

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, August 28, 2014, from 6:00-9:00 p.m. PDT in Oceanside, California

Meeting Minutes and Action Items

I) Community Engagement Panel Member Attendance

- a) Present: Dr. David Victor (CEP Chairman), Mayor Tim Brown (CEP Vice Chairman), Dan Stetson (CEP Secretary), Ted Quinn (American Nuclear Society), Valentine "Val" Macedo (Laborers' International Union of North America Local 89), City Council Member Jerome M. "Jerry" Kern (Oceanside), Gene Stone (Residents Organized for a Safe Environment), Dr. William Parker (University of California, Irvine), Supervisor Pat Bates (Orange County), Donna Boston (Orange County Sheriff's Department), Garry Brown (Orange County Coastkeeper)
- b) Absent: President John Alpay (Capistrano Unified School District Board of Trustees), Larry Rannals (Camp Pendleton), Supervisor Bill Horn (San Diego County), Jim Leach (South Orange County Economic Coalition), Mayor Pro Tem Larry Kramer (San Juan Capistrano), Mayor Lisa Bartlett (Dana Point), Rich Haydon (California State Parks)
- c) Southern California Edison Representatives: Tom Palmisano (VP and Chief Nuclear Officer), Chris Thompson (VP Decommissioning)

II) Convened by Dr. David Victor, CEP Chairman, at 6:15 p.m.

- a) Tonight's meeting, the third official meeting of the panel, will focus on the decommissioning plan, the Decommissioning Cost Estimate (DCE), the Environmental Impact Evaluation (EIE), and the Post Shutdown Decommissioning Activities Report (PSDAR). This will provide a strategic sense of what will be happening the next ten years and beyond.
- b) All documents can be found on the SONGScommunity.com website, as well as documents from prior meetings. The website includes live streaming as well as functions that enable the public to send messages to the CEP, request SCE speakers for community events, etc.
- c) Due to the long weekend a number of panel members are missing. We will follow up with them on the important issues from tonight's meeting.
- d) Hon. Tim Brown and Chairman Victor completed the panel survey and the results are posted on the SONGScommunity website. The panel is comfortable with how it's working and is interested in addressing a wide range of issues, such as emergency preparedness which is an important issue that will be addressed at an upcoming meeting.
- e) Hon. Tim Brown added that the Panel members missing from tonight's meeting have committed to reading all documents and being prepared for the October meeting.
- f) There appears to be confusion as to the role of the Panel. The CEP is not a decision making entity but a conduit of communication between the public and SCE. It's important to make sure that information flows between all parties.
- g) Panel comments will be collected so SCE can incorporate that feedback into filings.

III) Chris Thompson (VP of Decommissioning) – Decommissioning Core Principles and Values

- a) Our core principles and values are safety, stewardship, engagement
 - i) Safety of our workers, the community, and the natural environment
 - ii) Stewardship of the trust fund contributed to by ratepayers
 - iii) Engagement with the community,
 - For example, the Panel, which we intend to be a two-way conduit for information. We'll soon be filing a couple of major regulatory filings and the Panel has had the opportunity to review the documents and provide comments and feedback, which will be aggregated by Dan Stetson. SCE will take that feedback into consideration and share with the Panel the reasons for comments being incorporated or not.

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, August 28, 2014, from 6:00-9:00 p.m. PDT in Oceanside, California

Meeting Minutes and Action Items

- The Panel is one avenue of engagement and we will be offering public tours and providing speakers to talk about Decommissioning.

IV) Gene Stone (Residents Organized for a Safe Environment) – Summary of Ken Alex Meeting in Sacramento on August 14, 2014

- a) Shared testimony with five Senators as well as Energy Commission, Californian Coastal Commission, and the California Public Utilities Commission.
- b) Gene anticipates receiving an invitation to next year's Senate hearings.
- c) Gene Stone met with Mr. Ken Alex in the California Governor's Office on August 12th to discuss decommissioning and the panel's work. Mr. Alex was of the opinion that Governor Brown would not undertake a California Consolidation Plan because he believes it would be a 50-60 year effort.
- d) Gene stated that many members of the Panel and the public have shared with him their desire for SCE to slow down the decommissioning process, to ensure the best possible selection of canisters is made, to spend the money wisely, only once, and to avert another steam generator debacle like we had earlier, and to ensure the future safety of all of California.

