

PG&E DIABLO CANYON DECOMMISSIONING ENGAGEMENT PANEL

PUBLIC MEETING

COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER

BOARD OF SUPERVISOR'S ROOM

1055 MONTEREY STREET

SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 12, 2019

6:38 P.M. - 9:10 P.M.

REPORTED BY CAROLYNN E. SPERE, CSR #10091

1 MR. ANDERS: Good evening, Panel. Want to we
2 welcome you to the Diablo Canyon Decommissioning
3 Engagement Panel meeting. I also want to welcome all of
4 the public in attendance and also remind everyone that
5 this meeting is being live-streamed and it will also be
6 available for anyone to view after the meeting.

7 So welcome everyone. Before we begin, we want
8 to have a safety briefing, so Adam.

9 MR. PASION: Thank you, Chuck.

10 Would those PGE personnel with preassigned
11 safety assignments raise your hands, please.

12 Thank you.

13 So this evening, if we do experience an
14 earthquake, we just ask that everybody duck and cover as
15 best as you can. We would evacuate either out the back of
16 the room there. There is another exit here to the left of
17 the dais. Once out in the lobby, you can go left or
18 right, and you will be either on Higuera or on Monterey
19 Street. And in an active shooter situation, we're going
20 to get out, hide out, take out and call out.

21 Thanks, Chuck.

22 MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Adam.

23 Just a quick overview of the agenda. This
24 meeting is about the panel. This is essentially the
25 one-year anniversary of the panel's existence, and the

1 panel is taking the opportunity to think about what
2 they've done and also talk about how they can improve and
3 what their future might look like. So this meeting is a
4 discussion of the panel's performance, the panel's
5 accomplishments and also opportunities for improvement in
6 the future. So much of this meeting is presentations by
7 the panel members themselves.

8 So what we will do is we will have an
9 opportunity for some discussion. I've been asked to do a
10 little history of the panel and how the panel was selected
11 and also respond back to some questions that the panel
12 asked of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. There will be
13 some presentations on engagement panels, review of the
14 current charter for the panel, opportunity for public
15 comment, and then discussion of the path forward. And
16 there will be a number of panel members discussing and
17 presenting during this time.

18 I want to make sure that everybody in the public
19 knows that there is an opportunity for public comment.
20 That will take place right about around 8:00, and it could
21 be earlier depending -- or later, depending how the agenda
22 goes. We'll do our best to stay on time. And if you want
23 to comment, make sure you fill out a blue card and give a
24 blue card to one of the folks in the blue shirts back
25 here, and then we'll make sure that you have the

1 opportunity to comment. We'd love to hear from you.

2 So before we go on, we want to hear an update on
3 decommissioning from Jim Welsch.

4 Jim.

5 MR. WELSCH: Thank you, Chuck.

6 First off, I just want to express my
7 appreciation for this panel. I have an opportunity to
8 observe from behind the scenes all the work this panel has
9 been doing. The diversity of thought and opinion that
10 comes together, and how you work through to build
11 consensus on issues is really impressive. And I just
12 really appreciate that.

13 My role in the panel is really passive. As an
14 officer of the company, I want to make sure I am connected
15 with the thoughts and concerns and recommendations of this
16 engagement panel. Just as a reminder, relative to the
17 decommissioning filing with the CPUC, there is on August
18 7th and 8th, an opportunity for the panel to represent --
19 to represent the panel at that public hearing relative to
20 the decommissioning filing. I know we've talked some
21 off-line, but I really encourage the panel to take
22 advantage of that opportunity to ensure you're heard by
23 the CPUC.

24 As an update, one of the issues the panel has
25 been working on, you know, is used fuel. And we continue

1 to track the progress of the UCLA Risk Institute on doing
2 the risk study relative to the various options on used
3 fuel storage, both spent fuel pools and dry cask. So
4 that's on track. We're expecting that early in the third
5 quarter, and we look forward to providing that to the
6 panel to further inform your dialogue and debate and
7 alignment on a recommendation.

