



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

Community Engagement Panel Public Meeting

Transcript of Proceedings

Date: 11/05/2015

Job #: 598481

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, NOVEMBER 5, 2015

Reported by:
CARLOS R. HICHO
CSR No. 13111
Job No. 598481

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 6:08 P.M.,
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 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
(Not present)

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

9 DONNA BOSTON
10 ORANGE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

11 DR. WILLIAM PARKER
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE

12 JOHN ALPAY
13 CAPISTRANO UNIFIED SCHOOL BOARD

14 GLENN PASCALL
SIERRA CLUB

15 CARLOS OLVERA
16 MAYOR DANA POINT

17 TOM CAUGHLAN
CAMP PENDLETON

18 JIM LEACH
19 SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY ECONOMIC COALITION
(Not present)

20 PAM PATTERSON
21 SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO
MAYOR PRO TEM

22 TED QUINN

23 GARRY BROWN
24 ORANGE COUNTY COASTKEEPER

25 (Continued.)

1 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

2 TIM BROWN
3 SAN CLEMENTE MAYOR

4 BILL HORN
5 SAN DIEGO COUNTY SUPERVISOR
6 (Not present)

7 VAL MACEDO
8 LOCAL 89 SAN DIEGO
9 (Not present)

10 GUEST PRESENT:

11 DUSTIN SCHRADER
12 BEACON ECONOMICS POLICY MANAGER

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2015

2 OCEANSIDE, CALIFORNIA

3 6:08 P.M.

4 * * *

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

6 Who wants their photograph taken by the very
7 eager photographer here?

8 Thank you for joining us at the, I think, last
9 regular meeting of the Community Engagement Panel this
10 year. My name is David Victor. I'm Chairman of the
11 Community Engagement Panel. We'll be joined in just a
12 moment by Tim Brown, who is stuck in traffic; and Dan
13 Stetson, unfort -- secretary of the CEP, is
14 unfortunately out of the country today and unable to
15 join us.

16 We have a very busy agenda for you tonight,
17 focused principally on the economic impact of
18 decommissioning. We'll also be talking about some
19 other related issues, including Consolidated Interim
20 Storage.

21 Let me make a few opening remarks and
22 reminders: If there is an emergency, assess the
23 situation and then exit when it's safe either through
24 the doors you came in over there (indicating). If
25 those doors, for some reason, are blocked, there's an

1 exit behind this curtain here (indicating), so we pull
2 the curtain aside and the exit is magically revealed.

3 We have two officers from Oceanside Police
4 Department in attendance for your safety. If there's
5 anything we can do to help you, please, please do let
6 me know.

7 I want to remind everybody: The Community
8 Engagement Panel is designed as a conduit between the
9 communities affected by the plant and its
10 decommissioning and the co-owners of the plant, notably
11 Edison, which is operating the plant.

12 We're in a -- we're a body that deliberates
13 about things, helps Edison understand what the
14 communities care about and vice versa. We're not a
15 decision-making body.

16 Tonight's meeting, like all prior meetings, is
17 being livestreamed to the world on SONGScommunity.com.
18 You will find all the meeting materials and agenda on
19 that site as well. You will find, as soon as it is
20 presented tonight, the Economic Impact of
21 Decommissioning Study, the actual study will be posted
22 there as well.

23 You should find on your chair a hard copy of
24 the agenda as well as any slides that will be hard to
25 see. So, there is one slide in particular we've blown

1 up. And you can finally go to SONGScommunity.com and
2 sign up for tours of the site. The next tour is
3 December 12, it's a Saturday, 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

4 I want to welcome our guest, one of our guest
5 speakers, Dustin Schrader, who is the policy manager
6 from Beacon Economics. Dustin is down here, to my
7 right.

8 Dustin, welcome. We look forward to hearing
9 what you have to say later in the evening.

10 Edison has been doing many kinds of outreach
11 activities related to decommissioning and part of that
12 includes these booths, which are very informative.
13 They have now a model of the Holtec canister and
14 containment facility.

15 So, I urge you, during the break, to go over
16 and take a look there. There is a suit that looks
17 frankly like something out of Halloween, which is a
18 radiation protection suit, and a variety of other
19 things, to give you some sense of what's happening on
20 the site and a lot of materials there. And those
21 booths will remain staffed during our ten-minute break.

22 Public comment break, tonight:

23 As always, if you want to make a public
24 comment, you can sign up for that at the table that's
25 next to the door that you came in and indicate ideally

1 the topic that you want to talk about.

2 Tim Brown, when we get to that stage, will
3 help me keep track of the different comments and then
4 we'll have an opportunity at the end of the public
5 comment period to talk about action items.

6 If you want to submit a comment and don't have
7 an opportunity tonight or you want to submit a longer
8 comment than the three minutes allowed, just send a
9 comment to the nucomm@SONGS.sce.com. The address is up
10 on the screen here.

11 And if you send those in within five business
12 days of the CEP meeting, we'll make sure they're part
13 of the public record of the meeting and, also, the
14 action items that arise from the meeting and responses
15 to questions that arise from the meeting that that --
16 that those are included.

17 And, along the way, I'll be calling out action
18 items to -- to be captured for the public record and to
19 make sure that, where possible, questions that are
20 raised are addressed and answered and so on.

21 Let's turn now to our agenda:

22 First on the agenda tonight -- let me first
23 see if there are any questions or comments from members
24 of the Panel.

25 I'm not seeing anything right now.

1 First up is the update, decommissioning
2 update, which is a tradition in our meeting. And Tom
3 Palmisano is delightful to welcome you back.

4 Tom, the floor is yours.

5 MR. PALMISANO: Okay. Thank you.

6 I will step over here so it's easier to speak
7 to the Panel and the public.

8 What I have tonight is an update on a variety
9 of topics related to the decom -- the current
10 decommissioning status and current site activities and
11 also bringing back some topics, for example, like
12 status on Emergency Plan funding and trust fund status.

13 So, in my decommissioning update, on a regular
14 basis, we'll keep you updated on what's going on up
15 on -- what is going on on-site as well as some topics
16 the Panel has discussed.

17 So with that, our decommissioning principles:

18 Safety, Stewardship, and Engagement. This is
19 a bit hard to see visually. There are hard copies
20 we've provided that are hopefully more readable.

21 I want to narrate a couple of things. You
22 can't really see it well on the screen. If you look at
23 your handout, the four activities on the upper left we
24 told you we'd talk about, physical changes to the
25 plant, to configure the plant for the start of

1 decommissioning.

2 So, on a couple of slides, I'll talk about
3 things like the Cold and Dark Modification. But this
4 is the reactors have been permanently de-fueled, many
5 of the systems have been drained and retired, the
6 hazard has been removed from the site.

7 This work is now on track, to complete with
8 all systems retired in the plant Cold and Dark at the
9 end of the first/early second quarter of 2016. So that
10 work is underway and I'll show you a little more in a
11 minute.

12 These activities, in the center, are really
13 NRC changes. The permanently de-fueled technical
14 specs -- specifications, which are part of our license,
15 most importantly is probably the Emergency Plan, which
16 has now been approved and changed. We now have the
17 De-Fueled Emergency Plan in place and I'll talk more
18 about the funding related to that.

19 The acronym ISFSI, the Independent Spent Fuel
20 Storage Installation, or dry cask storage, this project
21 is underway. We have selected Holtec a year ago.
22 We've recently been through the Coastal Commission
23 Hearing where they approved the permit to put in the
24 Holtec System, so that work is being prepared to start
25 when the permit is actually issued.

1 Down here is other NRC documents that are
2 unique to decommissioning: The Decommissioning Cost
3 Estimate, the Irradiated Fuel Management Plan, the
4 Post-Shutdown Decommissioning Activities Report;
5 they've all been accepted by the NRC and are in place
6 now.

7 A couple of key activities down here,
8 particularly CEQA permitting: CEQA, California
9 Environmental Quality Act, we'll talk a little more.

10 But the next step at the permitting level
11 we're through most of the initial NRC approvals, now we
12 shift to the state level: California Coastal
13 Commission, California State Lands Commission, which is
14 where we'll pick up the California Environmental
15 Quality Act we've used.

16 So, as you look at where we are in the fourth
17 quarter of 2015, a lot of the activities focus on
18 California permitting, preparing to expand the ISFSI
19 and continuing to complete the activities to take the
20 plant to a Cold and Dark condition.

21 Let me go to the next slide.

22 So, NRC license status: Again, in your
23 handout, you can see this more clearly. Everything
24 shaded up here is now complete and approved or
25 accepted, down through the Emergency Plan, the tech

1 specs, cyber security requirements, have been changed
2 to reflect a decommissioning condition.

3 We're now looking -- working on a license
4 amendment related to the permanent spent fuel pool
5 cooling system. I expect to have that approved in
6 March; then we have some exemption request in from
7 operating plant requirements related to records and
8 insurance. So these are typically approved for
9 decommissioning plants and I expect the latter half of
10 2016 the NRC will approve those exemptions.

11 Now shifting over to more detail project
12 update: Cold and Dark, as a mentioned, on the big
13 20-year time line, the activity is to really complete,
14 preparing the plant for decommissioning, removing
15 remaining hazards, a good bit of this is done.

16 On the next slide, we'll talk about all the
17 permitting is now approved for that, the major
18 equipment is on site. We started construction in April
19 of this year. We're roughly 35 to 40 percent complete
20 today. We're going to complete at the end of the first
21 quarter in 2016; and the second quarter of 2016, we'll
22 be done configuring the plant, awaiting the California
23 permitting for the start of decommissioning itself.

24 This is a new slide, and I want to take a few
25 minutes. We had a lot of discussion recently about the

1 ability to ship fuel outside. One of the things we're
2 going to talk about later on in the agenda is work that
3 the Panel is urging to be done on Consolidated Interim
4 Storage.

5 So I wanted to come here and explain factually
6 where we are with the current loaded canisters and with
7 the future canisters. So starting at the top, at the
8 very top, this is 2015 now through 2030, so that shows
9 you a time line. Okay?

10 We currently have 50 canisters loaded with
11 spent fuel. These are the AREVA NUHOMS canisters.
12 This is the old Unit 1 fuel, which has been permanently
13 retired, partially decommissioned, all the fuel is in
14 the canisters. And this is 33 canisters with Unit 2
15 and 3 fuel that we have moved out over the years during
16 operation. Okay?

17 So that's our 50 canisters. All these
18 canisters are licensed for storage and transport. And
19 the transport casks are licensed today, the license is
20 held by AREVA. So for the 33 canisters that hold the
21 Unit 2 and 3 fuel, some of those canisters are eligible
22 for shipment today; they've met the appropriate cooling
23 time requirements, the rest will be eligible by 2019.

24 Okay. And I can go into more detail, like a
25 breakdown of actually all the 33 canisters. But these

1 are the AREVA 24PT4 canisters. And I don't want you to
2 get hung up on the numbers. We'll be glad to provide
3 this.

4 But these canisters are eligible to ship, some
5 of them starting today, all of them by 2019. The --
6 the transport cask is licensed today. The dilemma is
7 there's no place to ship it to. But I wanted to make
8 sure everybody on the Panel and everybody understood
9 what our current situation is.

10 Unit 1 is a little different story: Unit 1 is
11 older fuel. It's a different cladding material. It's
12 stainless steel, not Zircaloy, and it's an earlier
13 design canister and the fuel actually has to cool
14 longer.

15 So the Unit 1 fuel will not be eligible to
16 ship until 2018 for the first of the 17 canisters and
17 the last of the 17 canisters are not eligible until the
18 2028 to 2030 time frame.

19 And that cask is currently licensed to ship
20 and the transport cask is licensed, but it's a
21 different design. It's an earlier design than Unit 2
22 and 3 canister and transport cask.

23 So of the 50 loaded canisters, that's when
24 they will be eligible to ship. And, again, I can give
25 you specific breakdowns within that time line.

1 There is approximately 73 canisters we will
2 load in the new system. All that fuel is in wet
3 storage today, in a spent fuel pool, and those
4 canisters are licensed for storage today. The
5 transport cask, the license has been submitted by
6 Holtec to the NRC and the license review is in
7 progress, expected to take one to two more years.

8 The way Holtec has proposed, if the NRC
9 approves it as proposed, those canisters will all be
10 eligible to ship in 2020. It's a newer design, heavier
11 shield into the transport canister, so that's the
12 current plan.

13 I'll keep you updated as the NRC goes through
14 the licensing process because that's a preliminary
15 estimate until the NRC actually license the transport
16 canister. So that's a picture today on where we stand
17 on the ability to ship fuel in the current canisters.

18 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Can I just pause for a
19 second? I think this issue of the timing is very
20 important. I just want to see if there are questions
21 from the panel about this.

22 Ted Quinn?

23 MR. QUINN: Well -- yeah, this is Ted Quinn.

24 Can you hear me? Yeah.

25 The question I have is related to the -- it's

1 two questions: First, is the permitting being done by
2 Edison? Or you have -- you have done this? How is
3 that working on permitting?

4 MR. PALMISANO: Are you saying -- are you talking
5 about the environmental permit or are you talking about
6 the canister licensing?

7 MR. QUINN: The environmental permitting.

8 MR. PALMISANO: Well, the environmental permitting
9 is being done by Edison.

10 MR. QUINN: Okay.

11 MR. PALMISANO: You know, so we, Edison, on behalf
12 of other three co-participants, co-owners of the site,
13 we're handling the permitting.

14 MR. QUINN: So, in my humble opinion, that's a very
15 large job. I mean, it is very significant and there's
16 lots of activities that's involved in this. I just --
17 I don't want to say it any less or underscore it. It's
18 really important.

19 MR. PALMISANO: And I appreciate that.

20 And one of the focus topics for next year,
21 that's on my list, is to come in and devote a section
22 to permitting.

23 MR. QUINN: Okay.

24 MR. PALMISANO: To explain this, because the
25 California environmental quality permitting is actually

1 an 18-to-24-month process.

2 MR. QUINN: Yeah.

3 MR. PALMISANO: Which we'll start later this year.

4 MR. QUINN: Okay.

5 MR. PALMISANO: So we want to talk about that
6 earlier in the process.

7 MR. QUINN: Okay.

8 MR. PALMISANO: So the Panel and the public
9 understand what is yet to come on the environmental
10 permitting.

11 MR. QUINN: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I was going to add to that,
13 which is -- Dan Stetson is not here tonight, and I know
14 it's been very key, and I agree with him completely,
15 that we have a session soon, ideally, perhaps the next
16 session, that would focus on these environmental
17 issues, permitting issues, including coastal impacts
18 and the conduits and so on. So I think that's going to
19 be very important.

20 I want to ask you, Tom, these long dates in
21 the future when the canisters will be ready for
22 transport someplace.

23 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

24 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: What we're trying to do with
25 Consolidated Interim Storage is have a place to send it

1 to --

2 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

3 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- sooner rather than later.

4 My understanding is that the time when the
5 fuel could be transported depends on how much it's
6 cooled in its dry cask state, and right now there
7 hasn't been any incentive for anybody to go off and
8 invent better technologies or better licensing to
9 allows us to move the fuel sooner.

10 If there were a place to send the fuel, would
11 the industry go off and find, you know, better
12 transport canisters or seek earlier licenses to be able
13 to move the fuel? Help us understand that.

14 MR. PALMISANO: Sure.

15 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Because, I think, even the
16 canisters from Units 2 and 3 won't be ready under the
17 current protocols to ship until 2028 or something like
18 that.

19 MR. PALMISANO: No. Unit 2 and 3, they'll be ready
20 in 2020. But let me answer that question:

21 So if you look at this, you see the effect of
22 newer technology. When I look at the Units 2 and 3
23 canisters, out of those 33 canisters, 14 could be
24 transported today. Okay? The remaining of the 33 will
25 all be eligible by 2020.

1 If a facility opened tomorrow, we would
2 immediately go to AREVA and have them redesign the
3 transport canister for Unit 1, redo the analysis so we
4 could transport, you know, and the NRC would have to
5 license it so Unit 1 could be transported sooner.

6 So you're looking at, for example, for Unit 1
7 fuel, when this was originally designed, you know,
8 there was a thought that there was plenty of time to
9 deal with this. This is the cold -- total cooling time
10 after it leaves the reactor, so the wet cooling time
11 and the dry cooling time doesn't matter, it just has to
12 cool a certain period of time.

13 If we had an opportunity earlier, we and AREVA
14 would attempt to re-license the Unit 1 transport cask
15 to move fuel sooner, you know, and that would take NRC
16 approval, so not a given but we would certainly make
17 that attempt.

18 And my comment about the Holtec represents an
19 even later design than the AREVA Units 2 and 3, that's
20 why all 73 would have enough cooling time virtually by
21 2020.

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

23 Anything else people want to --

24 We should let you continue. Thanks.

25 MR. PALMISANO: Now, one thing I should add, this

1 last bullet, Full Transfer Estimated at 10 years. So,
2 with just some rough calculations, if a facility was
3 open tomorrow and we have 123 canisters of fuel in
4 San Onofre, it will take about 10 years to move it all
5 off site; that's based on talking to the Department of
6 Energy and the vendors, depending on how many trains
7 are available, how many transfer -- transport canisters
8 are available. It could be a 10-year window to move it
9 all off site if something were open tomorrow. Okay.

10 If something were open tomorrow and there was
11 more equipment available, more trains available, we can
12 cut that time possibly, but I -- I want to make sure
13 that we're clear here.

14 We're talking about a situation where we need
15 to safely store fuel for a number of years and prepare
16 to transport it, but even when the gates open to
17 transport it, it's a fairly long period of time to move
18 it all off site.

19 This is why we continue, in our dialogue, with
20 federal officials and state officials to advocate for
21 action, and we appreciate what the Community Engagement
22 Panel and members of the public are doing to advocate
23 for action. We need something done at the federal
24 level to help us here.

25 MR. KERN: Just one quick question.

1 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: This is Jerry Kern.