V) Chairman Victor – Identification of Key Technical Issues

- a) At the last meeting we agreed that there were a large number of technical issues surrounding the selection of dry cask canisters and the kind of vendors and materials involved and these ultimately involve a huge amount of technical information. The panel agreed that Chairman Victor would work with interested members of the Panel and the public and identify key technical questions and work on providing answers to those questions. We've identified seven key technical questions and they are being routed amongst panel members. Chairman Victor is close to completing a draft literature review and summary for circulation to the Panel so we can figure out what to do next. The goal is to make it technically accurate but also understandable to average people.

VI) Tom Palmisano (VP and CNO of San Onofre) – Presentation on PSDAR, EIE, and DCE

- a) Post Shutdown Decommissioning Activities Report (PSDAR) is an approximately 50 page document that summarizes the Decommissioning plan, the EIE, and the DCE. The Panel has been provided the documents.
 - i) Basis and content of the PSDAR
 - The basis for the PSDAR is:
 - (a) 10 CFR 50.82 and NRC Reg Guide 1.185 Rev 1
 - (b) Review of recent decommissioning plants' PSDAR submittals to NRC from other utilities
 - The content includes:
 - (a) Description of the planned decommissioning activities
 - (b) Schedule for the completion of these activities
 - (c) Expected costs
 - (d) Discussion of environmental impacts
 - The plan will become more detailed as we progress
 - ii) PSDAR Review Process
 - SCE submits PSDAR for NRC review; copy sent to the State of California

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, August 28, 2014, from 6:00-9:00 p.m. PDT in Oceanside, California

Meeting Minutes and Action Items

- NRC reviews and confirms that the PSDAR is adequate and that it meets content requirements; the NRC will post the PSDAR publicly and put a notice in the Federal Register
 - PSDAR is made available for public review and comment
 - The NRC holds a public meeting to discuss the PSDAR; SCE will be present and will explain the PSDAR to the NRC and the public; the NRC will talk about their review and solicit comments from the public
 - (a) Dr. Bill Parker asked where the meeting will be held and Tom Palmisano stated the meeting would be held locally, in the vicinity of the plant, to make it accessible to the stakeholders
 - Major decommissioning activities may commence 90 days after the NRC receives the PSDAR
 - (a) The PSDAR is a living document; changes must be submitted to the NRC and the State of California; the PSDAR is updated as plans or conditions change and the NRC uses it for inspection planning; major changes to cost or sequence required a revision. Other plants have submitted maybe 3 or 4 updates in a 10- to 15-year period
 - Chairman Victor asked for examples of what other plants found in the way of major changes
 - (a) Tom Palmisano stated that major cost changes, change in sequence, or perhaps something like deciding not to remove a containment building, however deciding to use an underwater cutting tool instead of a laser tool is not something the NRC would be interested in
- iii) Decommissioning Plan – A lot of work has been done in the last 6 to 12 months on the initial plan; it is still somewhat high level and we have yet to hire a Decommissioning contractor who will come in and do the more detailed planning and that is still about a year away
- 20 year or less schedule
 - We are about a year away from a decommissioning vendor starting work
 - Phase 2, Decontamination & Dismantlement (D&D) is expected to start in 1st Quarter 2016; this is where we mobilize the Decommissioning contractor, start the detailed planning and begin the decontamination and dismantling phase
 - Ted Quinn asked if it would be possible to get larger versions of the schedules that are easier to read
 - (a) Tom Palmisano stated he would provide them in the future, 11 X 17 for the hard to read schedules
 - Decommissioning periods – There are three major categories:
 - (a) Slide 8 is a graphic of decommissioning periods shows how each period relates to others
 - Chairman Victor asked about the status of the Irradiated Fuel Management Plan (IFMP)
 - (a) Tom Palmisano stated the document was drafted, comments incorporated, and plan was pending final approval by the owners and he anticipated submittal to the NRC in the latter part of September

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, August 28, 2014, from 6:00-9:00 p.m. PDT in Oceanside, California