8 I will, just to reiterate, you know PG&E, my
9 charter as an officer is to represent three key
10 stakeholders: obviously, our shareholders, as represented
11 by my board of directors; the ratepayers, via the CPUC;
12 and just as importantly, this community. And that's
13 because all three of those entities, groups, in different
14 ways have shared in the benefits and the risks of Diablo
15 Canyon. So as a PG&E officer, the work you're doing is
16 impactful. We make adjustments based on recommendations
17 and insights from this panel.

18 So I just want to finish again with the
19 acknowledgement of the work this panel is doing because it
20 is -- it is adding to the dialogue in terms PG&E on how we
21 plan for the decommissioning and the land use to ensure
22 that it's a path that the community supports and
23 appreciates when we're finished with decommissioning.

24 Thank you, Chuck.

25 MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Jim.

1 We also have the opportunity for the panel to
2 make any opening comments. So would any of the panel
3 members have any thoughts or comments you'd like to share
4 before we get started with the agenda?

5 Kara.

6 MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you, Chuck.

7 I wanted to make two announcements that I think
8 are both really great news. The first, the Central Coast
9 Labor Council every year honors somebody from their region
10 as Labor Leader of the Year. And this year they named
11 David Baldwin, who is on our panel, of course. You make
12 us look good, David. Thank you. That's a big deal.

13 And the other exciting piece of information that
14 I just learned a few minutes ago is -- well, backing up a
15 little bit, here on the slide is a map of the Diablo
16 Canyon Lands. And if you see towards the bottom, the
17 southernmost piece is called -- well, it's a 1200-acre
18 parcel. As you may recall, that parcel was put aside as
19 mitigation for PG&E to obtain their steam generator
20 permits some 10 years ago. For whatever reason, the deed
21 restriction was never recorded, and a number of us looked
22 into that and were curious about it. And then PG&E
23 responded by saying, yeah, they were going to finalize
24 that to make sure that that land was protected in
25 perpetuity. But there was some question about whether

1 that 1200-acre protection was just for the life of the
2 plant, which wouldn't be much longer, or truly in
3 perpetuity, which would really be the true conservation
4 outcome.

5 And I am just really excited and happy to report
6 that PG&E, through the leadership of Tom Jones and Jim
7 Welsch, has said that they are sticking to this mitigation
8 as being in perpetuity. So the process isn't complete
9 yet, but over the next several months, I think we will be
10 wrapping this up. In the meantime, we will be able to
11 look at that yellow parcel, if you can see there, as
12 in-perpetuity conservation land, which is wonderful in and
13 of itself. It's also really great because it's adjacent
14 to Wild Cherry Canyon, which has been a target of
15 conservation forever, but put together, that's quite a
16 sizable acreage for conservation that we can hope to not
17 ever see developed. So I just want to say thanks to PG&E
18 for following up and doing this in perpetuity and ensuring
19 the conservation of this land. Thank you.

20 MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Kara.

21 Sherri.

22 MS. DANOFF: Yes. Well, I want to acknowledge
23 Kara's effort in bringing the attention to the issue that
24 it had not been recorded and was not assured to be in
25 perpetuity. So thank you very much, Kara, for being on

1 top of that.

2 MR. ANDERS: Any other panel members want to
3 share observation?

4 Jim.

5 MR. WELSCH: Well, I will just add that it was
6 really appreciative that through your research you brought
7 that to our attention. When we did the review, the letter
8 of the content did have some ambiguity, but we did our
9 research and realized that what the intent was. And so it
10 was important for us to meet the intent. So very
11 appreciative of the research bringing that to our
12 attention. And so we will make sure that gets properly
13 recorded so there is no question about it going forward.
14 So thank you.

15 MR. ANDERS: Thank you.

16 Anyone else want to make any comments, thoughts?

17 Okay. Let's get to it. The next item is a
18 review of the spent fuel storage and emergency services,
19 vision, goals and recommendations.

20 So over the past few months, the panel has been
21 working on spent fuel storage issues. And back at the end
22 of 2018, it dealt with emergency services. So Linda has
23 been leading a lot of the efforts, a couple of workshops,
24 a public meeting, and lots of other working and research.

25 You want to bring us up to speed on the panel's

1 recommendations.