2 MR. KERN: Oh, yeah. I should announce.

3 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: We have to, for the record.

4 MR. KERN: If -- if we did nothing, right, by 2030
5 we could have everything moved off. Is that my
6 assumption?

7 MR. PALMISANO: No. What that means, Jerry, if we
8 just follow the plan, it's all eligible to move by
9 2030.

10 MR. KERN: Okay.

11 MR. PALMISANO: But what we need to do is get a
12 place to move it, so we need the facility and we need
13 the transportation.

14 MR. KERN: I'm just talking about the canisters, if
15 the idea that if we do nothing, we have the technology
16 to move everything off by 2030 if we have a place to
17 put it?

18 MR. PALMISANO: Right. Right. They'll be
19 available.

20 MR. KERN: I'm just wondering how much effort do we
21 really have to go through to design new canisters if
22 it's going to take 10 years, because now you're talking
23 15 years to move everything anyway?

24 MR. PALMISANO: So -- so the practical answer,
25 Jerry, let's say tomorrow, by whatever would occur, the

1 government would announce to plan to build something,
2 it's probably three to five years to license and build
3 and, fairly, you've got to get transportation.

4 I would tell you, I'm more realistic, I think,
5 that if the government said tomorrow they're ready to
6 go, it's five to ten years before it's open. Most of
7 this fuel is ready to go by that.

8 And you're right, practically, you may not --
9 you may not want to do anything with Unit 1. You may
10 want to get the stuff out first that's eligible and by
11 the time it's ready the canisters are ready.

12 MR. KERN: Yeah.

13 MR. PALMISANO: So we would make those practical
14 decisions.

15 MR. KERN: I just worry about, you know, going to
16 the cost of redesigning a canister, but if we waited
17 three to five years, you'll already have the canisters
18 in place.

19 MR. PALMISANO: And I've got plenty of fuel I can
20 ship well before that. I was just kind of answering
21 David's hypothetical --

22 MR. KERN: Okay.

23 MR. PALMISANO: -- question, would we consider
24 re-licensing? And, sure, we would. But, practically,
25 there's a lot of things we could do now with fuel

1 that's ready now or will be ready in the next five
2 years to transport.

3 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Right. I think, just to
4 summarize this, if it takes five-plus years to build
5 one of these Consolidated Interim Storage facilities
6 and get it all fully licensed, which is itself very
7 optimistic, it means the time to be working on that
8 option, which we'll come back to the time for that
9 option is right now so that throughout the time line is
10 ready and able to take fuel in the early 2020s and --

11 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

12 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- that we can actually get
13 all the fuel out of here as expeditiously as possible.

14 So, really right now is of absolute essence.

15 MR. PALMISANO: Yeah, we need to be acting now to
16 make this happen in a reasonable time frame.

17 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you.

18 MR. PALMISANO: Other questions on this slide?

19 And this is new information too. I just
20 wanted to brief the Panel.

21 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay.

22 MR. PALMISANO: Okay. Environmental Permitting,
23 let me give you a little more detailed update:

24 On August 13, the Coastal Commission approved
25 a permit for the spent fuel pool island project. This

1 is the alternate cooling system I've discussed before.
2 It's a predecessor to retiring the permanent system.

3 On October 6 -- 6 the Coastal Commission
4 approved the permit for the expansion of the
5 independent spent fuel storage installation, and we
6 will file another Coastal Commission permit in late
7 2016. This will be related to the CEQA review for
8 decommissioning because the Coastal Commission will
9 also have to take an action to allow the full
10 decommissioning to begin.

11 And it's going to take two things: It's going
12 to take a CEQA review by State Lands Commission and a
13 Coastal Commission permit by the Coastal Commission.
14 So that, I estimate, we'll file in late 2016. And,
15 again, next year, when we talk about the broader
16 permitting plan, we can certainly go into this in more
17 depth.

18 California Environmental Quality Act:

19 I really already talked about this. The State
20 Lands Commission will conduct the CEQA review. We
21 anticipate starting next month. The way we're going to
22 trigger that, we need -- the State Lands Commission,
23 really, we have ocean conduits. These are the 3,000,
24 5,000 foot intake and discharge pipes that took ocean
25 water to cool the plant when it was operation.

1 So that's actually on a lease from the State
2 Lands Commission that we have. So, to be able to
3 decommission those in the future, we need to file a
4 permit with the State Lands Commission to terminate the
5 lease and make a decision to remove those. We've
6 abandoned them in place.

7 With Unit 1, the State Lands Commission agreed
8 to abandon them in place. It's more environmentally
9 acceptable. But either way, it's not our decision to
10 make. We need to go through the CEQA Process.

11 So, that application will be filed in November
12 to deal with partial removal and extend the term to
13 cover decommissioning and then it's going to start the
14 broader evaluation of both the onshore and offshore
15 activities.

16 So the permit will start with the conduits,
17 but it will broaden the overall decommissioning review.
18 So that's how the CEQA Act will be applied to the
19 overall Decommissioning Review.

20 And, again, that will then have hook back into
21 the Coastal Commission process for their Coastal
22 Commission permit for the decommissioning itself.

23 MR. KERN: Tom, quick question.

24 MR. PALMISANO: Yes.

25 MR. KERN: The seismic study completion, do you

1 know when that'll be?

2 MR. PALMISANO: Yes, Scripps is completing that. I
3 believe the date is mid-2016. They're going to
4 complete that and publish their report. So, I mean,
5 they're really -- they've got all their data collected.
6 They're reduced the data. They've kind of given us an
7 initial brief and I think we're probably six to eight
8 months away from their final report.

9 And, Jerry, let me just take an action until
10 we actually get to the final date from Scripps. I'm
11 going off my memory on that one.

12 MR. KERN: Okay.

13 MR. PALMISANO: But, yeah, they are completing that
14 work.

15 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: We should get that circulated
16 to the Panel, obviously, and maybe have a briefing or
17 something like that on --

18 MR. PALMISANO: We'll do that. We'll have
19 Dr. Driscoll come up and brief the Panel on his
20 conclusions. This is a seismic work that was started
21 long before decommissioning.

22 I think it was post-Fukushima, for Diablo
23 Canyon, for SONGS. We decided, along with the Public
24 Utility Commission, to continue that work because we
25 felt it was important work to continue.

1 So, Dr. Driscoll, from University of
2 San Diego, is -- UCSD, is completing that work. So
3 we'll -- we'll schedule that, not only to give the
4 correct date or the accurate date, but bring him in for
5 a briefing with his conclusions.

6 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay.

7 MR. PALMISANO: Okay. So I am going to shift over.

8 Again, now, a couple of topics now really are
9 talking about things that have been discussed before in
10 Panel meetings. I want to just bring some facts back
11 in or just keep us updated on.

12 So, Decommissioning Cost Estimate:

13 This is the total cost estimate, 4.4 billion
14 in 2014 dollars; that looks at all the cost through
15 2052 to decommission the plant, store the spent fuel,
16 and that'll decommission the ISFSI when it's removed
17 from the site.

18 There's three categories, and this is NRC
19 terminology, really: License Termination, that's the
20 pie in green here, that's 2.1 billion; Spent Fuel
21 Management, that's the part in orange, 1.3 billion,
22 rounding that off; and then Site Restoration, this is
23 the completion of the non-radiological site restoration
24 after the NRC is satisfied and the license is
25 terminated. So those three sections of the pie

1 comprise the 4.4 billion.

2 We and the co-owners are funded at the hundred
3 percent level, which is good news. Because, there are
4 some plants in the country that are not fully funded
5 for their decommissioning.

6 Going on to the next slide, just a couple of
7 things: There's been some discussion on regulatory
8 oversight. I should mention, for example, out of this
9 4.4 billion, there are four owners responsible for
10 this. Edison share, for example, is about 3 billion.

11 That money comes from the customers. So the
12 customers have contributed a little over 1 billion to
13 that, the remaining 2 billion has been grown through
14 Investment Fund Management.

15 So we've collected the customer money over
16 years, there's a trust committee that oversees that
17 that's been invested, so it's grown to the value that
18 it is. So, if you want to think very simplistically,
19 about one third contributed, two thirds grown through
20 proper investment management.

21 With that, the Public Utility Commission
22 really is the state regulator that oversees the Nuclear
23 Decommissioning Trust, including review, approval, and
24 reasonableness of the cost estimate, the expenditures,
25 whether they're appropriate and they're reasonable.

1 They also -- I didn't include in my slide
2 here. They also oversee, if you will, the Trust Fund
3 Management to make sure it's been managed properly
4 since it's customer money.

5 The NRC also has rules about the
6 decommissioning fund. They are focused really on
7 radiological decommissioning and spent fuel management.
8 Well, that's two pieces of those three pieces that the
9 NRC regulations area clearly focused on.

10 There are some sites that, if you were to go
11 to Rancho Seco, which is a decommissioned and retired
12 nuclear plant outside Sacramento, they stopped after
13 the radiological decommission.

14 They did not remove the buildings once the
15 radiation and radioactivity was removed, so that's a
16 case where the owner in that -- of that facility had a
17 choice to make in terms of not completing site
18 restoration.

19 In our case, the land owner is the Navy. The
20 Navy expects us to complete the full site restoration
21 after the radiological decommissioning.

22 Unused funds, at the end, are returned to the
23 rate payers. So at the end of this process, any unused
24 funds are ultimately returned to the rate payers where
25 the funds have been collected.

1 MR. BROWN: Tom? May -- oh, excuse me.

2 MR. PALMISANO: Yeah.

3 MR. BROWN: May I ask a question?

4 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: This is Tim Brown.

5 MR. BROWN: Tim Brown.

6 MR. PALMISANO: Yes, Tim.

7 MR. BROWN: First, I apologize for being late.

8 Traffic coming north I underestimated.

9 MR. PALMISANO: Yeah.

10 MR. BROWN: One of the questions I have is, from my
11 own experience, for example, San Clemente waste is
12 buried up in Central Valley. We ultimately still have
13 a responsibility for it. There's a tie there. It
14 doesn't go away even though we've -- we've taken it off
15 site.

16 And the question still applies here: So even
17 if this does get relocated to an interim basis or even
18 on permanent facility, is there still some liability
19 tied to the rate holders, something that would always
20 make us liable for whatever the waste goes to or
21 against to?

22 MR. PALMISANO: So are you talking about spent
23 fuel, particularly?

24 MR. BROWN: Yes, that's correct. I'm sorry.

25 MR. PALMISANO: So spent fuel, what the federal law

1 requires, under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, the
2 Department of Energy takes title and liability of the
3 spent fuel.

4 MR. BROWN: Okay.

5 MR. PALMISANO: So once the DOE removes it from
6 site, they take title and liability, and the rate
7 payers are not going to be liable for that once the DOE
8 takes responsibility.

9 MR. BROWN: Does that include interim solutions or
10 is that only on permanent waste repositories?

11 MR. PALMISANO: Well, this is part of the debate
12 that needs to occur. Right now, by law, the Department
13 of Energy is really not authorized to set up an interim
14 storage facility. One of the things that needs to
15 happen is federal law change to allow the Department of
16 Energy to set up whether it's a pilot or a true interim
17 facility, but what needs to be addressed is what's
18 DOE's responsibility and liability once they set that
19 up.

20 MR. BROWN: Okay. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: We -- we'll come back when we
22 talk about --

23 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

24 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- the Consolidated Interim
25 Storage, we'll come back to this issue because we

1 discussed this with Darrell Issa's staff. And if
2 there's new legislation in this area, this is a window
3 of opportunity for backing that kind of law change.

4 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

5 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: It would be terrible if that
6 opportunity did not include getting title transfer to
7 DOE so that we don't end up on the hook forever,
8 basically.

9 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

10 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Garry, did you want to
11 comment on this? Garry Brown.

12 MR. BROWN. Yes, I just had a question for
13 clarification: The trust fund was, I thought I heard,
14 4.2 billion that had been put in by rate payer money
15 over the years or maybe it's 4.4.

16 On your -- on your No. 2, basically, that
17 includes transferring spent fuel from the pools to an
18 interim storage facility.

19 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

20 MR. BROWN: And, eventually, tearing that down.

21 But that does not include the construction of
22 an interim storage. And that's what kind of what
23 you're --

24 MR. PALMISANO: No. The 4.4 billion estimate
25 includes everything we've been describing, including

1 building the independent spent fuel storage
2 installation.

3 MR. BROWN: Okay.

4 MR. PALMISANO: So that is in that 4.4 billion, our
5 cost on-site. It does not include building something
6 in Texas or New Mexico.

7 MR. BROWN: No, I understand that.

8 MR. PALMISANO: Yeah, it includes all that.

9 One of the things I didn't highlight tonight,
10 which we -- probably, in the future, I should come in
11 and talk about, is talk about what we've been able to
12 do to recover money for the customers or rate payers.

13 Because of the money we had had to spend on
14 dry fuel storage for the current system and the future
15 system, we sued the Department of Energy. So all the
16 utilities are suing the Department of Energy and either
17 winning lawsuits and awards. And we have one award
18 already close to, I believe, 100 million dollars; that
19 money gets refunded to the customers.

20 We have our second lawsuit in progress for a
21 claim from 2006 through the plant closure, in 2013,
22 over 100 million dollars. We fully expect to win that.
23 We'll have a sizeable award that gets refunded to the
24 customers.

25 So, the money that we spend on the customers

1 behalf, if you will, to store fuel on site, dry fuel
2 storage, we have been and will continue to recover from
3 the Department of Energy, that's done by all utilities
4 across the country.

5 Some offers series of lawsuits and/or a
6 long-term contract, we've elected to go with lawsuits,
7 which given that we're into a premature decommissioning
8 is probably a smarter way to go.

9 MR. KERN: Right.

10 MR. PALMISANO: Okay.

11 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: We should probably let you
12 continue. I -- I know there are going to be some
13 questions about the Emergency Planning Funding and I
14 want to make sure we have time to address those.

15 MR. PALMISANO: Okay. Thank you.

16 So, Emergency Planning Funding:

17 This is another clean-up topic I want to bring
18 back in and tell you what we've done since the last
19 couple of meetings on this. I'm just very pleased with
20 the support from Orange County, San Diego County, and
21 the local jurisdictions that are part of the
22 Interjurisdictional Planning Committee.

23 You know, we've said, long before we submitted
24 the defuel plan, we had committed to maintain funding
25 for off-site emergency planning for local jurisdictions

1 at the time through the life of the existing law, which
2 was 2019.

3 Once the Defuel Emergency Plan was approved by
4 the NRC and FEMA, Federal Emergency Management
5 Association, notified the state that off-site emergency
6 planning was no longer a requirement, the State
7 eliminated the funding mechanism, which we had
8 anticipated to continue.

9 Because that was really the mechanism of
10 process by which the funds we contributed to the State,
11 were distributed to the counties, and the local cities.
12 So, and I think the State surprised all of us, quite
13 frankly.

14 So, we work with the local jurisdictions.
15 We're firm on our commitment to maintain that level of
16 funding through that period of time. We've now
17 actually entered the Memorandum of Understanding with
18 the counties and the cities for a seven-year plan to
19 maintain -- and I'll show you the time line -- to
20 maintain full funding through 2019 and a two-year
21 step-down to 50 percent of the current value.

22 It's now been fully approved and it's in place
23 and it's effective retroactive to July 1st. And I
24 can't be more appreciative of the support from the
25 counties and the cities in getting this in place; we

1 all worked hard on this and I think it was very, very
2 beneficial.

3 To give some historical value, the total
4 funding for state and local is 2.8 million -- 2.8
5 million a year. The State has told us they no longer
6 need that funding since they no longer have the
7 responsibility, so the local entities, the counties and
8 cities, is 1.7 million.

9 So, the Memorandum of Understanding keeps full
10 funding through 20 -- actually, 2019 to 2020, year six,
11 it drops to 75 percent, year seven, to 50 percent.

12 This is because, by this point, we will have
13 all the fuel in dry cask storage and the Emergency Plan
14 will change, yet again, and need less off-site support.
15 And we've committed to then negotiating a second
16 Memorandum of Understanding when we and the counties
17 and cities have a better understanding of what that is
18 and what their needs are.

19 So, the bottom line is: We are committed to
20 future funding. We now have the firm agreement in
21 place to cover the next seven years and we'll be ready
22 over the next couple of years to negotiate the next
23 memorandum.

24 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: So, before we move on, I want
25 to see if there are any questions about this because a

1 number of members of the Panel raised concerns about
2 this last time we met, I believe.

3 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

4 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And I just want to see if
5 anyone wants to talk about this further.

6 No?

7 Okay. Thank you, Tom.

8 MR. PALMISANO: Okay. So moving on, this is a
9 topic I may have touched on just briefly, but I want to
10 make sure that the Panel and the public knows what's
11 going on: There is a construction activity about to
12 start on the San Onofre site, in the switchyard, that
13 has nothing to do with decommissioning directly. It is
14 a result of the plant closure, though.

15 With the plant closed, there's 2,000
16 megawatts, 2200 megawatts of power no longer on the
17 grid; that it's been all compensated for by buying
18 power, buying more renewals, importing power to the
19 service territory by Edison and San Diego.

20 But what has not been able -- well, you can
21 import power, but voltage control is an issue. The two
22 large San Onofre units not only produce power but
23 provided significant voltage stability for this part of
24 the grid between San Diego and Los Angeles.

25 So, as a result of the retirement of the

1 plant, California Independent System Operator is very
2 concerned about grid stability and voltage support, so
3 they have asked San Diego and Southern California
4 Edison to put in what are called synchronous
5 condensers. These are basically big rotating machines,
6 if you will, picture a motor driving a generator, and
7 it's connected to the grid to maintain the voltage
8 level. Okay.

9 There are eight of these units that have been
10 asked to be installed by 2017. San Diego is putting in
11 seven of them, Edison is putting in one of them. San
12 Diego actively has two running in the Talega area in
13 San Clemente now, and the one they've -- the California
14 ISO was asked to go into San Onofre switchyard.

