey – Consolidated Interim Storage
 6. Richard Gargner – Utilize the turbine buildings for desalination
 7. Marni Magda – Public Awareness for Consolidated Interim Storage
 8. Marilyn Fuss, Los Angeles – Dry Cask Storage/Canisters
 9. Daryl Gale, Los Angeles resident – Environmental Concerns
 10. Richard McPherson – Benefits of Radiation
 11. Daniel Dominguez, VP of the Utility Workers of America – Effects of working at San Onofre
- b) Panel members addressed public comment issues
1. Tim Brown provided highlights from the public comments for discussion by panel members.
 2. Chairman David Victor addressed the California Coastal Commission information not being available on the website, by reiterating that the Coastal Commission has a mechanism to reach out to the public regarding meetings. He also said he would share the California Coastal Commission's approvals plus conditions with the panel.
 3. Ted Quinn provided his views regarding the National Academy of Science Cancer Study. The best scientists are advising the NRC regarding a new study with a different set of methods that goes to the cellular level. Ted Quinn supports additional research in nuclear medicine and will write a letter to the NRC and DOE to support better technology efforts and research for a more fact-based process. He also offered to meet with Mr. Johnson to discuss the issue.
 - i. Chairman David Victor suggested individual CEP members should work bi-laterally with Mr. Roger Johnson if they want to sign the petition.
 4. Tom Palmisano discussed the use of organized labor in the decommissioning process. Tom will add the topic to the agenda, and provide notice on meetings to organized labor, as well as advertise earlier and more clearly.
 5. Tom Palmisano responded to the public comment suggestion regarding delaying of the permanent construction the ISFSI project to wait for newer technology. Tom Palmisano will discuss the basis for the decision and strategy regarding the ISFSI vs. Spent Fuel Pool Storage as a future topic.
 6. Tim Brown and Tom Palmisano discussed the Effects of El Nino on decommissioning and spent fuel storage. Tom Palmisano discussed plant seasonal readiness as a routine function at the plant, and the ongoing preparations for the El Nino season at San Onofre.
 7. Chairman David Victor discussed Public Awareness regarding spent fuel storage, continuing the process of talking to as many groups as possible, continuing efforts at the federal, local, and regional levels and having an updated timeline by the next meeting. He also discussed the need to demonstrate conspicuous concern to elected representatives in Washington and Sacramento and to follow-up as the message gathers steam. There may be hearings in the spring regarding ISO legislation and to try to injecting ourselves (panel members) into future hearings to give testimony.
 8. Tim Brown discussed the fact these are serious issues, listening to the public and constituents and the direction the panel has been given. He is encouraged about these important issues and the direction the panel is going.

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, November 5, 2015, from 6:00-9:00 p.m. PDT in Oceanside, California

Meeting Minutes and Action Items

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

	Action Item Description	Comments
1	Scripps Seismic Study – Obtain accurate completion date, distribute report to CEP members, and schedule Dr. Driscoll of UCSD to provide a briefing to the panel	
2	Manuel Camargo will send CEP members request for future topics for 2016	
3	Tom Caughlan will convey to Navy the CEP’s request for briefing/engagement with panel, the type/ format to be determined	
4	Tom Palmisano to review SCE’s previous information and Beacon’s information with economists and financial people to come up with that analysis	David Victor suggested SCE/Beacon Economics provide Present Discount of Value (PDV) analysis. The expected life of plant vs. life of decommissioning, i.e., net impact
5	Present awarded DGC at future CEP meeting	Planned for 4 th Quarter 2016
6	Tom to identify “buy local” procurement strategy related to goods and services	
7	Garry Brown will forward an electronic copy of the Geoffrey Fettus testimony to Manuel Camargo	
8	Chairman David Victor will share previous Emergency Planning briefings and evacuation plan information w/ Pam Patterson	
9	The topic of union and organized labor will be added to a future CEP meeting agenda; SCE will provide notice on meetings to organized labor, advertise earlier and more clearly	
10	Tom Palmisano will address the basis for the decision and strategy/timeline regarding ISFSI vs. Spent Fuel Pool Storage	
11	Chairman David Victor will have an updated timeline regarding fuel storage discussions with a variety of groups by the next meeting	