2 MS. SEELEY: Thank you.

3 As Chuck just said, we started out this part of
4 our vision document by -- well, actually, we improvised
5 this part, as I recall. In our initial charter, we didn't
6 have the mandate to do a document to be -- to write about
7 the spent fuel, but then we realized, as we started
8 meeting, that this was one of the most important aspects
9 of our mission that we needed to accomplish. And so we
10 began our work on the spent fuel storage and emergency
11 planning, vision, goals and recommendations in early
12 February, I think. We -- the first thing we did was to
13 form a writing committee of four people -- Kara, Frank --

14 MR. MECHAM: No.

15 MS. SEELEY: Oh, Nancy, Sherri and I. Were we
16 the only four? Oh, and Loren, right.

17 MS. DANOFF: Initially Loren wasn't, but
18 recently --

19 MS. SEELEY: Right, then Loren joined, yeah.

20 And we met many times in person, and then we
21 spent a lot of time. And then we have had Kami as our
22 compiler, editor and person who has the ability to take
23 all of our different writing styles, put them together
24 into a coherent document.

25 We had administrative meetings about this where

1 we had the whole panel who met together about ideas. We
2 also visited San Onofre and had a visit of their dry cask
3 storage facility. We hosted two days of workshops, two
4 full days of workshops in February, February 22nd and
5 23rd, where we heard from lots of different people about
6 ideas on spent fuel storage.

7 And -- well, okay. Let me go -- we have not yet
8 finished our document. Okay. We are almost at the end
9 where it's coming very soon. We have some few tweaks to
10 make to it, a few people -- discussions that need to
11 happen for it to be a finished document, but it will
12 hopefully be done like by the end of June, I would hope.

13 So these -- this has been nailed down, our
14 vision. Of course we want to protect human health and
15 safeguard our community. And this part here, the part
16 about the spent nuclear fuel kept in the spent fuel pools
17 is a very, very complex issue, and it's something that we
18 have had to explore a lot. This is not -- this is not
19 something that I think will be -- this is going to change
20 and move during the next few years because of how PG&E is
21 going to have to handle spent fuel. And of course,
22 always, we aim to create the lowest possible threat to our
23 community.

24 They are going -- the current dry cask storage
25 system that they are using right now is not -- they have

1 no more dry casks to use. They are putting out requests
2 for proposals to dry cask manufacturers, and they will be
3 accepting proposals for new dry cask storage. That
4 request for proposal is supposed to go out in July, but I
5 don't know if that really will happen or not, but pretty
6 soon it is going to go out, and we hope to look for a very
7 strong, robust kind of dry cask. We want to make sure
8 that when we go through the new dry cask installation,
9 that the contractors are supervised well, that the safety
10 risks are basically eliminated.

11 As you know, I am sure all of you are aware of
12 the promise that we were made over 50 years ago by our
13 government that they would give us a repository for spent
14 nuclear fuel that has never manifested. And we don't know
15 up to this day if it is going to happen or not. They
16 always say it is going to, but it hasn't happened yet.
17 But our recommendation is that they get with it and create
18 a repository, but it may be impossible. The spent nuclear
19 fuel should be moved away from Diablo Canyon as soon as
20 safely feasible -- that's a very broad statement -- in a
21 manner that minimizes impacts to our communities and other
22 impacted communities.

23 Also, after this happens, if they ever do -- are
24 able to move all the fuel off site, we want to repurpose
25 the current site for another use or convert it to open

1 space. We very much want the ownership of the spent fuel
2 and the Diablo Canyon plant to stay with PG&E.

3 And then this is the Emergency Services Vision.
4 You know, our primary interest is in protection of people,
5 the plant and the ecology of the area. And our community
6 needs to be well informed about emergency planning and
7 updated emergency plans, you know, always made.

8 And you know, the third one is self-explanatory.
9 We want all -- I guess I would say our primary concern
10 with every single aspect of all of everything is to keep
11 people safe and protected, and not only people but animals
12 and plants and everything living.

13 And we want the NRC to ensure the full oversight
14 of the decommissioning process and PG&E to assure the
15 retention -- this is an issue that is coming up now to
16 have to retain the experienced personnel at PG&E during
17 this process because of the impending shutdown, so it's
18 very important for us to have them there. Okay. Thank
19 you.