15 So, that construction is permitted now, design
16 is done, construction is ready to start, so this will
17 be a site activity not directly related to
18 decommissioning at all, but to put in this machine.

19 And it's a large machine, it's a lot of
20 construction activity, so we simply want you to be
21 aware that this is going to go on at the request of the
22 California Independent System Operator. And you see
23 the time line for this then to be installed in 2016 and
24 to go in service third quarter of 2017.

25 So, I just want you to be aware of that

1 activity, because it will look a lot like heavy
2 equipment and construction equipment in that south end
3 of the switchyard on site.

4 MR. BROWN: I have a question on that: And so
5 where are those locations, again, the five locations?
6 It was -- you had mentioned --

7 MR. PALMISANO: Well, I'll tell you what, I've got
8 a couple of San Diego reps here.

9 So, guys, let me ask you to step up.

10 MR. BROWN: That could be after -- yeah.

11 MR. CARTER: Yes, so we have four different
12 locations. Like Tom mentioned, there were two --

13 MR. PALMISANO: Fred, please introduce yourself.

14 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Please use the mic.

15 MR. KERN: Go to the mic.

16 MR. BROWN: Grab the mic.

17 MR. CARTER: Great. Fred Carter, SDG&E.

18 So, we have four locations SDG&E is installing
19 synchronous condensers at: One is at Talega, like Tom
20 talked about, which has two units already running. We
21 have two units going in our -- San Luis Rey substation,
22 which is two more units. We have two going in at our
23 Miguel Substation, which is down south in San Diego,
24 and then one additionally at San Onofre.

25 And then, in addition to that, Edison is

1 putting one at their Santiago Substation.

2 MR. PALMISANO: Right. Right.

3 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Well, quite apart from the
4 construction site and the practical implication of
5 this, for people interested visually in the site is,
6 the lines will be there forever because it is a very
7 important switchyard that'll continue to operate.

8 MR. PALMISANO: Right. At this point the
9 switchyard will remain after decommissioning because
10 it's an important intertie between the two systems.

11 So, yes, so the switchyard and the
12 transmission lines in and out will remain because this
13 is the interconnection plant.

14 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you.

15 MR. PALMISANO: Other questions related to this?

16 Again, it's not a decommissioning topic,
17 per se, but it is a site topic so we want you to be
18 aware of it.

19 Okay. This slide, I didn't forget to fill in
20 the left column. This is really asking the Community
21 Engagement Panel members, we need to do our planning
22 for the 2016 topics.

23 And, you know, Manuel Camargo and I already
24 keep a running list. For example, I've done
25 Environmental Permitting as a topic to discuss and, you

1 know, there are clearly some other topics we're going
2 to want to talk about, but I would like the Panel, and
3 you don't have to give any feedback contemporaneously
4 right now, but I would like ask the Panel to provide us
5 feedback on some of the focus topics they would like in
6 the meetings next year.

7 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: So, please, and also share
8 that information with Dan Stetson and Tim Brown and me
9 since we've been playing a pretty active role in
10 guiding the agendas here.

11 MR. PALMISANO: Yeah.

12 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Clearly, we need to have
13 another meeting on the Consolidated Interim Storage.

14 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

15 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And we need to refocus, as we
16 promised we would do constantly, on Defense-in-Depth
17 for these --

18 MR. PALMISANO: For dry cask storage, yeah.

19 So, what I would ask is, Manuel Camargo to
20 send each of you an email, soliciting topics that you
21 would like to consider, then we'll work with David and
22 the officers of the CEP to kind of focus the topics,
23 get them prioritized, so we can schedule them properly.

24 MR. PARKER: Bill Parker.

25 Quick question: You talked about how you'll

1 solicit suggestions from the panel. Do you have any
2 ideas about how you might solicit topics from the
3 community?

4 MR. PALMISANO: Yeah. In fact, that's where I was
5 going to go next. So, two things: No. 1, the Panel
6 listens to the community, as do I and the other Edison
7 people here.

8 Secondly, we've got the ability for people to
9 send us an email on our SONGScommunity.com, so we
10 certainly invite any topics you think are appropriate
11 for a more detailed focused discussion.

12 We'll collect all that and put that together
13 as we plan the focus topics and curriculum and then
14 we'll come back to the CEP itself and talk about how
15 this lays out and what we think the right sequence is.

16 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I think it's very important
17 that this happen over the next few weeks because of the
18 practical matter the first two meetings of 2016 need to
19 get planned --

20 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

21 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- very soon.

22 MR. PALMISANO: Specially, if I need outside
23 speakers or something like that.

24 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Tim Brown?

25 MR. BROWN: Yeah. I think part of the Community

1 Engagement Panel, too, is that there's -- you know, we
2 have a number of elected officials as well as
3 representatives of the public in different areas. And,
4 hopefully, I think that's what the hope is, is that,
5 throughout our engagement, there are communities that
6 we can --

7 MR. PARKER: I'm looking at the audience out here.

8 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

9 MR. PARKER: And make sure they have an opportunity
10 to put their suggestions and the topics for future
11 meetings.

12 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: But also the types of --
13 Ted Quinn?

14 MR. QUINN: Yeah, Ted Quinn.

15 What I wanted to ask, Tom, is your
16 relationship with the Navy, I'd like to hear more about
17 it in the upcoming meetings.

18 MR. PALMISANO: Sure. Yeah, what we'll do, and
19 we'll pick the right time, environmental permitting
20 first, but then where we're going with the Navy
21 easement and then finishing the end-state, which is
22 really up to the Navy to agree to. So we'll put that
23 on as a topic list.

24 Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: It would be great if the Navy

1 could tell us, because they seem like a black box.

2 It's very hard to understand what's actually going on

3 there so maybe --

4 MR. PALMISANO: Well, Tom, I don't know if you want
5 to comment or not.

6 MR. CAUGHLAN: The Navy has a --

7 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Tom Caughlan.

8 MR. CAUGHLAN: -- organization called the -- the
9 Southwest Facilities Engineering Command that is
10 essentially the Navy's real estate manager and so they
11 function, if you would, as the commercial real estate
12 operator for all the installations around the world.
13 There's a -- it's a global operation.

14 The Southwest Division is the section we work
15 under. They live in San Diego, and we meet with them
16 all the time. We literally have every other week we're
17 going through some arcane decision about what we're
18 going to do with small things or even big things. But
19 it tends to be about how we move ahead to the next
20 intent.

21 What -- what are we going to do with the land?
22 We're going to -- we want to use it for training when
23 it's all restored to the as-was condition. Maybe we
24 want to use some of the buildings for training
25 purposes, storage purposes, some other military purpose

1 when it's all done.

2 So, we get engaged with them to talk about
3 real estate issues relative to re-use. We get engaged
4 with the operating forces to say, "If you're going to
5 use for a training facility, what's that going to look
6 like? How much do we have to restore? How much can we
7 leave "as is" to save that kind of money? How can we
8 make all the smart decisions well in advance?" And,
9 basically, walk through the process.

10 Does that --

11 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Tom? Tom, can I ask you to
12 convey maybe a message to them from us, which is,
13 clearly it's their land and, at the end of the day,
14 they're going to make very important decisions here and
15 that seems fitting and proper.

16 But the communities, in various ways, have
17 been engaged with the land and obviously paying
18 attention to this because the plant has been there and
19 I think it would be very helpful if we had some
20 constructive dialogue with the key folks at the Navy in
21 some way. And if we could organize that, I think that
22 probably would be of great --

23 MR. CAUGHLAN: Sure.

24 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- interest to the community
25 and maybe of great help to the Navy as well.

1 MR. CAUGHLAN: That's -- okay. I'll take a task to
2 talk to them and arrange. Would you like a
3 presentation? Is that what you're --

4 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Well, why don't we talk about
5 what the right format of engagement is?

6 MR. CAUGHLAN: Right. Okay. Sure.

7 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: But I think, for folks to
8 understand what's happening there and maybe for them to
9 understand what's happening here I think it would be
10 very helpful.

11 Jerry, do you want to comment on this?

12 MR. KERN: Well, just one quick question is, you
13 know, that Tom started to bring up with the Navy and
14 the federal and the CEQA, do we have to do a NEPA
15 document too?

16 MR. PALMISANO: Yes.

17 MR. KERN: Is that parallel? Is that -- are
18 they -- go ahead.

19 MR. PALMISANO: When I bring our environmental lead
20 in, she'll do the entire picture, so NEPA is done
21 really in a couple of stages:

22 First of all, the NRC has already done the
23 NEPA review for --

24 MR. KERN: You might want to explain what that is.

25 MR. PALMISANO: Oh, yeah. Thank -- thank you.

1 NEPA is National Environmental Policy Act.
2 Okay. So, the NRC has already done the NEPA, National
3 Environmental Policy Act, for the radiological
4 decommissioning and the spent fuel storage. Okay.

5 What the Navy will have to do as a federal
6 agency is the NEPA review for the ultimate site
7 restoration in the end-state of decommissioning. Now,
8 that is several years down the road. Okay.

9 So, the way this will all fit together with
10 the CEQA, California Environmental Quality Act review,
11 we will start with State Lands; State Lands Commission
12 will reach out to the Navy for their interface.
13 Likewise, when the Navy does a NEPA review in a couple
14 of years, they will reach out to State Lands
15 Commission.

16 So, this is all interlaced and we need to
17 probably spend a good 30 minutes on this as a focus
18 topic.

19 MR. CAUGHLAN: There'll be a test later, ladies and
20 gentlemen, so.

21 MR. PALMISANO: Yes. So, anyways, so we'll bring
22 this in as a broader topic because it's complicated and
23 there are federal, state agencies involved. There'll
24 be a couple of state agencies that assist the Navy on
25 determining end-state requirements.

1 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Why don't we move on to the
2 last slide of the meeting, Tom, and then we want to get
3 onto economic study topic?

4 MR. PALMISANO: Yeah.

5 So with that upcoming meetings, two of these
6 meetings are already complete. The next meeting, a
7 California Regional Water Quality board:

8 This is the NPDES, National Pollution
9 Discharge permit. This is a non-radiological discharge
10 permit that gets renewed periodically. This is a
11 fairly routine item. We've been through a workshop on
12 this. This will be the approval meeting with the
13 San Diego Regional Board, so that's an upcoming meeting
14 in December.

15 And with that, I'm going to shift over in the
16 Environmental Impact Study.

17 Is there any more questions on the basic
18 decommissioning status that I've covered?

19 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. I don't think so.

20 Thank you very much, Tom.

21 MR. PALMISANO: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: So, let's now -- I think
23 you're going to introduce --

24 MR. PALMISANO: Let me introduce this and --

25 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- the Economic Impact

1 Analysis and then we're going to get Dustin to talk
2 about the actual work --

3 MR. PALMISANO: Yeah.

4 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- that Beacon did.

5 MR. PALMISANO: Yeah. Very good.

6 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: So, Tom.

7 MR. PALMISANO: Okay. So we were asked -- this
8 really goes back over a year ago about what's the
9 economic impact of decommissioning. You know, the
10 economic impact of closing a plant. I am going to
11 characterize a little bit, but there is an economic
12 impact for the decommissioning work, the
13 decommissioning jobs, the decommissioning study.

14 So, what we've decided, we've contracted
15 Beacon to come and actually do a study, so we're going
16 to hear the results of that tonight and this will be
17 posted.

18 But, before I turn it over, so the purpose was
19 really -- there was, expressed with Panel and by some
20 members of the public, interest in decommissioning
21 jobs: What -- what do the jobs look like? What does
22 it mean in terms of the local economies? Does it
23 replace the economic impact to the plant closure?

24 And, you know, we've asked them to quantify it
25 in your term. The term they use is Economic Output. I

1 use Economic Impact. Okay? And I may be wrong on
2 that. But I want to tee this up. So during operation,
3 when the plant was fully operating, before the steam
4 generator difficulties, the plant, essentially, when
5 you see the word output, think about a 3.3 billion a
6 year impact in California, the impact of all the
7 spending.

8 First of all, the impact of the payroll for
9 the workers, the permanent workers, and the contract
10 labor that came in and out. You know, roughly one
11 dollar of payroll turns over five to seven times in the
12 local economy because people go to restaurants, go to
13 grocery stores, et cetera.

14 So the impact of that workforce, if you will,
15 is a positive impact to local economies; other
16 spendings, for goods and services, et cetera. So, we
17 had about a 3.3 billion dollar annual impact in
18 California.

19 This was based on the 2010 number that we
20 actually studied and developed when we were looking at
21 license renewal for the plants. We have higher
22 employment, more permanent jobs. We had an average of
23 500 contract employees.

24 For example, during operation, we had roughly
25 2200 people during this time frame and some additional

1 contractors. We had an annual budget for those two
2 units of about 770 million dollars and about 410
3 million, if you will, was in staffing cost or labor
4 cost.

5 During decommissioning, these numbers are down
6 to about 375 permanent people or core people right now
7 and that's a mix of SCE and contractors. We have an --
8 an annual average budget right now of 242 million. And
9 these numbers will go down. And our staffing budget is
10 about 8.

11 So as you can imagine, we have much less of an
12 effect. Today, instead of 3.3 billion annual impact or
13 output, we have about 10 percent of that, 293 million
14 roughly. We have lower employment, more temporary jobs
15 and a smaller number of contract workers.

16 So, as I turn it over to -- to the gentleman
17 from Beacon to talk about the economic impact of
18 decommissioning, which is positive, in a sense, you've
19 got to take it along the -- along the lines of a bigger
20 picture. There is really a net loss here, if you will,
21 in terms of economic impact through the plant closure.

22 So with that, we retain Beacon Economics, the
23 focus of their study: Looking at 2013 to 2026, the
24 major time for decommissioning, if you will, we asked
25 them to look at employment, output in terms of goods

1 and services, tax effects, and boost economic activity.

2 And with that, let me turn it over to Dustin.

3 Okay?

4 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you.

5 Dustin, are you going to stand up there or are
6 you going to remain seated?

7 MR. SCHRADER: Actually, I will preferably sit
8 here, so that way I can see the --

9 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay.

10 MR. SCHRADER: I'm having trouble reading up the --

11 Okay? Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And then can you just tell
13 us -- we have until, I think, 7:35. Do you want to
14 present for a period of time and then have us ask
15 questions at the end? Or --

16 MR. SCHRADER: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: What -- what is your plan
18 here?

19 MR. SCHRADER: I agree.

20 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: So if there are urgent,
21 clarifying questions, we can interrupt Dustin.

22 MR. SCHRADER: Sure.

23 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And, otherwise, we'll let you
24 talk.

25 MR. SCHRADER: Great. Thank you much. And thank

1 you to the Panel for --

2 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: We don't have a microphone
3 yet.

4 MR. SCHRADER: Oh, sorry.

5 PUBLIC MEMBER: Point it up.

6 MR. SCHRADER: Okay. Better? Is that better?

7 (Taps mic) There we go.

8 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I see lots of people
9 scurrying around on the back, so that's a good sign as
10 well.

11 MR. SCHRADER: Okay. I'm Dustin Schrader, Public
12 Policy Manager at Beacon Economics, who oversaw the
13 Economic Impact Study.

14 And let's go with a brief overview:

15 The total amount of spending by SONGS was 3.2
16 billion dollars from 2013 to 2026 and this covers two
17 primary sources of economy impact: The impact of the
18 deconstruction project itself and then the effects on
19 regional growth of the deconstruction.

20 And then there are a series of benefits that
21 go along with any economic impact study: The
22 employment benefits, which is just jobs for the regions
23 resident -- excuse me -- residents, the economic
24 output, which is demand for goods and services of
25 businesses in the geographical area of focus; state and

1 local tax revenues; and then, in general, the boost of
2 economic activity in the region of focus.

3 A total of three primary types of economic
4 impact: There's a direct impact, which is just the
5 expenditures that go into dismantling the nuclear
6 generating station, the deconstruction impacts, and
7 these provide jobs for county and city residents.

8 There is the indirect economic impact, which
9 is business to business -- excuse me -- business to
10 business spending, which includes purchases of building
11 materials and new real estate projects, such as
12 business expanding -- excuse me -- expanding existing
13 facilities or purchasing new facilities.

14 And then there is the induced economic impact,
15 which is just worker to business spending. And this
16 also might include -- excuse me -- tax revenues, such
17 as sales tax and goods that are purchased.

18 And so a brief overview of the economic impact
19 modeling program that we use: We use the IMPLAN(Impact
20 Analysis for Planning) Modeling System, which is used
21 to estimate an economic impact on a particular
22 geography and for a particular industry of focus.

23 And so, we constructed the analysis of the
24 county, state, and U.S. level. Though, this is
25 traditionally done at just the county level. And it's

1 based on multiple R-analysis, so X-dollars are invested
2 in the local economy, generating wide output and city
3 jobs. Excuse me.

4 And just a brief overview of the IMPLAN
5 Modeling System: Multipliers vary by the industry of
6 focus and the geography of focus. So, let's take the
7 example of California versus San Bernardino County:

8 So, California is going to have larger
9 multipliers and this is primarily due to the leakage
10 that occurs for the spending by geography. So the
11 example of PC manufacturing in San Bernardino County,
12 so for a PC manufacturer in San Bernardino County that
13 requires silicon -- silicon chips is a major input, but
14 the County of San Bernardino is not a major chip
15 manufacturing area, so the PC manufacturer who purchase
16 those silicon chips from outside the county and this
17 is -- this represents spending that leaks outside
18 the -- the San Bernardino County economy.

19 And there is a general rule of thumb: The
20 larger -- excuse me -- the larger the geography, the
21 less leakage takes place, and then the more diverse the
22 local economic, the less leakage takes place.

23 So, for instance, Los Angeles County is likely
24 to -- likely to have larger multipliers than
25 San Bernardino County.