Meeting Minutes and Action Items

- Dr. Bill Parker asked what would happen if the government doesn't meet its plan for a repository and if SCE has been looking beyond that and has an alternate plan (contingency plan independent of the NRC requirements)
 - (a) Tom Palmisano stated that SCE does have a plan and will be discussing it at upcoming meetings
- Chairman Victor noted that the panel would revisit the subject in early 2015, including the lack of DOE facility
- Gene Stone asked if the contingency plans will include costs
 - (a) Tom Palmisano stated that he'll discuss what will occur if the DOE can't perform and he will talk holistically
- License termination (green on the graphic on page 8) – NRC regulated
 - (a) Period 1 – transition to decommissioning
 - (b) Period 2 – decommissioning planning and site modifications
 - (c) Period 3 – decommissioning preparations and reactor internal segmentation (July 2015 – June 2019)
 - (d) Period 4 – plant systems and large component removal
 - (e) Period 5 – building decontamination (2022-2024)
 - (f) Period 6 – license termination, building demolition (2024-2032) – 2 years before the end we submit a license termination plan to the NRC (public notice and public hearings)
- Spent Fuel Management (yellow on the graphic on page 8) – NRC regulated
 - (a) Spent Nuclear Fuel (SNF) Periods:
 - (i) Period 1 – spent fuel management transition
 - (ii) Period 2 – spent fuel transfer to dry storage (end of 2019 completed)
 - (iii) Period 3 – decommissioning units 1, 2, and 3
 - (iv) Period 4 – dry storage units 1, 2, and 3
 - (b) Spent Nuclear Fuel Decontamination & Dismantling Periods:
 - (i) Period 1 – ISFSI license termination
 - (ii) Period 2 – ISFSI demolition
- Site Restoration (red on the graphic on page 8) – Non-radiological Decommissioning (local, state and community)
 - (a) Period 1 – transition to site restoration
 - (b) Period 2 – building demolition during decommissioning
 - (c) Period 3 – subsurface demolition engineering & permitting
 - (d) Period 4 – building demolition to 3 feet below grade
 - (e) Period 5 – subgrade structure removal below -3 feet
 - (f) Period 6 – Final site restoration and lease termination
 - (i) Some plants return the site to green field, some leave structures in place as a non-radiological facility
- Chairman Victor commented that the PSDAR is the strategic document
- Ted Quinn asked about the current use of Units 2 & 3 offshore conduits and when they would no longer be needed
 - (a) Tom Palmisano stated that the staff is working to reduce the plant's use of ocean cooling; most uses will be eliminated by early 2016

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, August 28, 2014, from 6:00-9:00 p.m. PDT in Oceanside, California

Meeting Minutes and Action Items

- Dr. Bill Parker asked if the Decommissioning Period under “Site Restoration Periods”(slide 8) was restoration of the ISFSI pads
 - (a) Tom Palmisano confirmed it was final site restoration
 - Chairman Victor asked what the US Navy has requested
 - (a) Tom Palmisano stated that we are in early discussions with the Navy
 - (i) The easement dates back to the early 1960’s and includes non-specific language
 - (ii) Plan is to meet all the regulatory requirements including radiological and work with the Navy to satisfy their removal requirements
 - (iii) Typically sites are excavated only to radiological level, not down to 60 feet; environmentally it’s safer to just meet the radiological requirements
 - (iv) DCE estimates removing all improvements
 - Garry Brown asked how fluid the PSDAR is, for example, the removal of the conduits
 - (a) Tom Palmisano stated that a significant change like that would alter the PSDAR and require an update, such as different assumptions regarding spent fuel storage
 - (b) Nothing is cast in concrete; these are initial plans only
 - Gene Stone asked when the application would be submitted to the CPUC
 - (a) Chris Thompson stated that should occur in the next 4-6 weeks
 - Chairman Victor asked about assumptions made in DCE were based on plausible worst case scenarios
 - (a) Tom Palmisano stated yes and he will point those assumptions out
- b) Environmental Impact Evaluation (EIE)
- i) Basis and Content of the EIE satisfies NRC requirements under NEPA (CEQA is yet to come)
 - Basis is:
 - (a) NUREG-0490 SONGS Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), 1981
 - (b) NUREG-0586 Generic EIS Decommissioning of Nuclear Facilities, 1988
 - (c) NUREG 1496 Generic EIS Support of Rulemaking for License termination
 - (d) 10 CFR 51.53 Post Construction Environmental Reports (ER)
 - (e) Consistent with the planned methods of Decontamination & Dismantlement (D&D) described in the PSDAR
 - Content:
 - (a) All key impacts assessed found to be not detectable or so minor that they will neither destabilize or noticeably alter any important attribute of the resource (does not trigger additional ER or LAR)
 - (b) Confirms differences are bounded by the Generic or existing EIS
 - ii) Key EIE assumptions related to keeping impacts “small”
 - (a) Assume that ocean conduits will not be removed – differing assumptions are used in the DCE; Tom Palmisano stated that the cost of removing the conduits is \$100 million
 - Dan Stetson asked if the conduits are under the purview of the State Lands Commission (SLC) and what are the criteria they use; do they do a survey of the environment, how long does it take, are there public hearings, etc.
 - (a) Tom Palmisano stated that discussions with the SLC took place prior to the SLC making its decision on Unit 1 and SLC agreed to leave the horizontal portions in place, however we removed some vertical access risers; discussions have not started in regards to Units 2 & 3 conduits