20 MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Linda.

21 And just a reminder that that was an overview of
22 the vision. But the panel has also prepared a more
23 detailed set of goals and recommendations on how to reach
24 those goals, so that will be part of the document for both
25 spent fuel storage and also emergency services.

1 Does any other member of the panel have any
2 comments or thoughts with regard to those two activities,
3 reports?

4 Okay. Let's talk about how the panel came
5 about. So again, you all asked me to do a quick review of
6 how the panel was established. And I think as we go
7 through the rest of this meeting, we will find that there
8 are other panels in other areas and each was established
9 in rather a unique fashion, and this is no different.

10 About a year and a half ago almost now, February
11 of 2018, PG&E initiated the process of creating an
12 engagement panel. They did that by creating a formation
13 committee made up of six public representatives from
14 around the county, highly-regarded community leaders, to
15 advise them on members of the panel, and also advise them
16 on what are the characteristics of the potential panel
17 members, what types of people should they pick.

18 And so they convened with this group in
19 February, and they identified the characteristics that
20 they would like to see in a panel. And PG&E then made a
21 public announcement shortly thereafter and solicited
22 interest in membership on the panel. And there was a lot
23 of publicity. There was newscasts and PG&E, I believe,
24 made a substantial investment in public outreach during
25 that process.

1 In March, panel applications were due and PG&E
2 received about a hundred applications. And about that
3 time, I became involved with the panel, and I had the
4 opportunity to participate in the second meeting with the
5 formation committee and facilitate their dialogue and
6 discussion. And prior to that meeting, each of the
7 members of the formation committee were walking around
8 with a notebook about 4 or 5 inches thick with all the
9 applications. And I can attest to the fact that they
10 reviewed those applications and were prepared when they
11 met. They discussed the applications, made
12 recommendations, used poling technology that you all have
13 used, and then selected a group of 20 applicants. And
14 based on that, PG&E made announcements in May of 2018.
15 And in May of 2018 was the first opportunity you had to
16 come together as a panel.

17 So the people have asked, "Well, what are the
18 criteria that were used?" And essentially, the criteria
19 were reflected in the questions that were on the
20 application. So based on the topics and the kind of
21 characteristics that the formation committee panel felt
22 was desirable, the questions reflected those
23 characteristics. And these are: an interest in
24 participating on the panel, people who cared, why would
25 you want to participate; experience that would qualify you

1 to participate, working experience, working as a member of
2 a diverse group, so how do people work together; interest
3 that you feel best to represent and provide a description
4 of those interests because diversity was critical to a
5 good panel, diversity in interest areas, diversity in
6 knowledge, diversity in geographic location and
7 communities that the panel members lived in.

8 Other questions reflect the characteristics:
9 "Are you a member of any group or activity that's
10 interested in decommissioning? How would you share the
11 information?" One of the missions of the panel is for a
12 means for PG&E to disseminate information throughout the
13 community, so the formation committee was interested in
14 how the panel members would distribute information to
15 groups and people that they were involved with. And then
16 just the opportunity to share any other information. It
17 was a very rigorous process.

18 The formation committee itself, as I mentioned,
19 was made up of six local community leaders -- Dee Lacey
20 from the North County; Katcho Achadjian, past board
21 supervisor, past state legislator; Ermina Karim, who is
22 president and CEO of the San Luis Obispo Chamber; Rochelle
23 Becker, executive director of Alliance for Nuclear
24 Responsibility; Jeff Thomas, a business manager for
25 Plumbers and Steam Fitters; Ken Thompson was the Diablo

1 Canyon Power Plant liaison for the Avila Valley Advisory
2 Committee. And there was also two participants, Tom Jones
3 and Stephanie Isaacson, from PG&E that participated in the
4 discussion.

5 And as a result of that, back in the second
6 meeting, they assessed the applications. They identified
7 20 applicants that everybody was good with. They
8 discussed diversity. They talked about the need for
9 diversity in a whole range of interest areas --
10 geographic, gender and so on. They made recommendations
11 to PG&E, and PG&E drew from that diverse pool of 20
12 applicants. They essentially said, "We are good with any
13 combination of the 20 applicants that PG&E chose," and
14 with the advisory that they wanted to create as much
15 diversity among the panel as possible to understand the
16 broad range of community interests and concerns.