1 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: So, Tom used an example of
2 wage income from the plant when it was operational was
3 recycled five to seven times, which implies a
4 multiplier of five to seven. Is that consistent with
5 the multipliers you're going to use for the analysis
6 you're about to show us?

7 MR. SCHRADER: That's right. His example applies
8 directly to --

9 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. So it's comparable.
10 We're talking about apples to apples comparison, then?

11 MR. SCHRADER: In terms of the multiplier effects,
12 yeah.

13 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay.

14 MR. SCHRADER: And so looking at the major project
15 expenditures by category, we have Waste Management and
16 Remediation. The utility sector, which includes
17 primarily SONGS-related expenditures, deconstruction
18 impacts and then other categories, like security,
19 insurance, machinery rental and leasing, for a total
20 3.273 billion dollars.

21 And this is a bit of a unique study for us.
22 Most of our economic impact studies, construction is a
23 relatively major expenditure. In this case,
24 deconstruction represents solely roughly 20 percent of
25 total cost, even a smaller percentage than other costs,

1 like architecture.

2 So, a brief note on the impacts:

3 Oops. A brief note on the impacts, is that
4 these are not permanent jobs; most of these jobs will
5 end when -- when the project is complete, when the
6 spending ceases.

7 Output reflects revenues or business
8 opportunities for local vendors in each geographical
9 region. This is not for SONGS partners. And then
10 labor income is not exclusively for SONGS workers, it's
11 for workers throughout the geography of focus.

12 And so looking at the summarized economic
13 impacts: The United States is expected to generate
14 roughly 45,415 full-time equivalent jobs over the
15 2013-to-2026 period and roughly 9 billion -- excuse
16 me -- 9 billion dollars in economic output and roughly
17 2.8 billion dollars in labor income.

18 And just less than half of this is going to
19 take place in California and roughly 21,000 full-time
20 equivalent jobs, 4.1 billion dollars in output and 1.4
21 billion dollars in labor income, primarily in Southern
22 California counties, like San Diego and Orange County.

23 And, then, I've noticed the secondary
24 economic -- oops -- the secondary economic impacts we
25 find in California, out of the total of 4 billion

1 dollars in total economic impact, roughly 1.9 billion
2 dollars of this total will come through secondary
3 effects alone.

4 And there are two examples that really stand
5 out: The real estate sector, where there's only
6 5 million dollars in direct spending and over 110
7 million dollars in indirect and induced spending
8 generated, and the petroleum refinery sector with zero
9 dollars in direct spending and roughly 100 million
10 dollars in indirect and induced spending.

11 And why might this be the case?

12 Because, when a business receives revenues as
13 a result of spending project in the community, they
14 expand existing facilities, build new facilities and,
15 likewise, this applies to workers as well. When
16 workers receive an increase in income, they expand on
17 their existing homes and purchase new homes.

18 And then for petroleum refineries, this
19 primarily involves fuel cost, so fuel cost for a
20 business and fuel cost for a individual.

21 MR. BROWN: This doesn't -- just to be clear,
22 though, this doesn't necessarily -- what you're
23 conveying is the activity, decommissioning activity,
24 but, as Tom said, the net effect is not calculated in
25 your --

1 MR. SCHRADER: That's right. This is the --

2 MR. BROWN: -- preview?

3 MR. SCHRADER: -- gross impact.

4 MR. BROWN: Right. Okay. So, yeah. And so the
5 net effect that you're saying here in terms of output,
6 you have to have a similar structure on what's being
7 taken away in terms of full-time jobs and then it's
8 balanced against that?

9 MR. SCHRADER: Right. This is --

10 MR. BROWN: But that's not part of your
11 exploration, you're just simply looking at the
12 decommissioning impacts?

13 MR. SCHRADER: Right, the impact of the
14 expenditures in the decommission.

15 And then looking, briefly, at California
16 Fiscal Impacts: We expect to see 185 million in state
17 and local tax revenue generated across the State of
18 California from three primary sources:

19 Sales tax, at roughly 45 million dollars;
20 personal income tax, roughly 44 million dollars; and
21 business property tax, at just over 36 million dollars.

22 And, in essence, the increase in income
23 generates state tax revenue income and then what
24 increases in spending generates local tax revenue, like
25 property and sales taxes.

1 Let's look at a couple of counties, in
2 particular, that see the largest impacts: Orange
3 County sees the largest output impact of any county and
4 it's driven by the largest total, direct spending.

5 And three primary sectors are impacted: The
6 utility sector, most apparently, due to impact at
7 SONGS, remediation and architecture and engineering.
8 And there are more jobs supported in security than in
9 any other sector of which 1700 are direct jobs.

10 Other primary sectors impact include food
11 services and real estate, primarily from secondary job
12 impacts. We already talked about the real estate
13 impact, but food services is always a big sector
14 impacted by secondary worker spending.

15 And looking at San Diego County: San Diego
16 County expects to see the largest employment impacts of
17 any county and many of this is direct jobs. An
18 interesting case, though, is that there is less labor
19 income generated than Orange County yet there are more
20 jobs created. And why might this be the case?

21 The difference between high wage and low wage
22 jobs. Orange County's spending is expected to generate
23 more workers at high-wage sectors, like architecture,
24 and engineering, and utilities than San Diego County.

25 And then briefly looking at the --

1 Sorry. I thought somebody had a question.

2 MR. BROWN: No.

3 MR. SCHRADER: Looking briefly at the real estate
4 impacts we estimated, so we did a brief -- or excuse
5 me -- an extensive review, looking at the removal of
6 nuclear facilities and its impact on nearby home values
7 and we found that, on average, there's roughly a 6.4
8 percent bump in home prices within about 10 miles from
9 a nuclear site.

10 Three cities fit into this radius: Dana
11 Point, San Clemente, and San Juan Capistrano. So we
12 assume that that 6.4 percent increase would apply to
13 homes in these three cities and their residential
14 assess valuation will increase in time.

15 Now, this is long-run impact, not a short-run
16 impact, because of Prop 13, which limits assess
17 valuation in terms of property taxes generated.

18 And then we assume that 20 -- 20 percent of
19 property tax revenue generated as a result of this
20 increase in assessed valuation would be sent to those
21 three cities as municipal tax revenues, generating a
22 total of roughly 900,00 dollars -- excuse me -- 900,000
23 dollars for Dana Point, 1.3 million dollars for
24 San Clemente, and 600,000 dollars for San Juan
25 Capistrano.

1 And just to sum up briefly the key findings:

2 We estimated roughly 9 billion dollars in
3 total economic output generated across the United
4 States of which 4.1 billion dollars would be
5 concentrated in the State of California, with 1.9
6 billion dollars generated through secondary impacts.
7 This is the indirect and the induced impact.

8 And then much of this economic activity will
9 come in Southern California, in particular, including
10 over 6300 jobs in both Orange County and San Diego
11 County, roughly 1.2 billion dollars in output in each
12 of those respective counties, and over 400 million
13 dollars in labor income generated in each of those
14 counties, and a total of 185 million dollars in state
15 and local tax revenue generated throughout the State of
16 California.

17 Thank you much.

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

19 I'm -- I have a few questions, but I'm going
20 to hold my questions until others have had a chance to
21 talk.

22 Bill Parker.

23 If anyone else wants to raise questions, why
24 don't you put your flag up like this? And we have
25 plenty of time to discuss this.

1 Bill?

2 MR. PARKER: I'm a physicist, not an economist, so
3 please excuse the naivety of my question.

4 MR. SCHRADER: Sure.

5 MR. PARKER: What would strike me of interest would
6 be the total impact of the decommissioning of SONGS.

7 As Tom said earlier, the expenditures of
8 Southern California Edison are reduced by several
9 hundred million dollars a year.

10 You're looking over -- what? -- a five-year,
11 six-year period. So there's reduction in economic
12 activity of, perhaps, a billion dollars over the
13 period. You're talking about the activity associated
14 with decommissioning.

15 What seems to me would be relevant is the net
16 impact of decommissioning of SONGS; that is the last
17 revenue, which I understand you're not analyzing, so
18 you have the balancing, if we're going to lose money
19 here and gain something here, you're only talking about
20 this part (indicating). And what I would think the
21 community is concerned about is the sum of what you
22 lose and what you gain.

23 So, do you have any estimate of what the net
24 impact on this area would be from the decommissioning
25 of SONGS, the loss economy activity, and the gaining

1 from the decommissioning activities? What's the net of
2 all of this?

3 MR. SCHRADER: Unfortunately, I don't have a great
4 answer for you, looking just at the expenditures. But,
5 I think, Tom's slide, where he kind of balanced the
6 decommissioning sort of gained economic output
7 relatively to the loss economic output is about the
8 closest.

9 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Can I make a suggestion,
10 which is, this is not robust to multiple significant
11 digits, but it's the first answer to the question Bill
12 is asking and I think that's the same question that Tim
13 was raising earlier, which is, if you folks could do a
14 simple present discounted value calculation of the flow
15 of benefits with the multiplier that Tom was talking
16 about for the rest of the expected lifetime of the
17 plant and compare that present discounted value
18 calculation with the present discounted value
19 calculation over the lifetime of decommissioning, which
20 you've done, and if you just were to give us those two
21 PDV, present discounted value calculations, that would
22 tell us roughly what the numbers look like.

23 And I think it would be actually very
24 informative to the community in addition to the tax
25 information, which is very interesting, also. I'll

1 also ask questions about that in a moment.

2 So if there's a way to do that, which should
3 require firing of Excel and running it for about an
4 hour, that would be great.

5 MR. BROWN: Okay. That's the next slide.

6 MR. PALMISANO: I'll tell you what, let me take
7 that for an action and see what between our -- our work
8 we have done previously and what Beacon has done, if we
9 can couple those together to give you that kind of an
10 answer.

11 Because, you know, I try to characterize very
12 simply the effect when the plant was operating and
13 contrast the effect shutdown with Beacon's work. Let
14 me see what our, you know, economist and financial
15 folks can do to really give us a better answer.

16 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: But it needs to be a discount
17 flow now, obviously, because many of the benefits from
18 the plant, and we don't need to assume any of the
19 license -- license extension and so on. Okay.

20 Is it on the same theme?

21 MR. BROWN: It is on the same theme.

22 One of the -- for example, I was going to say,
23 I was pretty excited when we saw 6.4 percent bounce in
24 real estate value, that we would realize then -- then I
25 realized when the plant closed, you had approximately

1 three- to four-hundred employees in the City of
2 San Clemente who no longer had a reason for being there
3 anymore -- homes turned over, homes got sold.

4 And so, you know, there's a -- there's a
5 depreciable effect in terms of houses on the market;
6 there's depreciation there and then there is
7 depreciation for the value of the plant not being
8 there. There's all these soft effects.

9 Although, this is very fascinating, I think
10 one of the reasons why this was brought up, and I
11 believe it was Bill who brought it up originally, from
12 San Diego. Wasn't it? Bill Horn? Didn't he -- was he
13 the one who asked --

14 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And Jerry was also keying
15 on -- on organized labor on that.

16 MR. BROWN: I think what's interesting about this
17 is that ultimately what we're looking at is, "Okay.
18 This happened and we're with this reality now. This is
19 the reality of the situation we're in."

20 So how is it going to benefit us starting now,
21 which is intriguing to me? The question I have is
22 really about a lot of the A&E(Architecture &
23 Engineering) work and a lot of the soft work that has
24 to be done, the intellectual work.

25 What -- what isn't clear to me is how much of

1 that really is going to impact the local economy. When
2 you're talking about contractors that are doing studies
3 on decommissions, you could do that in Virginia, you
4 could do that anywhere.

5 Although the food service, labor, and other
6 things that happens locally, when you start getting
7 into a lot of the planning and the A&E work, that can
8 be done anywhere in the world. And so how do you
9 calculate that effect on local economy? It doesn't
10 have on the side, actually, sketch and drawing.

11 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I am actually going to put
12 that first to Tom because I think this relates to some
13 issues that this panel has raised many times about
14 insuring as much of the economic value of
15 decommissioning stays in local communities as possible.

16 MR. PALMISANO: Yeah.

17 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Tell us where we stand on
18 this.

19 MR. PALMISANO: Well, and, you know,
20 decommissioning of the plant is really deconstructing
21 the plant; it is not as complicated as building a
22 plant. So once the plant is basically de-fueled, it's
23 Cold and Dark, and especially once the fuel is all on
24 the ISFSI pad, the amount of engineering is much less
25 than if you were to build a new facility, whether it's

1 a coal plant, a nuclear plant, or a desalinization
2 plant.

3 So, a lot of the jobs we anticipate are really
4 construction trade jobs, a lot of labor jobs, which is
5 the appropriate skill set with some of the other trades
6 to take the plant apart.

7 So, we've actually told all the contractors
8 who were bidding on the large decommissioning general
9 contract that we expect them to use local union labor
10 for that and they have that message very clearly.

11 Some of the professional jobs, the A&E jobs,
12 architect and engineering, that some of them might be
13 done on site, as Tim was saying, a lot of that might
14 not be done on site.

15 Quite frankly, there's relatively -- in very
16 general terms, there's relatively little of that
17 compared to building a new plant. It's not building a
18 facility. Once it's de-energized and the hazard is
19 removed, it's really just knocking it down and shipping
20 it away.

21 So I think, David, what we need to do is bring
22 this back in with probably a more complete discussion
23 about maybe what the local effects may look like.

24 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: So, I wanted to -- before we
25 ask Dustin to comment on this as well, we have also

1 received several letters and comments from organized
2 labor in the communities about similar issue.

3 And I noticed on your time line, which is this
4 giant document here, that all of you have, that you're
5 going to award the decommissioning general contractor
6 in the first quarter of 2016.

7 So, maybe, later next year, we can meet the
8 contractor and learn more about what's going on in
9 terms of organized labor, unorganized labor, which
10 kinds of jobs, and how we maximize the local benefits.

11 MR. PALMISANO: Yeah, and we'll be glad to do that.

12 But right now my award date is likely May of
13 2016. You know, I'm not showing it that precisely
14 here. And once we select the contractor, announce it,
15 we'll be glad to bring them into a meeting for them to
16 discuss what their plans are.

17 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. So that sounds like
18 that might end up being fourth quarter next year.

19 Dustin, do you want to comment on this
20 exchange?

21 MR. SCHRADER: Sure, just briefly.

22 I just wanted to specify, I listed total
23 project expenditures in the aggregate, but those were
24 actually separated by region where the expenditure
25 would take place.

1 So, outside of California expenditures were
2 categorized outside of California, a modeling was done
3 for an outside of California impact and, likewise, for
4 California by county and the rest of California.

5 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Ted Quinn, you've been a
6 model of patience. Would you like to ask your
7 question?

8 MR. QUINN: Sure.

9 In your analysis -- my question is on supply
10 chain pieces and parts. I understand you analyzed
11 people very well. Did you also analyze local
12 businesses that provide some equipment that can be used
13 during deconstruction?

14 MR. SCHRADER: We were given expenditures. We
15 didn't really go out and try and look for alternatives
16 ourselves.

17 MR. QUINN: Can Tom answer that?

18 MR. PALMISANO: Did we analyze local expenditures
19 for goods and services --

20 MR. QUINN: Right.

21 MR. PALMISANO: -- or equipment?

22 MR. QUINN: Yes.

23 MR. PALMISANO: Not in a great deal of detail.

24 There's numbers in the Decommissioning Cost
25 Estimate, which is what I believe we provided to

1 Beacon. But, again, until the contractor is selected,
2 all that is very preliminary, Ted.

3 So that's something, when we really select the
4 contractor and --

5 MR. QUINN: Right.

6 MR. PALMISANO: -- they've got about a year's worth
7 of planning, we can talk much more specifically.

8 MR. QUINN: But it does add to the financial
9 benefit to the local community?

10 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

11 MR. QUINN: Okay. All right.

12 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Is the same contractor doing
13 the ISFSI expansion that's doing the dismembering,
14 dismantling of the rest of the facility?

15 MR. PALMISANO: No. No. We've not selected the
16 contractor for the dismantling of the facility.
17 currently, we've really got three construction-type
18 contractors working. Holtec will be installing the
19 ISFSI and they'll be bringing in a contractor for the
20 physical work. Kiewit is active on-site with the Cold
21 and Dark mods, and I've got CB&I, Chicago Bridge &
22 Iron, doing some other work.

23 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Other comments
24 about --

25 MR. KERN: I --

1 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Jerry Kern.

2 MR. KERN: Quick question. To add on what he said,
3 does Edison have like a buy-local policy? Is that part
4 of the policy, to try to purchase locally?

5 MR. PALMISANO: We have a number of policies that
6 will encourage us to buy local as well as diversity
7 goals in terms of, you know, goods and services.

8 MR. KERN: Oh, okay. But the contractor is not
9 going to be bound by that?

10 MR. PALMISANO: The contractor will be -- you know,
11 for example, my direction that I expect them to use
12 local labor and union labor, they'll be bound by that.
13 Beyond that, we've not negotiated the terms of the
14 contract yet.

15 MR. KERN: Oh, okay. So, that was my thing here
16 about the purchasing. Because, some of these materials
17 you can basically buy them on ebay, basically, and have
18 them shipped in or whatever, and there's really no
19 local impact.

20 So, you were just given the numbers from
21 Edison to say, "This is what they buy within the
22 region."

23 MR. SCHRADER: Uh-huh, region by region.

24 MR. KERN: And then going back to the Mayor's
25 comment about, you know, new real estate, I don't see

1 any new real estate impacts from this because there's
2 such a vacuum now of real estate, you know, maybe
3 that's the wrong term.

4 But people moving because they no longer have
5 a job and they're moving to other nuclear facilities
6 across the nation, so now we have an empty house, that
7 this is not a permanent long-term housing driver. This
8 is -- you know, this is very short-term in any respect.