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, August 28, 2014, from 6:00-9:00 p.m. PDT in Oceanside, California

Meeting Minutes and Action Items

- (b) Took about 2 years to get through that process with Unit 1 but is expected to take less time for Units 2 & 3
- Garry Brown stated that the removal of the conduits was problematic. The owners promised (in the SLC lease) that they would remove them and return the environment to its natural state
 - (a) Tom Palmisano stated that post-2000 the decision was made to not remove Unit 1 conduits
 - (b) Garry Brown stated the public is now more concerned about coastal preservation and asked if the savings associated with non-removal would be put towards mitigation
 - (c) Chris Thompson commented that Unit 1 scenario is different and stated that the SLC came to the conclusion to keep the conduits in place based on the CEQA analysis, not SCE
- Chairman Victor commented that the CEP needs to come back to this issue and provide some input, especially in anticipation of the CEQA process
 - (a) Tom Palmisano stated that the DCE assumes removal; if the conduits are removed, the EIE would then be revised
- Other EIE assumptions /continued
 - (a) Ensure no blasting will be used in decommissioning
 - (b) Maintain existing land "use" (building/zoning) designations
 - (c) Limit dewatering to 1,000 foot radius from site
 - (d) There are no drinking water wells in the area of SONGS
 - (e) Comply with existing permits, obtain other permits where required
 - (f) Limit excavations to area previously excavated during original construction
 - (g) Ensure air quality impacts are minimized (diesel engines)
- iii) Ted Quinn asked if any assumptions in the EIE were the same as Unit 1's
 - Tom Palmisano took the action to compare this EIE with Unit 1's
- iv) Hon. Pat Bates asked if these environmental evaluations are vulnerable to legal challenges from the public
 - Tom Palmisano stated that the NRC does not have a hearing process but will certainly take comments; the CEQA process will be transparent, and the NRC process will pick up with an actual environmental assessment as part of license termination
- v) EIE Key Impacts Assessed, all impacts judged to be small:
 - On-site / off-site land use
 - Water use / quality
 - Air quality
 - Aquatic /terrestrial ecology
 - Threatened & endangered species
 - Radiological / rad accidents
 - Occupational impact
 - Socio-economics
 - Environmental justice
 - Cultural, historical, archeological resources
 - Aesthetics impacts

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, August 28, 2014, from 6:00-9:00 p.m. PDT in Oceanside, California