17 And here is our panel. I think that the
18 formation committee did an excellent job. And you can see
19 the diversity throughout the county, and I can attest to
20 the fact that they chose people who care about this issue
21 and are willing and dedicated to working together to solve
22 problems.

23 The first year's activities of the panel --
24 eight panel meetings, six full-day workshops, numerous
25 tours and working meetings. The panel has received over

1 1,000 public comments on a range of topics and developed
2 vision, goals and recommendations on the decommissioning
3 process, decommissioning funding, lands, facility reuse,
4 and have drafted strategies for emergency planning, spent
5 fuel storage, and the rest of this year are going to take
6 on economic impact and transportation impacts.

7 So anyone have any questions about the formation
8 process? I hope that little history was useful.

9 Okay. Our next item is a discussion of the
10 NRC's benchmarking report that Congress directed them to
11 complete by July of 2020. It's about a year from now.
12 And so in preparation for this, we had the opportunity --
13 the panel put together some questions that they had of
14 Bruce Watson, who is in charge of this activity with the
15 NRC. And we submitted those questions to Bruce, and he
16 responded back very quickly. And essentially, I want to
17 just go over a little bit of the requirements for the
18 benchmarking activity.

19 So the Section 108 of the Nuclear Energy
20 Innovation and Modernization Act -- do you guys have an
21 acronym for that? NEIMA, is that what it's called now?

22 MR. JONES: It is now.

23 MR. ANDERS: It is NEIMA, okay. Well, it
24 requires the NRC to collect information on the use of
25 local community advisory boards during decommissioning

1 activities and issue a best practices report back to
2 Congress by July 2020.

3 The NRC is required to "host a minimum of 10
4 public meetings to consult with host states, communities
5 within the emergency planning zone of a nuclear power
6 reactor and existing local community advisory boards."

7 And I am reading this because it's a statute, regulatory
8 requirement, and I want to be precise.

9 The contents of the report are to include: a
10 description of the type of topics that could be brought
11 before the community advisory board; how the board's input
12 could inform the decision-making process of stakeholders
13 to various decommissioning activities; how the board could
14 interact with the NRC and other federal regulatory bodies
15 to promote dialogue between the licensee and affected
16 stakeholders; and how the board could offer opportunities
17 for public engagement throughout all phases of the
18 decommissioning process. And it would provide a
19 discussion of the composition of existing community
20 advisory boards and best practices identified during the
21 establishment and operation of such boards, including
22 logistical considerations, frequency of meetings and
23 selection of board members.

24 So the schedule for completion is on March 18th.
25 The NRC requested stakeholder input for public meeting

1 locations at the direction of the panel. The panel
2 actually submitted a letter to the NRC as part of the
3 formal proceeding requesting that a meeting be held here
4 in San Luis Obispo dealing directly with Diablo Canyon
5 decommissioning. On the 17th, it was the deadline for
6 those requests. In June of 2019, NRC is in the process --
7 will select the public meeting locations. And they are in
8 the process of management and review of those
9 recommendations right now.

10 The meetings will be held sometime in August
11 through October. Anticipated time frame to conduct the
12 meetings -- my guess is it's likely San Luis Obispo or
13 California -- meetings might be toward the beginning of
14 that, assuming California. Obviously California will be
15 chosen, but we don't know the locations. And in June or
16 the end of June 2020, NRC will issue the best practices
17 report to Congress.

18 So that's essentially the schedule of activities
19 for the NRC benchmarking report.

20 Yes, Kara.

21 MS. WOODRUFF: Do we have any guess as to
22 whether a meeting will, in fact, occur in this local area?
23 Have you heard anything either way?

24 MR. ANDERS: It's my understanding that five
25 people submitted a request to have hearings here in

1 San Luis Obispo.

2 Is that right, Tom?

3 MR. JONES: That was correct. Mr. Watson was
4 very diligent about not offering anything other than they
5 received five requests, so they haven't decided how they
6 are going to locate those meetings yet.