9 So I'm not getting where the real estate
10 impacts will have any at all.

11 MR. BROWN: I think it's -- I think it's the stigma
12 of being close to a plant to be the positive impact.

13 MR. KERN: Yeah.

14 MR. BROWN: So, you know, my home is within 10
15 miles of the plant. The plant is no longer there. You
16 know, you no longer have your Naked Gun reference point
17 anymore. Right? And so it's gone and so, therefore,
18 my real estate values go up because there's no longer a
19 nuclear plant within 10 miles.

20 MR. SCHRADER: Exactly.

21 MR. KERN: Oh, okay.

22 MR. SCHRADER: That was our real estate.

23 MR. BROWN: Did anyone get that reference?

24 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: We got it. Weren't we
25 supposed to?

1 MR. BROWN: I just wondered if I was the only one
2 who saw the movie. Sorry about that.

3 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Now I -- now I know what
4 keeps you up at night.

5 MR. KERN: Because I'm trying to figure out, you
6 know, what's driving these numbers.

7 MR. QUINN: That's -- that's it, devaluating.

8 MR. KERN: Because I -- intuitively, I said, "Okay.
9 Why would people leave the region?" So I can't see
10 building new houses, you know, the new construction
11 portion of the housing market directly benefits from
12 decommissioning, so I'm looking at the -- on those
13 terms.

14 And then the idea of the employment about,
15 obviously, San Clemente and Oceanside probably are
16 going to be impacted the most about losing their jobs,
17 so I'd like to keep those local jobs in the region as
18 long as possible.

19 So, the people that work at San Onofre now in
20 those -- in those sectors, that are probably critical
21 sectors, you still have and I'd like to make sure that
22 they stay there as long as possible.

23 So the idea of having -- especially those
24 people that work with the nuclear fuel and work around
25 the nuclear fuel, I'd like to keep those people there

1 as long as possible.

2 And then as far as the deconstruction, you
3 know, whatever building trades, you know, they need,
4 that's fine. So I was just -- that was my concern,
5 those two things.

6 So, I still try to wrap my brain around the
7 real estate impacts, but I will -- I will try to figure
8 that one out.

9 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: So I had two questions, but
10 let me see if there are other questions.

11 I have two questions: One of them is about
12 this issue of the real estate impacts, because I've
13 always been weary of these big complicated models until
14 I really understand the assumptions that are going into
15 them.

16 So can you tell us, you have this kind of
17 cryptic language here that says, "Some studies claim
18 removal of nuclear facilities increases nearby home
19 value." That tells me that there's actually a debate
20 going on in the literature and that the assumptions
21 here aren't very robust.

22 And so I'm wondering, how much do we really
23 know about this? And is it true for removal of any
24 nuclear facility even if the fuel pad is still there,
25 the ISFSI is still there? Does it require the removal

1 of the fuel pad to get these improvements in real
2 estate? Help us understand just the state of the
3 economic science, enlighten us.

4 MR. SCHRADER: You're right to -- to -- to suggest
5 that there is some debate among the literature. We saw
6 that. We saw some studies that suggested that the
7 impacts would be negative after the removal of the
8 facility because of all the lost jobs, all the
9 high-income housing that would go away.

10 So, for our purposes, generally, we saw a
11 trend that looking at facilities that were removed,
12 there was a slight bump in home prices. It's not a --

13 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Once you correct for the fact
14 that there's an employment impact is what Jerry was
15 talking about.

16 MR. SCHRADER: Yeah, it's not a unilateral
17 assumption across the literature, though.

18 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Right.

19 MR. SCHRADER: As for the spent fuel, I can't
20 really speak to the uniqueness of our model relative to
21 the others; it really wasn't much of a concern. This
22 was more of a halo effect, a halo effect of the, as the
23 Mayor said, the proximity to the facility.

24 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I think it would be helpful,
25 without walking out too much, to get some sense of what

1 we really know about this because, you know, there's
2 similar studies that have looked at real estate values
3 near high-voltage power lines, and a variety of other
4 things, near refineries.

5 And I think, as we're moving forward on the
6 Consolidated Interim Storage, we want to know what
7 those benefits are going to be to the community.
8 Obviously, a lot of people want to get the fuel out of
9 here, for obvious reasons, but then there may also be
10 tangibly economic benefits that come from having it out
11 of here. And if we're able to put some numbers on
12 that, I think that would be very helpful.

13 So the second question I wanted to ask you is,
14 you have -- so there is this huge, albeit temporary,
15 impact on the entire country of 9-ish billion dollars
16 of which only half comes to California even though
17 California bears the brunt of the harm, as it were,
18 from not having the plant operational;

19 And, of the portion that goes to California,
20 only half of that go to San Diego County and Orange
21 County even though those counties bear the brunt of the
22 employment loss that we've just been talking about.

23 Is that just the way these models work because
24 of these recycling of income from the labor markets or
25 is there something that could be done to raise the

1 fraction of the benefits that flow to California or
2 raise the fraction of the benefits that flow to San
3 Diego County and Orange County?

4 MR. SCHRADER: There are two primary drivers of
5 that effect: The leakage effect, that I mentioned.

6 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: But that's intrinsic to the
7 way the economy operates.

8 MR. SCHRADER: Right. And, secondly, the
9 expenditure basis, where the expenditures are going.

10 So, in this case, a lot of expenditures are
11 out of state, a lot of expenditures are in Los Angeles
12 County, and that's what drives these impacts,
13 primarily.

14 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And then that's just about
15 where the laborers are who are employed?

16 MR. SCHRADER: Yes, and where the businesses are,
17 where spending is taking place.

18 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: So, every time an engineer
19 from out of state visits the plant, we ought to force
20 him to buy a Chicken Cesar salad or something like
21 that.

22 MR. SCHRADER: To generate those dollars, yeah,
23 local employers.

24 MR. KERN: Define regional, how big?

25 MR. BROWN: Two megawatts of power.

1 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: So I just think, you know,
2 Tom, as we come back to this issue, when we learn about
3 the general contractor and so on --

4 Oops, Siri is telling me. Sorry, Siri. Stop.

5 MR. KERN: So you mentioned L.A. a couple times.

6 What -- define what the region is that we're
7 talking about. Are we talking L.A. South or are we
8 talking just the Orange County/San Diego as the region?

9 MR. SCHRADER: Oh, it's the -- when I say
10 Los Angeles, I refer to the Los Angeles County,
11 specifically. It's primarily a county-based model and
12 then we build up from the counties to generate the
13 statewide --

14 MR. KERN: But when you're referencing region in
15 this document, you're talking Orange and San Diego
16 County?

17 MR. SCHRADER: Yeah, just the region of focus.

18 MR. BROWN: Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. I think, if we can --
20 if you can help us, both the economist and the
21 practical employers, help us understand, and the
22 communities, understand what we can do to raise these
23 fractions --

24 MR. SCHRADER: Right.

25 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- that flow back into local

1 communities, I think that's something that people care
2 about. We've seen this in the correspondence.

3 MR. SCHRADER: Right.

4 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: We care a lot about this and
5 I understand why that is.

6 Are there other questions or comments people
7 want to make? Ted Quinn?

8 MR. QUINN: Yeah. Just in summarizing, now we've
9 seen the numbers and I just -- it seems clear to me
10 that it's very important what Edison releases in terms
11 and conditions to the potential vendor, a large vendor,
12 as to what direction to encourage the use of local both
13 goods and services of any kind.

14 And, Tom, it seem -- I don't know if you're
15 doing that in the specs, but I sure hope you are.

16 MR. PALMISANO: We clearly have in terms of the
17 labor expectation.

18 MR. QUINN: Okay.

19 MR. PALMISANO: In goods and services, I need to
20 check to -- to look at what the company standard terms
21 and conditions are.

22 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: There might be some
23 interesting engineering subcontract and so on that
24 could really be beneficial.

25 MR. QUINN: Yeah, there's plenty of local talent.

1 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. I don't see any
2 other --

3 MR. PALMISANO: And just -- just let me add, with
4 the current vendors we use, and our vendor workforce is
5 ramping up, is we do our Cold and Dark mods and get
6 ready for the ISFSI expansion. They generally one,
7 No. 1, their trades are virtually all local, out of the
8 San Diego halls; and, secondly, they really value
9 former employees in a lot of respects because of their
10 knowledge of the site.

11 We have a number of former employees who will
12 come back with some of the vendors. So we do and
13 we've -- I've been able to be relaxed some company
14 rules along that to encourage that because it benefits
15 the employ -- the employee, the former employee, and it
16 benefits the contractor.

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

18 I think this has been a very helpful
19 conversation. Dustin, I want to thank you --

20 MR. SCHRADER: Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- both for the work that you
22 and your colleagues have done and also for making the
23 trip out here and spending some time with us. It's
24 been quite informative.

25 And thank you, Tom --

1 MR. PALMISANO: Okay.

2 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- for helping to follow up
3 on this request that many Panel members have had, to
4 understand more about the economic impacts.

5 We're going to adjourn now for 10 minutes.

6 You can go visit the information booths over, they're
7 staffed, you can eat cold pizza, which is over there.
8 That's another solid option, and we'll be reconvening
9 in about 10 minutes.

10 (10-minute break was taken.)

11 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. We're going to resume
12 now. We have a brief conversation first about
13 Consolidated Interim Storage, an update on that. It's
14 become a major priority of many members of the
15 community and many members of the Community Engagement
16 Panel and then, after that, we're going to have the
17 public comment period.

18 So if you'd like to make a comment during the
19 public comment period, these three-minute comments,
20 please put your name on the list and the list at some
21 point will migrate up to me and then we will begin the
22 public comment period.

23 So I'd ask a few members of the panel to join
24 me and talk about their perspectives on what's happened
25 on the issue of Consolidated Interim Storage since the

1 last meeting.

2 I want to say, just using some slides, I want
3 to make a couple of introductory comments:

4 I want to just remind everybody that our
5 interest in advancing Consolidated Interim Storage is
6 really to focus on an area where I think almost
7 everybody shares the goal of removing the used fuel --
8 fuel, the spent fuel, from San Onofre as soon as
9 possible.

10 And Tom Palmisano, earlier tonight, gave us
11 some sense of, technologically, what the time lines
12 might be for that. Frankly, the technology here is not
13 the problem, it's the politics.

14 And part of our task here, to create emergency
15 around the need for this and build some public support
16 so that people see that this is not just some local's
17 special interest knishy topic, but it's actually an
18 important California priority and, therefore, an
19 important federal priority.

20 In the ideal world, you'd have a place to send
21 the spent fuel; that may or may not be a place like
22 Yucca Mountain, that may or may not be some new
23 technologies, like deep-bore hole technologies, that
24 Per Peterson has briefed this panel on twice now.

25 But absent some permanent place to send the

1 fuel, these private Consolidated Interim Storage
2 facilities, of which there are three in the works, two
3 in a pretty serious way right now: One in New Mexico,
4 South Eastern New Mexico, one in Western Texas, are
5 really interesting.

6 If we're going to make this happen, there are
7 critical political activities that need to happen on
8 the state and local level that this Panel is starting
9 to work on and we look for as much help from the
10 community in the same direction.

11 At the same time, we need to think about
12 what's happening at the federal level because it's
13 pretty clear, although not certain, that this can't
14 happen without a change in federal law. And until
15 very, very recently, the federal politics really were
16 not lined up to do this.

17 I think that's changing in Washington, and
18 I'll talk a little more about that in just a moment.
19 And then we need to also do the spadework and help the
20 state do the spadework so that all the elements of
21 what's necessary to make Consolidated Interim Storage a
22 reality, those elements come into place.

23 And there are several memos that this Panel
24 has been involved with, one most recently in late
25 August, that Tim Brown, Dan Stetson, and I put together

1 that gave an update on that.

2 I think, to make a long story short, what's
3 clear to me, at least, is that getting private
4 facilities built is -- is possibly the easiest part of
5 making Consolidated Interim Storage a reality.

6 There are a lot of other much harder problems.
7 And, in particular, the transportation issues are very
8 serious and need some work. So there's all kinds of
9 work that needs to happen, starting now, to try and
10 build some support for this.

11 So, what have we been doing since our last
12 meeting? And notably with Jerry Kern's help, and I'll
13 ask him to say a couple of words in just a moment,
14 we've had a number of briefings with local, elected
15 officials and staff.

16 We went and visited the San Diego County Board
17 of Supervisors, we went and visited the local staff of
18 Darrell Issa. We'll be in Washington at some point,
19 probably in the first quarter of next year to -- to see
20 Congressman Issa and the other political supporters of
21 new legislation in this area.

22 We have met with the former member of our
23 Community Engagement Panel, now state senator, Pat
24 Bates, also Rocky Chavez and Bill Brough. And we're
25 trying to understand what needs to happen in Sacramento

1 to make this a reality. I think we have the contours
2 of that right now, and I'm sure other people will talk
3 about this in a moment.

4 At the federal level, I think what's
5 interesting is that there is now growing interest on
6 both sides of the arrow, republicans and democrats
7 alike, to adopt new legislation that would amend the
8 Nuclear Waste Policy Act, that would allowed the
9 Department of Energy to take title to the fuel, as we
10 discussed earlier, that would allow companies, like
11 Edison, to contract with private companies to transport
12 and store the fuel.

13 It's all kinds of progress, at least, on paper
14 being made now on -- on options other than just relying
15 on Yucca Mountain.

16 I have also seen a massive shift inside the
17 Department of Energy. The Department of Energy is not
18 a super-nimble organization, so we've not yet seen
19 visibly and officially, but we've seen a very
20 interesting speech by Ernie Moniz, the Secretary of
21 Energy, in March.

22 We've seen a lot of shift in the staff level
23 and a lot of attention to this at the staff level and I
24 think we're actually going to start to see some formal
25 changes in policy in the coming months from the

1 Department of Energy.

2 So, you know, there's a lot of stars aligning
3 here. It's also frankly a very busy time in
4 Washington. The last couple of months have been very
5 distracting, at least, because there was no leadership
6 on the Republican side in the House; that's now just
7 changed recently.

8 But now we're about to have a Federal election
9 for president, so that's not a propitious time to adopt
10 new Federal law. But there's a lot of work and
11 churning going on on this topic on both the Republican
12 side and on the Democratic side.

13 And the last thing I'll say is, there's still
14 a lot of logistical work and spadework to be done, to
15 understand transportation routes, the Department of
16 Transportation has been involved with this; to
17 understand the state's strategy in this area, including
18 on transportation; and to learn the use of critical
19 local stakeholders, elected officials, environmental
20 groups, consumer groups, public interest groups, law
21 enforcement.

22 It's just incredibly important and so we're
23 spending a lot of time talking to people and we look
24 forward to learning more about this and then helping
25 where we can. So I'm going to stop there.

1 And maybe I can ask Jerry Kern first to talk
2 about your perspectives on what we've been doing over
3 the last few months, and then I am going to ask Tim
4 Brown to talk about this, from his perspective, and
5 then Garry Brown, who has been very helpful, along with
6 Dan Stetson, in reaching out to another -- a number of
7 the environmental groups, and Glenn Pascall may want to
8 comment at that point as well.

9 MR. KERN: Well, thank you.

10 Actually, my role of this is that I've been
11 basically facilitating meetings and David has been
12 coming. I introduce David, then I get out of the way.
13 You know, that's my -- you know, that's one of the good
14 things.

15 And like I told the County Board of
16 Supervisors, the less I talk, the smarter I sound. And
17 we let -- turn it over to David and Tom Palmisano to
18 give all the technical side of that.

19 David has really kind of hit on something:

20 That before we were all kind of in the same
21 boat, we were all rowing in different directions. I
22 think we're all still trying to get rowing in the same
23 direction. We're still out of sync on some things. We
24 need to bring everybody together to move in a forward
25 motion.

1 Congressman Issa's Bill, I think it's 3643.
2 Don't quote me on that. But that's online now. It's
3 been numbered. That number was just assigned, I think,
4 earlier this week.

5 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And, I think, if we have not
6 circulated it, we will circulate it --

7 MR. KERN: Yeah.

8 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- momentarily. I'm looking
9 for Manual Camargo.

10 MR. KERN: Yeah, so, but you can go on --

11 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yes.

12 MR. KERN: Was I right, Manuel? I guess --

13 MR. CAMARGO: I don't have the number, but we'll
14 forward it.

15 MR. KERN: Okay.

16 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: We will circulate it.

17 MR. KERN: So but it's still --

18 It just went to committee, it just got
19 chaptered. You can go on and read it. And, actually,
20 it is what -- what Tom Palmisano was talking about,
21 there's changing in existing laws, so there's a lot of
22 changes in paragraphs in existing laws. So if you read
23 through that, you'll see what those changes are.

24 With Yucca Mountain not longer a viable option
25 at this time, to have Department of Energy take control

1 over Consolidated Interim Storage is our goal and
2 that's what we really are aiming to do.

3 And Congressman Conaway, from Texas, who has
4 the facility in his district, and Congressman Issa,
5 plus a lot of congressmen from both sides of the isle,
6 are onboard to do this. So that's moving forward.

7 We met with the County Board of Supervisors,
8 Supervisor Ron Roberts and Dianne Jacobs, who were very
9 interested in this. David gave a presentation then,
10 along with Tom, about what we're trying to do to move
11 forward.

12 And then we did have a meeting at the -- in my
13 office, in Oceanside City Hall, with Pat Bates, Rocky
14 Chavez, and Bill Brough about what the state can do.
15 And, I think, out of that meeting, Senator Bates said
16 that they're going to form some type of ad hoc
17 committee or special committee in Sacramento to how
18 they can move it along.

19 Because what we -- the next big hurdle,
20 because we're moving towards the interim storage site,
21 and David eluded to this, is transportation. We have
22 the fuel in one spot, we need to move it to the other
23 spot. How do we get it there?

24 So that is going to be the next big hurdle
25 we're going to have to deal with and we'll continue to

1 facilitate meetings throughout the region and hopefully
2 we'll get everybody onboard and moving.

3 So if there's any input, especially from the
4 environmental community, let us know. I mean, we're
5 all accessible, you go online. And so whatever help
6 that you can give us once, the letters of support for
7 this bill, it would be really helpful.