Meeting Minutes and Action Items

- Noise
 - Transportation
 - Irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources
- vi) Next Steps – Permitting Overview
- The project will adhere to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines
 - The following federal and state agencies are likely to play a key role in the decommissioning process:
 - (a) US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 - (b) US Department of the Navy
 - (c) US Army Corps of Engineers
 - (d) California State Lands Commission
 - (e) California Coastal Commission
 - (f) State and Regional Water Boards
 - Chairman Victor commented that in regards to the CEQA discussions, if the CEP can play a role they should; the Panel should start work on a list of issues
 - (a) Asked that we make sure the missing Panel members are brought up to speed on this discussion
 - Dan Stetson said it would be great to know which agencies are interested in which activities
 - (a) Tom Palmisano will brief the CEP on the schedule for discussions with the agencies and identify which agencies are interested in which topics
 - Chairman Victor asked a question about whether the GEIS is working
 - (i) Tom Palmisano's stated that the NRC PSDAR meetings will include the right group to talk to us
 - Gene Stone commented that he continues to have issues with impacts being determined "small"
 - (a) Chairman Victor stated that he was not surprised that the environmental impacts of an existing site are small given that it already has been massively disturbed
 - (b) Tom Palmisano stated that the NRC staff can probably better explain how they've designed this process
- c) Decommissioning Cost Estimate
- i) Basis and structure of the DCE
- Basis:
 - (a) 10 CFR 50.75(c), 10 CFR 72.30, 10 CFR 50.54(bb)
 - (b) EnergySolutions estimating model and date
 - (c) SONGS-specific walk down validation for quantities
 - Structure:
 - (a) Discusses the decommissioning plan
 - (b) Assurance of the adequacy of funding
 - (c) Provides total cost by period
 - (d) Plan for adjusting funding
 - (e) Summarizes the costs of services
 - (f) Summarizes undistributed costs
 - (g) Outlines costs for license termination, spent fuel management, and site restoration

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, August 28, 2014, from 6:00-9:00 p.m. PDT in Oceanside, California

Meeting Minutes and Action Items

- ii) DCE key assumptions (note, slide 20 is miss-titled... should be DCE, not EIE); this is a conservative estimate:
 - Date fuel is out of spent fuel pool is June 2019
 - DOE performance start date of 2024
 - Pool islanding date of June 2015
 - Substructure excavation (all substructures removed)
 - Duration of D&D is 10 years
 - Contingency of 25% (22.8% weighted average)
 - Ocean conduits are removed
 - Treatment of Class A waste – no Class A waste exempt
 - Start of D&D is January 2016
 - Low level waste burial cost escalation: D&D is CPI, Post-D&D is 7.33%
 - Dr. Bill Parker asked what assumptions were made in regards to available low level waste disposal sites
 - (a) Tom Palmisano stated that SCE has a life of plant contract with the facility in Clive, Utah, which provides a level of certainty; there is also a facility in Texas
 - Ted Quinn asked if the reactor vessels were greater than Class C and where were they going to be disposed of
 - (a) Tom Palmisano stated the internals only are greater than Class C; there are some options for shipping the balance of the reactor vessels
- iii) DCE Breakdown (in 2014 dollars @ 100% level):
 - License termination is \$2.1 billion
 - (a) decommissioning planning through reactor and other plant system D&D
 - Spent fuel management is \$1.0 billion
 - (a) transfer of spent fuel and management of dry cask storage and ultimate demolition of the ISFSI
 - Site restoration is \$1.3 billion
 - (a) Clean building demolition and site grading
 - Total cost of \$4.411 billion
- iv) Dr. Bill Parker asked what percent of the \$4.4 billion is specific and what percent is contingency
 - Tom Palmisano stated that there is an overall 25% contingency and that as the details are worked out, contingency will go down
- d) Chris Thompson presented a slide on Cost Estimate & Trust Fund Detail (dollars in billions)
 - i) SCE is one of the co-owners (approximately 75%)
 - ii) The green bar represents the total estimate of \$4.4 billion in 2014 dollars, as if we could execute the entire project this year
 - iii) The gold bars on slide 22 identify SCE's share of the total:
 - \$3.3 billion in 2014 dollars
 - \$4.1 billion when escalated to year-of-expenditure or nominal dollars
 - \$2.9 billion in present value dollars -- the cost estimate assumes decommissioning occurs in 2014; however, decommissioning will occur over time, thus cost escalation and present valuing of nominal cash flows to 2014 yields \$2.9 billion cost for SCE
 - iv) The gray bar represents the after tax value of \$3.1 billion – this is the liquidation value

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, August 28, 2014, from 6:00-9:00 p.m. PDT in Oceanside, California