7 MR. ANDERS: Any other questions or comments?

8 Yes, Linda.

9 MS. SEELEY: I'm reading about what the report
10 contents could include. I am wondering, these aren't
11 written in a way that it says they're going -- "you will
12 act in such a way." Do you think that these parameters
13 are going to be rules or are they going to be suggestions
14 from the NRC, or do you not know?

15 MR. KARLIN: Maybe I could speak to that because
16 I think I brought this news. The law was enacted in
17 January 14th of this year, and I think I brought it to the
18 attention of the committee at that time. I know Bruce
19 Watson, I worked with him at British Nuclear Fuels for
20 seven or eight years, and I worked with him at the NRC. I
21 looked at the statute, and it is a report that they are to
22 submit to Congress about what they think may be best
23 practices in this area. There is not going to be anything
24 mandatory about it. They may subsequently or in addition
25 voluntarily issue some guidance that would guide companies

1 or communities. They might even go to a regulatory
2 mandatory thing, but the thing that's due in July of 2020
3 is just a report.

4 And it is -- the context a little bit of this is
5 that the NRC, Bruce Watson and his group -- he is the
6 chief of the decommissioning branch at the NRC -- have
7 studiously avoided this issue for some years, and they
8 really don't want to get into it, but they have to now
9 because Congress has enacted this law. And so they will
10 come up with a report, and it will just be a report.
11 There will be nothing mandatory about it at that point.

12 MR. ANDERS: If I could quickly read Bruce
13 Watson's response to that question. The panel asked him,
14 "Will the outcome of the NRC Research and Community
15 Advisory Panel result in just recommendations or a new
16 policy that will dictate funding and be regulated?"

17 The answer is, "We do not know what the results
18 of the report will conclude. The current NRC policy and
19 industry good practice is to recommend a community
20 advisory board panel be formed to provide stakeholder
21 information and education on the decommissioning of sites
22 to be released for unrestricted use. For a site to be
23 released with restrictions, NRC regulations require the
24 licensee to engage the local community." So that was the
25 answer to that specific question.

1 MR. KARLIN: And if I may address that, there is
2 a guidance document that the NRC has issued for sites that
3 decommission but leave the site contaminated. And
4 therefore, in order to leave it contaminated, after
5 60 years or whatever the time frame is, there have to be
6 institutional controls imposed at that site for as long as
7 there is going to be radioactivity there. And in order to
8 develop the institutional controls for a site that's not
9 going to be fully cleaned up, the NRC does say that the
10 company must have a community panel which will then
11 discuss those institutional controls and what would be the
12 best way to manage the remaining radioactivity on the
13 site. So that's their guidance document that I have read
14 and I have a copy of, but it only deals with sites that
15 are not fully cleaned up. And that's not planned to
16 happen here, and we all hope and plan that it won't.

17 MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Alex.

18 Jim, did you have a comment?

19 MR. WELSCH: Yeah. It is just a report, but we
20 will look at that report and we want to have a model that
21 we think really, you know, has the right level of support
22 and engagement, so we will be very interested in that
23 report. We will certainly look at it within PG&E to
24 understand what improvements we can make. And I am
25 certain this panel is going to be interested in reviewing

1 that and coming up with any recommendations moving
2 forward. But you are right, it is a report. It doesn't
3 have anything binding legal, but it's certainly going to
4 be a report that we are all very interested in.

5 MR. KARLIN: And there's a reasonably good
6 chance it won't even come out in the 18 months prescribed
7 by the statute because there is really no sanction that
8 applies to NRC if Bruce Watson says, "Gee, we don't have
9 the budget right now. We'll get to it later." They're
10 already several years behind in the decommissioning
11 revisions to the decommissioning regs that they are
12 supposed to be issuing, so this -- don't count on it
13 coming out in July of 2020 is what I am saying. Don't
14 hold your breath.