8 Thank you, David.

9 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yeah. And I wanted to just
10 add to that, which is, Pat Bates told us that the root
11 for setting up, say, a special committee or something
12 in the legislature in Sacramento, that root is
13 straightforward if people see that there's actual local
14 interest in getting this done and pressure, and so
15 that's why we're spending so much time on this.

16 Tim Brown, do you want to comment about how
17 you see this from -- from local government perspective
18 and then I'm going to ask Garry Brown to comment, from
19 his perspective.

20 MR. BROWN: Well, I -- I -- I think, what has
21 become very clear to me is that time is not our friend
22 when it comes to these -- to the local interim storage
23 or to permanent storage solution.

24 It is in the nature of environmental
25 regulation for it to become easier in the future. And

1 so we have this waste that needs to be transported and
2 placed somewhere, and I can guarantee you that it's
3 going to be more difficult 10 years from now than it is
4 right now and even more challenging 20 years from now
5 than it is right now.

6 And so when we look at these transportation
7 hurdles, when we look at all these items that David has
8 so eloquently outlined for us is that, you know, the
9 most important time for us to act is right now to try
10 and align everything and create it so that the onus
11 isn't on the local communities or even, you know,
12 Edison to be able to be ready for decommissioning, but
13 that they were waiting on the Department of Energy and
14 the Federal Government for action.

15 You know -- and so, you know, I've -- I've
16 only noted this, in my experience, in -- in very short
17 time of public service, that things five years ago that
18 we would turn and look at from a planning and
19 environmental perspective have only increased in terms
20 of depth, complexity, and review.

21 And so, you know, when I -- when I look into
22 the future and I -- and I see what has to be done,
23 I've -- I'm concerned that this would lose steam, that
24 we get used to it being there and, ultimately, that it
25 becomes so problematic, it becomes so, so challenging

1 to move it, that it becomes entrenched and we -- we
2 won't have that opportunity in the future.

3 And so -- and so for me, in particular, and I
4 speak for, I think, for all the residents and no matter
5 where you stood on -- on the operation of the plant, I
6 think by one-hundred percent unanimous vote we can say
7 the waste doesn't belong here, it was never designed to
8 be here; it should be moved as soon as possible.

9 And I know, you know, our entire council is
10 aligned behind that. We've had several res --
11 resolutions that just said that, and I don't think it
12 would be a challenge for any city council in the
13 San Diego and Orange counties, that I think it would be
14 very easy to get similar resolutions passed.

15 And so, from my perspective, I love the
16 momentum, I love the energy, and I love the fact that
17 there's been so much good work done by my colleagues
18 here and I'd just like to see -- continue with it in a
19 great deal of energy.

20 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much.

21 And maybe during the public comment period, if
22 there are people from other towns and communities who
23 want to comment on what the resolutions they're passing
24 or discussions they've had.

25 We've had some very helpful discussion in

1 Laguna Beach last meeting of this Panel, that would be
2 great and useful.

3 Garry Brown, do you want to talk about how you
4 see these issues --

5 MR. BROWN: Sure.

6 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- to engage the
7 environmental community?

8 MR. BROWN: Sure. Thank you.

9 One thing I learned decades ago is, is you
10 never say you speak for the environmental community
11 because you can't. You can just go, talk to different
12 individuals, assimilate their opinions, and try to
13 communicate that; and that's what I've done.

14 I've talked to a number of executive directors
15 of -- of statewide organizations and I think -- I
16 think, the more local you are, the more interested you
17 are in the -- in the ultimate solution, which is to not
18 have spent fuel stored on the San Onofre site.

19 I mean, I -- I haven't talked to anybody that
20 really thinks that's a good idea. And people would
21 like it off as soon as possible. The reality then
22 comes in. What -- what are the options?

23 The best option is not available today, in
24 reality, to our understanding. And so that leaves, do
25 you keep it in the cold water pool or do you put it in

1 dry cask storage?

2 I think it's pretty much everybody's opinion.
3 I haven't talked to anybody who thinks a cold water
4 pool is as safe or safer than dry storage. So the
5 environmental community is pretty much coalesced behind
6 "Get it out of the pools and get it in dry storage."

7 Now, where that dry storage is, maybe there is
8 still room for debate. But I think on -- on local, on
9 the statewide basis, that's kind of where we are.

10 And, certainly, if that's your motivation
11 to -- to get spent fuel off the site and away from
12 here, then, you know, that Consolidated Interim Storage
13 looks attractive.

14 So then I went and I said, "Okay. We're not
15 going to get anywhere until -- unless we have federal
16 support, Federal legislation, and federal support from
17 environmental organizations as well."

18 So I -- I've called in and was lucky enough, I
19 talked to some individuals that -- that frequently and
20 regularly have testified before congressional hearing
21 committees on nuclear power and, probably, the most
22 well-noted is Geoff Fettus, who was the senior attorney
23 for NRDC (Natural Resources Defense Council) on all
24 things nuclear.

25 And I would suggest, and I'll -- Manuel will

1 electronically send you a copy, but just in May -- on
2 May 15th, he testified, in an 18-page paper, before
3 Congress on exactly the topic we're talking about, the
4 background of it, why Yucca Mountain is such a failure,
5 and what do we do going forward.

6 And so, you know, I think for, particularly,
7 the committee of panel members, I think it would be
8 valuable reading for you.

9 But on an national perspective, I think I
10 would probably describe the response to Consolidated
11 Interim Storage as somewhere between a "qualified no"
12 and "Hell no."

13 I think, though, it's not knee-jerk reaction,
14 it's basically well thought on some -- some premises.
15 One is that there is a thought that that basically the
16 federal repository system is broken, and so let's rush
17 to leap over that and go to Consolidated Interim
18 Storage.

19 The point they're making is that if we do that
20 successfully, then we will severe the core of
21 responsibility for the Federal Government ever
22 supply -- ever providing long-term repository.

23 And, by de facto, these interim storage
24 facilities will, in fact, become the long-term resting
25 place for spent nuclear fuel. And so if we do one

1 before the other is fixed or in the process of being
2 fixed, we're creating a disaster, and that pretty much
3 is -- is the feeling.

4 Now, I -- we've -- then I talked about
5 San Onofre specifically and, you know, we've heard the
6 term "stranded the spent fuel," and -- and their kind
7 of a different spin was, you know, "There is the thing
8 possibly stranded spent fuel, which is fuel out of a
9 decommission, it's closed down, shut down reactor
10 that's decommissioned, but should not be stored on that
11 site because of seismic, nuclear, tsunami, because of
12 other natural issues."

13 And maybe there's room for a pilot program to
14 transfer that. One suggestion was to transfer, and I
15 know that probably, Tom, it will set your hair on fire,
16 but -- but, basically, to other operating nuclear
17 facilities because they have the whole infrastructure
18 in place, regulatory people who know what they're doing
19 in oversight.

20 And so, you know, I -- there's a willingness
21 to work with, possibly, unique cases, what they want to
22 call stranded fuel, but to say are they going to jump
23 onboard for Consolidated Interim Storage without fixing
24 the federal repository problem, it's between "no" and
25 "Hell no."

1 I think the consensus is that -- that the
2 ultimate resting place, the ultimate solution is a
3 geologic facility or facilities and not a hardened
4 concrete, outdoor hardened facility, because nobody --
5 they're not designed to be the final resting place.

6 And the fear is, they will become the final
7 resting place if there's not tandem efforts
8 simultaneously going on to fix it.

9 So that led to my final question, basically:
10 Is the federal repository system fixable?

11 And there was a little hesitation, but
12 everybody that I talked to said, yes, it is. It -- it
13 takes -- we've got to get from the NRC having a hundred
14 percent of all the say-so and all the power to more of
15 a consensus-driven system; the states have to have a
16 say-so in an alternative other than just suing to stop.

17 And -- and the EPA (Environmental Protection
18 Agency) needs to have a role. And so they're saying,
19 you know, obviously, the Nuclear Waste Policy Act needs
20 to be amended, they say. But, you know, if the right
21 people came together and it was the right mood in
22 Congress, that it could be fixed. It could be put on
23 track.

24 The feeling of the nationwide environmental
25 community that -- and these guys have worked on this

1 all the time say, you know, "You can talk all you want,
2 Yucca Mountain is dead," and it's not because of one or
3 two politicians, it was politically cited. It was
4 originally cited by politics. Everything that's guided
5 Yucca Mountain has been politics, not science, not the
6 actual geological.

7 And then you get into things of a titanium
8 water barrier that would have to be built robotically
9 after you've put these in. They've never been even
10 designed, much less done. And so one example I was
11 given by an attorney, he said -- he just settled a
12 lawsuit that lasted four years with the NRC to
13 basically resolve three issues in the lawsuit.

14 And he said, "Right now there's some very
15 smart attorneys that have filed federal actions on
16 Yucca Mountain." And he said, "How many issues do you
17 think there are in that -- in that action?" And he
18 said, "Take a wild guess." And I said, "70."

19 He said, "higher." And I said "150." And he
20 said, "Higher." And I said, "I give up." And he said,
21 "300 issues are in that -- that lawsuit." And it just
22 took him three years to settle three issues.

23 And he said, "You know, I can tell you 10
24 different ways why Yucca Mountain is dead." But he
25 said, "You know, there is a path to go through there

1 and they would look at working with something on a more
2 of a pilot program instead of just a leap over the
3 federal repository." So that's kind of -- a whole
4 bunch of phone calls, a lot of conversations, but I
5 wanted to be as accurate as I could.

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

7 And please do circulate that testimony so we
8 can circulate it to the rest of the Panel.

9 I just want to underscore one point, which is,
10 that I learned in this process, is you cannot, at the
11 federal level, build a winning political coalition for
12 doing this unless you, at the same time, work on the
13 permanent repository.

14 MR. BROWN: Right.

15 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: This should not be seen as an
16 enemy of the permanent repository. They're compliments
17 and that's politically -- I mean, I think it's also a
18 good policy, but it's also essential politics at the
19 federal level.

20 We do have to go to our public comment period,
21 but I want to collect brief comments on this.

22 Pam? Pam Patterson, do you want to comment on
23 this?

24 MR. PARKER: I'd like to follow up on what --

25 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Go ahead. I'm going to give

1 the floor to Pam first.

2 MR. PARKER: Oh, I'm sorry. Did you -- excuse me.

3 Who did you call?

4 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Pam Patterson.

5 MR. PARKER: Oh, I'm sorry.

6 MS. PATTERSON: Thank you.

7 So I just wanted to give you my perspective of
8 the situation. The reality of the situation is, it's
9 not really what all this candy-coating is about, it's
10 that Southern California has created an ultrahazardous
11 condition via an ultrahazardous activity, which
12 absolutely has strict liability associated with it.

13 And there was no long-term planning, that I
14 can tell, that was even considered at the inception of
15 this project. So it's very similar to what the State
16 of California has done with respect to the drought
17 situation.

18 And most people understand that drought is
19 cyclical. So absolutely no long-term planning for a
20 drought or the next drought. It's not going on in the
21 State of Cal -- with the State of California.

22 I mean, really what they're -- their remedy is
23 "Stop drinking water and don't take showers," so that's
24 the State of California's long-term plan with drought.

25 So we've got inadequate storage. I got

1 involved with a situation about 12 years ago, where I
2 attended a hearing that was being held by the NRC
3 because San Onofre had had more than the automatic
4 shutdowns that they were able to have in a quarter.

5 And at the time what I was asking was -- and I
6 discussed the fact that there was inadequate storage
7 with respect -- respect to the spent fuel rods at that
8 time.

9 And so, in this case, we've already had public
10 acknowledgment that there is no intent to enforce the
11 no-fly zone despite the fact that we've already had
12 testimony before Congress that the terrorist --

13 Now, this was back, you know, around 2001,
14 when we were living in a much safer world --

15 -- that they were -- there was testimony that
16 the terrorists were saying "Hit the -- hit the nuclear
17 power plants." So, what we know is that although there
18 is a no-fly zone in effect, that I guess what they're
19 requiring -- are requiring is a 30-day written notice
20 from the FBI that -- that a jet is coming in and so
21 "Get ready to shoot it down," despite the fact that
22 Camp Pendleton is right there with everything required
23 to do so effectively and efficiently. So, I mean,
24 they're in the business of -- of shooting down
25 airplanes.

1 So when the last time I commented about this,
2 somebody here said, "Well, you don't want us to shoot
3 down an airplane?" And I was, like, "Yes, I do,"
4 because it would be a disaster bigger than Chernobyl if
5 something were to happen.

6 Now, we also know that we live in an
7 earthquake zone and so there's absolutely no planning
8 with respect to what happens if a disaster hits. So, I
9 guess what the planning is, is keep your fingers
10 crossed and then maybe nothing will happen and somehow
11 we can get these fuel rods put in somebody else's
12 backyard.

13 I'm sure they're looking forward to getting
14 that package in the mail. So it's a cavalier attitude
15 regarding our safety, the safety of our children and
16 our money. I mean, not to mention the 4.4 billion that
17 they just happened to confiscate for dissolving, which
18 quite frankly is a mess that they've created.

19 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: I'm -- I'm going to try to
20 keep this focused on the Consolidated Interim Storage
21 topic because we have --

22 MS. PATTERSON: I'm -- I'm --

23 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- to move on.

24 MS. PATTERSON: I actually -- because, quite
25 frankly, in my opinion, the way this Panel is chosen,

1 it's -- it's not meant to get a fair public hearing.

2 So I'm going to -- I'm going to keep until I'm
3 finished with my message here.

4 So -- so, what I want to know is, with respect
5 to the emergency planning that we have going on, I
6 mean, I think we should -- we all know that the biggest
7 issue is, how do we get everybody out of here?

8 So, what is that evacuation plan that -- that
9 you, I'm assuming, you have in place, but I'm pretty
10 sure you don't have it in place. How do you get all
11 these people out of here when we know that even on a
12 regular Saturday is gridlock, trying to get down the
13 freeway?

14 So -- so there is no planning with respect to
15 what happens if there is an accident here. I don't
16 really care that there's the potential that property
17 values are going to go up if we all survive the
18 situation.

19 What I really want, and this is what I asked
20 for 12 years ago, is an independent third-party, who is
21 qualified, has the qualifications to make the
22 assessment to look at the situation and come up with a
23 good emergency plan, if something were to happen.

24 But then, in addition to that, how can we,
25 what can we do to avert that from happening? And, of

1 course, obviously, earthquakes aren't that predictable,
2 so it's not like we can all get notice and we all go
3 somewhere else before a big earthquake hits.

4 So there's my experience -- and, actually, I
5 represent Children with Disabilities and I've been
6 fighting the State of California with the fact that
7 they're out of compliance with respect to the law.

8 My experience is that there's an insatious
9 relationship between regulatory bodies and the agencies
10 that they're supposed to be regulating. And I see that
11 here with the NRC, with the CPUC, and, obviously, with
12 the utility companies.

13 So I don't really know if I have any --
14 anything more to say except for the fact that I think
15 that people really need to look seriously about the
16 safety factor here.

17 And, I mean, I actually priced these outfits,
18 the nuclear -- nuclear outfits, back probably 12 years
19 ago, and they're probably like 750 dollars for one of
20 those suites, so if there was an accident that occurred
21 that, at least, we would be safe potentially until we
22 could get out of here.

23 But also one other thing that needs to be
24 understood is that grocery stores have, on average,
25 three days of food, okay, and that's with just regular

1 shopping.

2 So, imagine that there's this accident here,
3 so, absolutely, no supply trucks are going to be coming
4 in, so we're going to be out of food within three days.
5 And I want to know what the evacuation plan is.

6 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very much
7 for your comment. We're not --

8 MS. PATTERSON: You're welcome.

9 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: We've now eaten -- we've now
10 used 10 minutes of the public comment period, so we
11 will try to bring ourselves back on time.

12 I want to see if there's anything other -- any
13 one other urgent comments people want to make about the
14 agenda item right now, which is Consolidated Interim
15 Storage.

16 MR. PASCALL: David.

17 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: With exceptional brevity,
18 Glenn.

19 MR. PASCALL: With exceptional brevity, even though
20 I would be happy to yield the floor to Donna Boston to
21 talk about emergency procedures.

22 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: We've had some --

23 MR. PASCALL: But I will --

24 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: We've had some meetings on
25 that.

1 MR. PASCALL: Okay. Here's my --

2 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And we will come back to
3 emergency planning --

4 MR. PASCALL: Here's my -- yes. Well --

5 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- and the security of --

6 MR. PASCALL: For those of us who have not created
7 this time crunch, please give me just a moment.

8 I want to thank Chairman David and Garry Brown
9 for establishing the nexus between Consolidated Interim
10 Storage and long-term geologic repositories and that
11 makes life much easier for the Sierra Club.

12 Since 1983, we have supported long-term
13 geologic repositories and we view the failure of
14 movement toward that objective to be a national
15 tragedy; that still it's our first priority.

16 And let me just say, we appreciate your
17 goodwill in trying to restart the debate about safe
18 places to keep waste and we believe it should help
19 generate momentum that can be a benefit to restart the
20 search for a long-term repository.

21 And I just want to thank both of you for
22 establishing that nexus, because interim means interim
23 and if there's no ultimately storage, the term interim
24 has no meaning.

25 So, thank you for using that framework.

1 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: All right. Thank you very
2 much.

3 And I also want to assure Pam Patterson that,
4 in some earlier work of this Panel, we have focused a
5 lot on this issue of emergency planning and
6 preparedness.

7 We have raised the issues of security, and I
8 am working with Edison folks to figure out how we have
9 a public meeting about security, including aircraft
10 security that's in a non-classified format, so that's a
11 very important topic.

12 And why don't I take it as an item that I will
13 pull together the materials we've already discussed on
14 this and share them with you and then I will also
15 follow up with you as to how these issues of security
16 will be addressed.

17 MS. PATTERSON: Thank you. But please include the
18 evacuation plan in that.

19 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Of course.