Meeting Minutes and Action Items

- v) Chairman Victor commented that this graph shows SCE dollars, but when you include the other owners it all adds up to the 100% level; the CEP has decided not to engage in financial oversight; to the point, are there enough funds?
 - Chris Thompson responded that there are sufficient funds
- vi) Hon. Tim Brown asked what happens if there are delays in removing the fuel and it remains on site indefinitely; will there be an amount held to support those ongoing maintenance costs
 - Chris Thompson stated that there is a 25% contingency, however, the DOE is on the hook for not having a repository and the company would continue to pursue litigation
- vii) Chairman Victor stated the CEP needs to put together a summary that assures the public that the long term cost of the site is accounted for; reassurance in the funding of a long term plan
- viii) Dr. Bill Parker expressed concerns that the 3.75 % discount rate seeming low
 - Chris Thompson stated that was after tax
- ix) Gene Stone commented that ratepayers will have to foot the bill if the trust fund runs out of money
 - Chairman Victor stated that was the fact, however, ratepayers will be refunded unspent funds
- x) Chris Thompson stated the funds are seeing substantial investment growth; \$1.05 billion has been contributed by the ratepayer, the remaining \$2.31 billion (\$2.00 billion liquidation value) has resulted from the appreciation of assets
- xi) Hon. Jerry Kern commented that he would like to see the spending kept local and asked that SCE consider the resources, especially in regards to the Decommissioning contractor and making an effort to keep the personnel they have on site
 - Tom Palmisano stated that the site has reduced SCE personnel from 1500 to 460 and that the workers were assisted in finding new jobs for those that wanted them, and that would continue
 - (a) Decommissioning would be done by a big contractor, such as Bechtel or CB&I, using a small management and supervisory team and that the bulk of the workers would be from the local trades and the bulk of the payrolls will be local
 - (b) Chairman Victor asked that the panel be kept apprised of workforce issues
 - (c) Hon. Tim Brown stated there was a great interest in looking at a local workforce
- xii) Pat Bates mentioned that the Cost Estimate & Trust Fund Detail was missing from the deck and requested that the panel be kept apprised of the expenditures going forward
 - Chris Thompson said that would be corrected when they posted the file on SONGScommunity.com and that expenditures would be reported
 - Chairman Victor asked that information be something the panel could easily understand
- xiii) Val Macedo stated that historically, during outages, SCE has directed its vendors to hire locally
- xiv) Chris Thompson discussed Trust Fund and Regulatory Oversight:
 - SCE Decommissioning Trust Committee
 - (a) The Nuclear Decommissioning Trusts are overseen by a five member committee (2 internal, 3 external) who are nominated by management, confirmed by the SCE board, and approved by the CPUC. Responsibilities include:
 - (i) Prudently manage the investments in the Trust

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, August 28, 2014, from 6:00-9:00 p.m. PDT in Oceanside, California
Meeting Minutes and Action Items

- (ii) Approve asset allocation based on expected decommissioning schedule provided by the company
- (iii) Hire and manage investment advisors and trustee
- (iv) Hire and manage other advisors as appropriate
- Regulatory Oversight of Decommissioning Trusts
 - (a) The NRC regulates the funding adequacy for radiological decommissioning and spent fuel management
 - (b) The CPUC regulates:
 - (i) Funding adequacy and all spending from the Nuclear Decommissioning Trusts,
 - (ii) Radiological decommissioning,
 - (iii) Spent fuel management, and
 - (iv) Site restoration
 - (v) This includes disbursement of funds, the manner in how the funds are expended, and the reasonableness of those expenses
 - (vi) Filed a request for interim access to the Trust with CPUC in November 2013
 - (vii) Will file an application for permanent approval with site specific DCE in 2014
- xv) Chairman Victor asked for periodical updates and asked that when the “Cost Estimate & Trust Fund Detail” slide is added to the deck, that it include the non-SCE portions of the funds
 - Reminded the CEP that 9/5 is the deadline for comments on the PSDAR, the EIE, and the DCE materials
- xvi) Hon. Tim Brown spoke briefly about his Sacramento visit:
 - Attended the Senate Committee Hearing; explained what the CEP does, such as engagement with the public, described how information is processed, lessons learned to date, etc. Tom Palmisano was present and spoke on technical issues; seemed to be well received and Hon. Tim Brown anticipates being invited back in a year or two

VII) Public Comment Period:

[A public comment period included comments from 15 members of the public. Their verbatim comments are captured in a video recording of the meeting, which is posted at www.SONGScommunity.com. Following is a list of the speakers.]