20 MS. PATTERSON: I'll give you my card later.

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

22 Because the evacuation planning issues change
23 a lot when you move from an operational plant to a
24 decommissioned plant; that is the single most important
25 thing that we've learned from the briefings about this.

1 And I will collect those briefings and share
2 those with you. So, thank you very much.

3 We're going to move now to the public comment
4 period: First in our list, for a three-minute comment,
5 is Donna Gilmore, from sanonofresafety.org, and after
6 Donna is Roger Johnson.

7 MS. GILMORE: I want to speak about the California
8 Coastal Permit. I've given all the members of the
9 Panel a handout and I have these available for the
10 public. These are the reasons the Coastal Commit for
11 the permanent nuclear waste dump should be denied.

12 The Coastal Commission put a number of special
13 conditions on that permit. They -- they acknowledge
14 that the canisters that Edison has chosen cannot be
15 inspected for cracks. They acknowledge that they're
16 susceptible to cracks.

17 We also have Dr. Singh, who at this previous
18 meeting, said it isn't even practical to repair them
19 because it would just introduce another corrosion
20 factor.

21 And you cannot -- there is a NRC regulation,
22 you cannot transport the canisters with any cracks in
23 it, even partial cracks. And, right now, we can't
24 inspect even see if there are any.

25 So I still have my same recommendation that

1 will solve these problems: You use thick cask
2 technology. It is currently licensed in the
3 United States. The NRC has elicited a number of thick
4 casks that are -- it isn't the German cask, it's the
5 AREVA cask.

6 Fukushima used a thick cask, it survived the
7 earthquakes, it survived the tsunamis. It is not too
8 late to make this decision. We still got that
9 4 million dollar pot of money, sitting there. It
10 hasn't been authorized yet.

11 We still have time to procure thick casks that
12 are proven. They are transportable. They're used all
13 the time in Europe to transport waste. They don't
14 crack. They can monitor waste. They can be
15 maintained.

16 You will not need the special conditions. The
17 Coastal Commission put on special conditions that says,
18 "Well, since you can't do this now, since you can't
19 inspect and maintain them now, we'll give you 20 years
20 before you have to tell us how to do that."

21 I mean, it's a nonsen -- nonsensical special
22 permit -- special conditions that were granted. And
23 there is a process for getting the Coastal commit --
24 Commission to revoke that. And I urge everyone to get
25 involved in that process.

1 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very much
2 for your comment.

3 And, as in meetings past, Tim Brown and Dan
4 Stetson, in spirit, are collecting the major themes and
5 we'll come -- cycle back on those at the end and
6 identify action items.

7 Next is Roger Johnson and after that is Rob
8 Howard.

9 Roger Johnson, the floor is yours.

10 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. Good evening.

11 Several weeks ago, I corresponded with
12 Professor Victor about the National Academy of
13 Science's Cancer Study, which was recently cancelled to
14 be done here in this area.

15 This is not a -- this is a local problem for
16 us because it would've been done here, but it's also a
17 national problem. There's 47 million people who live
18 within 30 miles of a nuclear power plant, 112 million
19 within 50 miles of a nuclear power plant.

20 Right here, 2 1/2 million people live within
21 30 miles of San Onofre. In California, the leading
22 cause of death in children is cancer, 150,000 new cases
23 of cancer every year in California.

24 Not everybody knows that there are many causes
25 of cancer and there's many sources of radiation. But

1 additional radiation can be troublesome and this is an
2 issue, which is very controversial and it's always
3 been.

4 So it was studied, in this country, in 1990 by
5 the National Cancer Institute and they did a study of
6 this and they found -- they could not find a cancer
7 link. But every scientist knows that failure to find
8 an effect does not prove there's no effect.

9 Statisticians will say you can't prove a no-hypothesis.

10 So we really don't know. But, meanwhile,
11 there have been -- the problem with that study, there's
12 a lot of problems with it. But, first of all, they
13 studied only deaths, they did not study cancer
14 incidents.

15 They studied where people died, they did not
16 study where they worked or lived. And they also
17 averaged in people who lived far away from a nuclear
18 power plant from those who lived close by, so it's not
19 surprising they didn't get any effect.

20 Since then, there'd been a number of studies
21 in England, France, and Germany, which are much better
22 studies and they did find that children living near a
23 nuclear power plant doubled the risk of cancer.

24 In October, a month ago, the British Journal
25 of Medicine reported a study of 407,000 employees in

1 nuclear power facilities and they reported a
2 significant rise -- cause of rise in cancer from low
3 doses or radiation.

4 And the International Agency for Research on
5 Cancer stated that this study strengthens evidence of a
6 causal relationship between cellular cancer and
7 exposure to low doses of ionizing radiation.

8 And I said, "This is not just a problem for
9 the nuclear workers, it's a problem for all of us." So
10 the NRC commissioned the National Academy of Scientists
11 to do a study in 2010. In 2012, they came up with a
12 500-page document that said it can be studied and it
13 should be studied.

14 Then the NRC commissioned them to go back, to
15 come up with a proposal to do a study. They did that;
16 it was announced last January. And then on
17 September 8th, a few months ago, the NRC decided they
18 don't want to do the study after all.

19 So I'm asking if the NR -- if the CEP would
20 consider this petition to write a letter to the NRC and
21 ask if they'd reconsider their decision of canceling
22 this -- this important study.

23 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you very much
24 for your comment. And we'll come back to that. I'd
25 also like Ted Quinn later, after this, to comment on

1 this as he's been following the study very closely.

2 Rob Howard and then Ray Lutz.

3 MR. HOWARD: Rob Howard, Business Manager, Utility
4 Workers Union Local 246, representing a number of
5 employees at San Onofre, including the Operations
6 Department and Maintenance workers as well as the
7 administrative staff.

8 Based on today's or tonight's meeting, I had a
9 number of other comments I wanted to discuss, but I'll
10 focus on specifically the contracting of local
11 contractors.

12 Contracting local contractors is something
13 that the process is pretty laid out:

14 You send out the request for proposals; you
15 see who has the qualifications to do it or not; and
16 from that, you select who you believe to be the best to
17 do the job.

18 Based on tonight, I want to emphasize a couple
19 of things. When you are the individual writing a check
20 to have a service done, you have a lot of control. So
21 I'm requesting that San Onofre take the time to ensure
22 that when they are writing these contracting checks,
23 that there is an emphasis on local hires, local
24 companies.

25 An example is: We currently have someone on

1 site, a contractor, doing document management. This is
2 work that our employees, our members, have done for
3 years, yet those employees are laid off and we hired a
4 company -- it was San Onofre -- hired a company to do
5 that work.

6 My issue with that is, that the individuals
7 doing that work are going to be people who are rehire
8 when in-house employees can do that work with minimal
9 training.

10 So my concern is that we stress to San Onofre
11 to ensure that, if we're going to do contracting, that
12 that contracting requirements that there'd be an
13 emphasis on local hiring.

14 And no one is talking about someone doing
15 something that's not qualified, that's not what I'm
16 talking about.

17 Because, a lot of that work, besides the
18 laborer work, can be done in-house, can be done with
19 local contractors, which, as you talked about having a
20 balance on how to increase the amount of local money
21 that stays here, how the contracting is done can
22 greatly increase that.

23 But it takes work and you have to be willing
24 to do that work and you have to have a passion about
25 it. And I am here to put or add to the pressure to do

1 that. Because if we don't apply that pressure, the
2 process goes on without our support and our emphasis on
3 what's important to us.

4 The money is in the decommissioning fund.
5 local residents -- put that money there. We ought to
6 do everything we can to recycle those dollars in
7 San Clemente, my City of Oceanside, and the surrounding
8 community.

9 I believe you would be surprised of how much
10 expertise is actually available, if we focus on
11 ensuring that that money be spent locally.

12 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: All right. Thank you very
13 much for your comment.

14 Next is Ray Lutz and then Jennifer Massey.

15 Ray Lutz, the floor is yours.

16 And I saw, by the way, you sent a document
17 earlier tonight, which I will make sure is circulated
18 to the CEP.

19 MR. LUTZ: Thank you.

20 Ray Lutz, with Citizens' Oversight.

21 Now, this nuclear storage facility that
22 they're building, planning to build, I heard something
23 from some of the members here, I think, is correct.
24 Once this thing is put in, it's probably never going to
25 come out. It's going to be really difficult to get it

1 to leave.

2 It is probably one of the worst places on
3 earth you could choose within 100 feet of the seawall,
4 only inches above the ground water.

5 You know, if you ask human beings what are you
6 doing here? Are you really thinking? It's hard to
7 believe any thought went into this.

8 Well, so we want to stop this and delay it.
9 The fuel pools are not unsafe here like a lot of
10 plants, which are up three stories high, like the
11 Fukushima. These fuel pools are in the ground and
12 relatively safe compared to a lot of them.

13 There's 38 plants in the United State where
14 they're three stories up. Those are ridiculous. This
15 one -- these fuel pools are not bad. And there is good
16 reasons to delay this project. There's many things
17 that are on the cusp of happening right now.

18 These interim storage facilities, the
19 transportation issues, the size canister that they're
20 putting in are too big for final disposal. They're not
21 easy to transport on a regular railroad cart, they're
22 too big.

23 They're trying to standardize on a -- the size
24 of canisters right now at the Nuclear Waste Technical
25 Review Board. They think this is going to happen

1 within the next few months or years. It's going --
2 it's happening right now.

3 So, to build this, right now, and to say
4 "We've got the plan right now," without thinking ahead
5 and say "How are we going to move it? Where are we
6 going to put it? Is this the best place or are there
7 other alternatives?" It's insane.

8 I was disappointed. That, I asked the Chair
9 of this committee to distribute information about the
10 meeting on the Coastal Commission. It was not
11 announced on your page. It's a very significant event
12 in the decommissioning plan.

13 This should've been announced and everyone
14 should've known about this meeting. I asked that it be
15 distributed and it didn't happen.

16 So you can answer that when you get a chance.

17 We have filed a petition with the State
18 Superior Court to stop the approval of this interim
19 waste facility, for many reasons, and you can read them
20 all in here. This is the document we were just talking
21 about.

22 We would like everybody, who is concerned
23 about this insanity, to come onboard and sign it. You
24 can become a plaintiff in the case. It doesn't take
25 any work to do that. So, please --

1 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much for your
2 comment.

3 MR. LUTZ: -- contact me, if you'd like more
4 information. And you'll get it from David Victor.

5 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank -- thank you very much
6 for your comment, Ray Lutz.

7 Next Jennifer Massey and then Richard Gardner.

8 MS. MASSEY: Thank you very much.

9 I've just been away for five and a half
10 months; just got back. So, actually, I'm not quite as
11 current as my -- some of my friends here.

12 So I'd like to know if any of decommissioning
13 San Onofre Safety people would like to speak further
14 and have my three minutes. Anybody? No? Anybody?

15 Okay. I did hear you, Dr. Victor, I think,
16 you asked for some help from the audience, and could
17 you repeat that? What -- what can we -- we, who want
18 it out so badly, what can we do to help you or help get
19 this accomplished?

20 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: So let me just briefly answer
21 that, because I'm trying not to have a lot of
22 back-and-forth during this segment of the meeting.

23 MS. MASSEY: Oh, I'm sorry.

24 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: But -- but this is a very
25 important question. There are, in addition to the

1 national environmental groups that Garry Brown talked
2 about, there are a lot of very important local
3 stakeholders, some of them are organized environmental
4 groups, some of them are organized for other purposes,
5 most of them don't know about Consolidated Interim
6 Storage, and they don't know how this could play a
7 role.

8 And so if you and your colleagues have people
9 we should talk to, organizations we can help brief,
10 ways that we can help generate, whether it's petitions
11 or resolutions in town councils and other places to
12 demonstrate public concern about this and then connect
13 it to a practical course of action; that's what --
14 that's the help that I'm -- that I think we're asking
15 for.

16 MS. MASSEY: Can you help us a little bit with your
17 concept or the Panel's concept of practical solution?

18 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yes. So let me -- let me
19 suggest that offline you and I exchange emails and I
20 will share with you the memo that this Panel has put
21 together that outlines what that means in practice in
22 California and how we can move to connect --

23 MS. MASSEY: Thank you very much.

24 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- the next steps.

25 And with your permission, Garry, maybe I can

1 share our correspondence --

2 MR. BROWN: Sure. Sure.

3 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- on the same issue, because
4 that lays out some of the details --

5 MR. PALMISANO: I agree.

6 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- and the relevant documents
7 and so on. In fact, I will share that with the entire
8 Panel.

9 So next on my list --

10 Thank you very much.

11 Next on my list is Richard Gardner and then
12 Mar -- Marni Magda.

13 MR. GARDNER: Good evening.

14 I wanted to come again and maybe give a brief
15 update on what minimal amount of progress I've had.
16 You may remember that I spoke to this group and
17 suggested that the turbine buildings could be utilized
18 for a public benefit, perhaps housing reverse osmosis,
19 ocean desalination facility.

20 And I pointed out that that way there would be
21 water for the Marine Corps. They wouldn't have to be
22 dependent on an offer for this probably already being
23 drawn down.

24 South Orange County is without aquifer, so we
25 are completely dependent on imported water, 90 percent

1 plus. The idea is that when it gets bad, if it doesn't
2 rain much this winter, then California Central Valley
3 grows your food, your vegetables, and the Imperial
4 Valley, we could have a major problem with lack of food
5 supplies pricing up. And it would be a different kind
6 of problem.

7 And so at that point, they'll say "How fast?"
8 You know, perhaps Carlsbad plant would be online. And
9 this plant will serve people who don't have an
10 alternative source of water.

11 So, I look at this as a potential benefit. It
12 cost 134 million dollars to demo the turbine buildings.
13 So, obviously, Southern Cal Edison would get a benefit
14 by not having to do the demo.

15 And the water authority that took over the
16 building of the RO(Reverse Osmosis) facility would not
17 have to build the building and they will save another
18 100 million dollars.

19 Now, the Department of Navy would have to step
20 in and say, "Well, California does more than just
21 supplies of carrots and veggies and nuts and berries,
22 they're feeding the whole country. So, maybe it's okay
23 to have the turbine buildings, a small portion, still
24 utilized."

25 Now, environmentally, as you may remember the

1 email to Rick Wilson and some of the other surf-riders,
2 the concept is that the 14-foot diameter intake pipes
3 would have well casings laid in them and then they'll
4 be buried in sand, so it would be a large sand -- a
5 sand filter and there would be no plankton or any take
6 of ocean life, and I think we can make that work.

7 And there's 5,000 foot outfall that has
8 diffusers on it already. We have a reservoir, the
9 Chiquita Reservoir, that could hold some of the water
10 and it could also be connected to the line that brings
11 water to San Onofre now. So it might work real well.
12 That's my effort. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Great. Thank you very much
14 for your comment and for your efforts.

15 Marni Magda and then Marilyn Fuss.

16 MS. MAGDA: Thank you for being here.

17 And I'm very sad that so few of us in the
18 public are here. I hope you will start announcing this
19 in newspapers and give us reminders a month in advance
20 and not just a week in advance and then maybe more
21 people will be here.

22 Because, it's really devastating that --
23 there's so much information here that everyone needs.

24 My biggest concern is that there are so few
25 people in Southern California who know what's

1 happening. No matter how many times I try and write
2 and put it in the newspaper, and when you talk to the
3 public, they don't know. So I would ask this panel to
4 start getting a way to promote the ideas that we're
5 hearing here.

6 Garry, thank you for your report. I hope that
7 you will let everyone in the environmental committee --
8 community know that that contract, that is interim, is
9 a 100-year contract.

10 And I know we want final. But I also know
11 that it's essential that we don't put something
12 somewhere and then get blackmailed at the cost of it.

13 So it's an incredible possibility. Who -- I
14 would ask all of you, how do we get this organized and
15 moved? We have to have someone right now mapping from
16 San Onofre to Texas and New Mexico the railroads.

17 The only way we're going to get already
18 environmental committee -- community is going up to try
19 and stop it going through anybody's town out of the
20 fear. So, you know, I get these emails.

21 So, what we have to do is be proactive, to
22 start reaching the people every city it will go
23 through, where a 250 ton canister and an escort cart,
24 being designed right now, to take Holtec out of here by
25 2020 every single one of the canisters gone.

1 Let's get it done. But we need the map now.
2 We need to start meeting with every official along that
3 train track to New Mexico, to start saying, "If you let
4 us have permission to get this out of here, we will
5 give you this infrastructure change the Federal
6 Government will provide.

7 Your railroad will be upgraded, your bridges
8 upgraded, your way to get your city to have
9 transportation forever will be fixed now. You'll get
10 the money."

11 And we've got to have someone whose name is on
12 that, to get the committee together and not wait even
13 another year. So I know I'm going to run out of time.
14 There's so many things tonight that I hope we will
15 continue to work together on.

16 We have to get this bill of interim storage
17 passed both at the senate fed -- Feinstein's bill and
18 Darrell Issa's bill and we've got to have -- I mean, I
19 don't even know the numbers tonight.

20 That should be the main thing that the Press
21 starts hearing: The fuel can't be moved until that
22 bill is passed.

23 We have to pass that bill right now. And
24 we've got to turn the minds of people who are opposing
25 it because we cannot afford to leave our fuel sitting

1 for hundreds of years as the reactors, where it is
2 right now.

3 So, thank you for your time. Help me help
4 you. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Great. Thank you very much.
6 And it's HR3643. At least, we know the number now.
7 Thank you very much for your comment.

8 Marilyn Fuss and then Daryl Gale after.

9 Marilyn Fuss.

10 MS. FUSS: I'm Marilyn Fuss, from Los Angeles.

11 And the Poet John Donne wrote that, "No man is
12 an island entire of itself; every man is piece of the
13 continent, and a part of the man."

14 These brilliant Cornishes of phrase, from 400
15 years ago, have become commonplace, turned into cliches
16 due to the sensory overload of this Century and, worse,
17 due to our denial, to really recognize that we're
18 poisoning our air, our soil, our fresh water, and that
19 of everybody else.

20 Here, near San Onofre, and up at Diablo
21 Canyon, we've also ruined our salt water and sand, home
22 to countless species of every class of animals, not to
23 mention dens, canopies of diverse plants.

24 Tin drums of nuclear waste, sitting on any
25 beach, should be prohibited by an internal accord,

1 because coastal storms, tsunamis, melting ice caps,
2 daily tides, and some other things that some people
3 have mentioned already, make beaches the most
4 changeable places on earth.

5 Fukushima has long since made its way here in
6 the form of fallout by air and sea. Why would we ever
7 think of talk -- of taking chances with nuclear
8 pollution being released from substandard canisters
9 after witnessing what was released in Fukushima?

10 This isn't a case of "Not in my backyard, but
11 not on any yard, not on any -- not on any beach."
12 It'll have to be in some yard unfortunately. But not
13 on any beach, on any continent, each of which is a
14 piece of the same world and us.

15 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much for
16 your -- for your comment.

17 Next is Daryl Gale and then Richard McPherson.

18 How I do pronounce your name?

19 MS. GALE: Daryl.

20 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay.

21 MS. GALE: Hi. I'm also from Los Angeles. I come
22 down here on the train and I come here regularly as
23 much as possible because I really am very concerned
24 about discussion of these issues, and this is not just
25 a local area that's going to be affected; all of

1 California will be affected if there is any kind of
2 major problem.

3 In Los Angeles, I go regularly to seminars at
4 UCLA, monthly seminars, on environmental topics. And
5 I'd like to -- you to consider some of these other
6 topics that may impinge upon all this waste.

7 We talk about water at these seminars. And
8 climate scientists have spoken to us there about it's
9 very, very possible that there will be a very severe
10 El Nino. So we will be -- we need rain, our aquifers
11 are dry, all over California.

12 So we really need this water. We need to
13 store this water. But these -- there could be some
14 very severe storms, so I'm concerned about that.

15 And I'm also familiar with some recent papers
16 by Dr. James Hansen, formerly of NO -- of NASA and now
17 at Columbia University, he's talked about sea level
18 rise because of the glaciers calving, and specially in
19 West Antarctic and in Greenland Ice Sheets.

20 He says that all the coastal areas in this
21 century will probably become dysfunctional to life in
22 as possibly as early as the next 50 years, as much as
23 of 5 meter sea level rise. So you can check out his
24 topics. He's on YouTube. He's on CNN.com. You don't
25 have to read his highly intelligent paper.

1 TEPCO thought that when they cited Fukushima
2 high up it was, you know, safe enough and it wouldn't
3 be, you know, bothered by, you know, any kinds of
4 tsunamis or storms. Well, they were wrong.

5 I'm really concerned about two things for this
6 area: I'm concerned about storms, I'm concerned about
7 El Nino and what is going to do to the current
8 situation of the, you know, water infiltration on waste
9 that is currently there and, you know, what's going on
10 with the plant there.

11 And I'm also very concerned about if we are
12 going to be underwater around the Coast in the next 20
13 to 30 years, and there is some kind of interim storage
14 there, how are we going to move it when it's under
15 water. So that's why I came. Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Great. Thank you very much
17 for your comment.

18 Jim Hansen is here in San Diego today.

19 Richard McPherson and then Daniel Dominguez.

20 MR. MCPHERSON: David, thank you.

21 I think a lot of -- I've heard a lot of
22 NEI(Nuclear Energy Institute) nuclear people and people
23 even at this panel talk about concerns over radiation,
24 and the radiation is harmful to us.

25 Does everybody -- does anybody here think that

1 any amount of radiation is harmful to you?

2 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: You should make your comment
3 and --

4 MR. MCPHERSON: My comment is simple. I just -- I
5 have prostate cancer and I just underwent two months of
6 radiation treatment. I had -- four times I had 13
7 needles put in me with isotopes put directly into my
8 prostate, four times. I then went through daily
9 radiation treatments for the last couple of months.

10 And I'm here to tell you that after 52 years
11 in nuclear power, in one way or another, that I know
12 firsthand that radiation can be very beneficial.

13 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you very much for your
14 comment.

15 Daniel Dominguez. And this is the last public
16 comment and then we have a number of items that we have
17 to collect and report out on.

18 The floor is yours.

19 MR. DOMINGUEZ: Daniel Dominguez, Vice-President of
20 Utility Workers Union of America.

21 I'll keep my comments brief. Our members have
22 worked at the San Onofre plant since the 60s; our
23 commitment when the plants were running was to protect
24 the health and safety of the public.

25 That commitment has not changed since now that

1 we're decommissioning Units 2 and 3. As long as our
2 members remain at the site, our commitment will still
3 remain to protect the health and safety of the public.

4 And the other thing I'd like to mention is
5 that, you know, we've -- our members have worked there
6 for -- since the 60s. I think, Unit 1 came online in
7 '68. And, you know, we -- we monitored our members'
8 health and stuff and the inci -- I know there's been
9 discussion on cancers.

10 The cancer rate for our membership is well
11 within the norms of whatever the general population is.
12 And so there's not been any specific high incidents of
13 cancer.

14 And I'm probably going to get in trouble
15 because I'm going to put my wife on the spot, that she
16 works at the plant and she worked there up until her
17 ninth month of pregnancy with both my sons and the only
18 problems is that we can't get our sons to clean their
19 rooms; that's about it. That's the only effect, I
20 think, it came out of her working there.

21 So with that, thank you very much.

22 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Thank you. Thank you very
23 much for your comment. This has been a very helpful
24 public comment period. A large number of issues have
25 been raised.

1 I want to ask Tim Brown, if you could go
2 through the many items and read them into the record
3 and then also there are a handful of items where I
4 would like other members of the Panel to comment or
5 indicate follow up.

6 MR. BROWN: I'm going to -- I'm going to touch on a
7 few highlights that folks brought up that may be worth
8 addressing and it's purely your discretion:

9 First of all, the Coastal -- the Coastal
10 Commission action, which was taken. There was concern
11 that it wasn't notified or information wasn't given on
12 our website and then also some concern about the
13 approvals and the process they went through.

14 Do you want me to go through them?

15 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Do you want -- let me just
16 comment on that very briefly. I appreciate very much,
17 first of all, there were the approvals from the Coastal
18 Commission.

19 Why don't we share those with the Panel so
20 everybody can see both the approval but then, also, as
21 Donna Gilmore pointed out, the conditions on that and
22 then that way everybody can understand this?

23 I appreciate the vigor with which Ray Lutz has
24 made his case and has been active on these issues, from
25 the very beginning. I think the first time Ray and I

1 met we agreed on some things and disagreed on many
2 things and I appreciate that dialogue.

3 I do want to point out that the Coastal
4 Commission is ran by adults, and they have their own
5 mechanism, including the mail, and all kinds of ways of
6 reaching out to the public, to tell people about their
7 meetings, and this is a group of volunteers, so we
8 can't be doing the advertising for every Coastal
9 Commission meeting.

10 I do recall receiving an email from you, Ray,
11 asking me to put this information up on the website. I
12 went back and checked the time stamp. You sent it to
13 me on a Sunday evening at 7:49 p.m. for a meeting that
14 was being held on Tuesday morning.

15 I was not sitting in front of my computer at
16 7:49 p.m. on a Sunday evening, waiting to advertise
17 meetings to the world.

18 And so I really think all of us that work very
19 hard to be fair to each other and the way we've
20 represented other people's actions and views, and I
21 don't think that that's a fair characterization of what
22 I have done here, so I really did not appreciate that.

23 Next on the list.

24 MR. BROWN: The next item is the NAS(National
25 Academy of Science Study) Cancer study, the viability

1 of it, the action to restart the study.

2 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yeah. Can I ask, Ted Quinn,
3 you've been to many of their meetings. Can you tell
4 us --

5 MR. QUINN: Sure.

6 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- what the state of play is
7 there?

8 MR. QUINN: Sure. You know, I'd like -- I'd like
9 to go over, I also support additional research in -- in
10 nuclear medicine. I was surprised by the proposal by
11 Mr. Johnson there on additional -- on going back to the
12 study that's already been conducted.

13 To be real frank, the best science --
14 scientists that I've worked with and are currently
15 advising the NRC is to start a different study with a
16 different set of methods that goes to the cellular
17 level.

18 So, why is it so important? Because what's
19 being analyzed now is that the DNA process at the
20 cellular level is what's critical and important, it's
21 not the statistical analysis.

22 So I'll read what the National Academy said
23 that, finally, this effort that they conclude "may not
24 have adequate statistical power to detect and pursue
25 small increases in cancer risk." They said it was a

1 flawed study.

2 What I do support, with Mr. Johnson, is to --
3 and I'll write my own letter. It doesn't have to be.
4 I know you have -- you have limits. But I'll write a
5 letter to the NRC to support, and to the DOE, which
6 used to -- used to perform these activities as well,
7 and I'd like to meet with you afterwards because I
8 firmly believe there are better technology efforts and
9 research that can be done in answer to the question in
10 a more fact-based process.

11 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thank you.

12 And I do want to -- individual members of the
13 CEP should work bilaterally with Roger regarding the
14 petition that he's put in front of people, if they want
15 to sign that or modify for their own purposes.

16 One last item here, which is, when this issue
17 first came up and, in particular, the question of
18 statistical power, which is the key here from a
19 scientific point of view, I asked the experts on this
20 at the Electric Power Research Institute to share with
21 me their correspondence with the Nuclear Regulatory
22 Commission and with the Academy on this question and on
23 whether the study could be -- could be done at all.

24 And I have -- I've already circulated that
25 entire email thread and record to this Panel. But if

1 anybody would like to see it, I will make it -- it's
2 already a matter of public record, but I will make sure
3 that somebody -- that everybody has a copy of it.

4 Next on your list.

5 MR. BROWN: The union and -- the union and
6 organized labor concerns and questions regarding how do
7 we ensure that local work and vendors are included in
8 the decommissioning process; that was a refrain from a
9 few of our speakers.

10 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And I think the point made
11 that this is hard, but it needs work and diligent work.

12 Tom, is there anything further you want to say
13 about this? You've already commented about the
14 standards that are being applied to contractors.

15 MR. PALMISANO: Yes. Probably, it's best if I come
16 in when we got some time on the agenda to really talk
17 about what the contractors are doing and what we're
18 doing.

19 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. I think people would
20 really appreciate that.

21 MR. PALMISANO: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: And, you know, Marni Magda
23 made a very important point about not -- notice on
24 these meetings, so let me follow up with Manuel and
25 find out what --

1 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

2 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- we're actually doing,
3 because I think, on that topic, we want to make sure
4 notice gets out to -- to organized labor and other
5 constituencies --

6 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

7 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- that are often on here.

8 MR. PALMISANO: For the CEP meeting, we can take
9 the action to advertise these earlier and more clearly,
10 you know, and largely we do that on the Internet, but
11 we can take that action. So we'll work with you, as
12 Chair, to make sure we understand your expectations.

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

14 Next.

15 MR. BROWN: I think a question that was raised,
16 that it's worthy is, "Can we delay any permanent
17 construction of the ISFSI, all these other items, until
18 newer technologies develop and more decisions are made
19 regarding permanent or interim storage solutions?"

20 Effectively, can we push these decisions out
21 years down the road and so we're not pigeonholing
22 ourselves in a certain technology or build commitment?

23 I don't know if that's something we can
24 address, but I think, you know, it's worth discussing
25 or answering. You know, For example, I'll give the

1 scenario, let's decide that we want to keep everything
2 in the pools for five years while we figure out if
3 we're going to get interim storage solution and we
4 should build a different cask for that.

5 Tom, could you give us an idea of feasibility
6 or the wisdom of that?

7 MR. PALMISANO: Well, a couple of things: One of
8 the questions -- and if I can catch up with Ray Lutz
9 afterwards. This decision you said somebody's making
10 in the next several months, I'm not aware of that. I'd
11 be curious as to what the reference is.

12 The comments about the San Onofre spent fuel
13 pools: I've managed four other nuclear plants and
14 visited most of the plants in the country. These
15 fuels -- these spent fuel pools are robust and they're
16 built at ground level; they're better than the older
17 pools higher in the building.

18 But the general consensus in the industry, and
19 this is not just pro-nuclear people, it's people like
20 even concerned scientists, when you're permanently
21 closed, you should empty the fuel pools sooner rather
22 than later because a fuel pool contains, in our case,
23 1300-some assemblies each, one event can -- can affect
24 a pool adversely, it can affect 1300 assemblies as
25 opposed to a canister that can affect 24 or 32 or 37.

1 So, what I suggest, rather than just, you
2 know, go on ad hoc here, I can come back in with more
3 next updates and really talk about the basis for our
4 decision to empty the pools early, what the industry
5 research tells us both by pronuclear or antinuclear and
6 talk about why we've selected the strategy and timing
7 we have.

8 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Okay. Thanks. I think
9 that'll be good. I think these timelines have been
10 enormously helpful to help all of us understand what
11 needs to happen, when and --

12 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

13 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- why some things right now
14 aren't very urgent even though they don't have --

15 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

16 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: -- full consequences for a
17 decade or perhaps more.

18 MR. BROWN: I've just got one or two more. The
19 effect of El Nino in any summer -- any of these storms
20 that are coming up, it's -- it's something that I look
21 forward to because of the rain, but ultimately we keep
22 hearing about all these storms that are coming up, I
23 think it may be worth talking about the effect of
24 El Nino or any -- any weather event on, you know, our
25 efforts in decommissioning and on storage.

1 MR. PALMISANO: All right. Can I just mention
2 something very briefly? During the plant operating
3 period, we all had -- we had what we called "Seasonal
4 Readiness Work" we did to prepare the power plant for
5 the winter season, the rainy season, significant
6 El Ninos. This is done at San Onofre and across the
7 country.

8 We've have already started the reviews with
9 the -- the forecasts for a severe El Nino season coming
10 this year because one of the things beyond the
11 construction or deconstruction projects, the plant is
12 largely idle. There is still some things that are
13 energized that don't need to be, those things tend to
14 get wet and fault.

15 So that's one reason you hear me talking about
16 Cold and Dark and de-energizing everything to render
17 the plant as inert as you can, quite frankly.

18 We're also looking at plant construction work
19 through the El Nino season to make sure, if there's
20 excavations, like the San Diego synchronous condenser,
21 it's adequately protected in the event of heavy rains.

22 So we do that regularly and we're doing that
23 especially with respect to the ongoing construction
24 activities.

25 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: The data suggests this is

1 going to be an unbelievable El Nino.

2 MR. PALMISANO: Right.

3 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: It's really incredible.

4 Tim?

5 MR. BROWN: The last item is, there were a number
6 of -- of folks who wanted to say, how can we help
7 accomplish this? How can we get in touch with
8 communities along the route to, you know, raise
9 awareness, to raise concern?

10 And I think -- I think it will be worthwhile
11 maybe, David, if you'd like to speak succinctly about
12 what is the best thing that we could do to align
13 ourselves around removing the fuel inter -- interim
14 basis. Maybe there are some things we shouldn't be
15 doing, et cetera.

16 CHAIRMAN DR. VICTOR: Yeah. So I think, first of
17 all, at our next meeting, we should get an updated time
18 line scheduled so we understand what needs to happen
19 now and why certain things actually are more urgent
20 than they might originally appeal.

21 And my view of what we need to do over the
22 next few months is continue this process of talking
23 with as many groups as possible at the federal level
24 and especially at the local level and regional level
25 and we need to demonstrate conspicuous concern about

1 this fact to our elected representatives in Washington
2 and in Sacramento.

3 We will then follow up as that message gathers
4 steam, especially in Sacramento, to get the process
5 going at the state level.

6 We have heard that there may be hearings in
7 the spring or late winter on the Issa legislation. I
8 would be surprised that the Issa legislation is the
9 only piece of legislation at the federal level in the
10 House.

11 And if there are hearings, we will try to
12 inject ourselves into those hearings and get testimony
13 and contribute in any way. I think Jerry will attest
14 that we had a long and very productive discussion with
15 his staff here, locally.

16 And, I think, what I've learned is that these
17 are very complex issues and we've done a lot of work to
18 learn about them and people really appreciate that when
19 we're sharing that information.

20 MR. BROWN: One -- one -- one last thing about that
21 and just a comment:

22 Sometimes I get the feeling that a lot of
23 folks come here and aren't necessarily pleased with a
24 lot of the outcomes because it may not be as
25 fast-moving, as -- you know, as pushing for ideological

1 and political change.

2 But part of the important thing, in -- in
3 chatting with David and -- and Dan about this is, we
4 have to be a very sober and serious body to be taken
5 seriously by elected officials and the like.

6 And so as we contemplate these issues, we have
7 to really wrangle over the issues that matter, things
8 that are before us, and show that we have -- are
9 serious about what we're doing here, and then conveying
10 to the public and listening to our constituents.

11 And I, for one, am grateful for the direction
12 given, I'm grateful for the public comments, that help
13 us to -- to really understand what the public is
14 hearing and -- and what we need to bring to light in
15 future meetings. I'm encouraged by the direction.

16 And I just think, you know, I look at a lot of
17 the folks here, we're all volunteers, you know, and
18 we're here on our time because we believe that this is
19 an important issue.

20 And I'm grateful for all the energy and work
21 that goes into, you know, the different assignments and
22 then things in the questions in the study. I'm
23 encouraged by the direction.

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

25 I want to see if there are any other comments

1 members of the panel want to make before we adjourn.

2 Seeing none, we're adjourned for the evening.

3 And thank to all of you for coming out.

4 Please drive safely on your way home.

5

6 (Whereupon, the Community Engagement Panel

7 meeting concluded at 8:51 p.m.)

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, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2015.



CARLOS R. HICHO
CSR NO. 13111