- a) Rochelle Becker (A4NR)
- b) Chris Johnston Rob Howard (SCE operator and Oceanside resident)
- c) Rob Howard (SCE operator and Oceanside resident)
- d) Gary Headrick (San Clemente Green)
- e) Donna Gilmore
- f) Ron Rodarte (Dana Point)
- g) Don Mosier (Del Mar Council Member)
- h) Marni Magda
- i) Joe Sciortino (worked at SONGS for 20 years)
- j) Karl Aldinger (Fallbrook resident)
- k) Jeff Steinmetz
- l) Ace Hoffman
- m) Patricia Borchmann (Escondido resident)
- n) Roger Johnson

San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel
REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, August 28, 2014, from 6:00-9:00 p.m. PDT in Oceanside, California
Meeting Minutes and Action Items

- o) Ray Lutz (Citizens Oversight)

VIII) Panel Comments:

- a) Gene Stone appreciates Ace Hoffman's and Ray Lutz's comments on defense-in-depth requirements for waste storage
- b) Hon. Tim Brown asked about cracking, radiation monitoring and potential degradation of the current casks
 - i) Tom Palmisano stated we have 50+ casks that were pressure tested when loaded and the external temperature is continuously monitored; no cask leaks have been identified in the nation; in the industry there are legitimate concerns about stainless steel corrosion and an aging management program is needed (the 2023 license renewal will include it)
 - ii) Hon. Tim Brown asked about defense-in-depth mechanism on the casks
 - Tom Palmisano stated that there is a design basis that the casks and security have to meet
- c) Gene Stone asked if SCE had ever pulled a cask out to inspect it
 - i) Tom Palmisano responded no
- d) Ted Quinn asked if the October meeting would include a discussion of the emergency plan and associated security
 - i) Tom Palmisano stated that the security requirements don't change, just the site footprint
 - Emergency planning is on the October agenda and we'll see what non-classified security discussion can be included
- e) Dan Stetson mentioned that he had recently been on a walking tour of the site and encouraged people to take advantage of it when it's offered to the general public

IX) Closing (Chairman Victor)

- a) Chairman Victor commented that there is a lot of information out there on casks and that we are very dependent on cask vendors and therefore need a long term participation with them; we need to learn from other sites on the aging cask issues; the term defense-in-depth is not being used in the regulatory process in this area but perhaps we use different terms and maybe SCE could better explain it and what it means at the San Onofre site
- b) Next regularly schedule CEP meeting is October 9, 2014, and will be focused on emergency planning and preparedness

X) Meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

**San Onofre Decommissioning Community Engagement Panel
REGULAR MEETING**

Thursday, August 28, 2014, from 6:00-9:00 p.m. PDT in Oceanside, California
Meeting Minutes and Action Items

ACTION ITEMS AND PROPOSED RESPONSE

	Action Item Description	Comments
1.	Ted Quinn asked that the panel be provided larger copies of hard to read presentation pages (e.g., the schedules)	Will provide in the future, as well as providing copies for the public in attendance
2.	Dr. Parker asked about alternate plans if DOE does not perform	Tom Palmisano said he would discuss contingency plans at a future meeting
3.	Chairman Victor asked that we revisit the IFMP in early 2015	
4.	Chairman Victor asked that the Panel review the issue of the conduits and provide input to the SLC	
5.	Ted Quinn asked if the assumptions for the U2&3 EIE were the same as the U1 EIE	Tom Palmisano said he would prepare a comparison
6.	EIE permitting uses; Chairman Victor would like the Panel to start work on a list of CEQA issues to address	Tom Palmisano will brief the Panel on the schedule of discussions with the agencies and identify which agencies are interested in which topics
7.	Hon. Pat Bates asked that the Panel be kept apprised of the Decommissioning recorded costs on a regular basis	Tom Palmisano ensured cost updates would be provided routinely
8.	Chairman Victor asked that the slide on "Cost Estimate & Trust Fund Detail" reflect 100% level, not just SCE's portion	
9.	Tom Palmisano to get the Emergency Plan on future agenda earlier than planned and include as much of a Security discussion as possible	
10.	Chairman Victor asked for a future discussion on "defense-in-depth" to clear up any confusion	