15 MR. ANDERS: Okay. Any further comments or
16 questions?

17 All right. Let's move on to the next agenda
18 item, and that is status of the -- or Panel Perspectives
19 and Discussion on Community Engagement. And as we began
20 discussing this issue, and actually last year in the
21 recommendations that were submitted to PG&E and passed on
22 to the CPUC, the panel looked -- the issue of panel
23 organization was discussed and two perspectives were
24 presented. The panel's general perspective was to
25 continue as a panel supported by the utility on a

1 voluntary basis. Alex proposed an alternative view of
2 creating a panel appointed by a regulatory body with the
3 current representation. To kick off this topic, both Alex
4 and Loren had the opportunity to make a formal
5 presentation. Alex chose not to, and Loren chose to make
6 that presentation.

7 So Loren, the stage is yours.

8 MR. BROWN: All right. Thank you.

9 Good evening, everybody. My name is Loren
10 Brown. I've been a member of this Diablo Canyon
11 Decommissioning Engagement Panel for the whole time of its
12 existence, one whole year. We're getting our feet on the
13 ground here.

14 My presentation is titled "Maintain and
15 Strengthen the Current DCDEP." And as we go through my
16 slides, you will see the case that I am making in support
17 of this position.

18 First of all, step back and think about why PG&E
19 wanted this kind of a panel. They created this as an
20 all-volunteer, nonregulatory body that would promote,
21 basically, a two-way conversation between the community
22 and PG&E. They wanted a way to communicate to the
23 community what their decommissioning plans were. They
24 anticipated that the community would indeed have some
25 concerns and would want to communicate some

1 recommendations and preferences back to PG&E.

2 PG&E chose this panel as the vehicle for
3 achieving that kind of two-way communication. I think
4 this is a very legitimate undertaking by PG&E. They knew
5 that this was going to be a huge effort lasting several
6 decades, costing literally billions of dollars. This is a
7 big, big deal for this community. They knew that there
8 would be concerns about the economic impact, losing
9 ultimately a lot of jobs, high-paying jobs in the
10 community. They knew that there would be continuing
11 concerns about nuclear safety, both for the remaining
12 years of operational time, but also safety during the
13 decommissioning itself.

14 They could imagine that this community would
15 have some ideas about protecting some of the lands north
16 and south of the plant in some kind of an open-space
17 preservation. They suspected that the community might be
18 interested in repurposing some of the infrastructure out
19 there that was not radiologically contaminated, but they
20 couldn't be sure that the community supported that. Some
21 people in the community might prefer that we take
22 everything back as close as possible to the original
23 conditions. So as a result, PG&E wanted to have that
24 conversation. They also wanted to be a good neighbor.
25 The result was here is a vehicle for creating that

1 conversation.

2 Now, I said this is a nonregulatory body. It
3 doesn't have any power to make PG&E do anything, but we do
4 have the power of representing the community. PG&E has a
5 ton of regulatory agencies who are looking over PG&E's
6 shoulder all the time, starting with the NRC, the CPUC and
7 many others. I asked Adam for a list of all of the
8 stakeholders and various agencies that PG&E had to keep in
9 their sights. It's literally dozens and dozens of
10 different stakeholders. So I looked at all of them and I
11 realized not a single one of them has a major focus on
12 creating a dialogue with the community, so this body
13 answers a unique need in that regard. So I think that
14 there is general agreement that having a community
15 advisory panel of some sort is very desirable.

16 There are a couple of major approaches to it.
17 One proposed by Alex was to have one that is fully
18 independent of PG&E. That would ensure that PG&E would
19 not inappropriately influence the decision-making, keep it
20 completely independent. If that were organized, it would
21 be composed of community members. It would be probably
22 including governmental representatives, maybe some
23 technical experts. It would have multiple purposes,
24 possibly including oversight, making sure that the various
25 regulatory bodies were cooperating. The other possibility

1 is to maintain what PG&E has created, an entity that
2 operates under the auspices of PG&E itself.

3 Now, financing between those two approaches are
4 actually pretty similar if you really look at it. If it's
5 an independent body under the auspices, say, of CPUC, they
6 would take funds collected by PG&E from the ratepayers to
7 pay for the cost of that independent. They would oversee
8 it and make sure that it's done. On the other hand, if
9 it's an entity created by -- under PG&E's auspices, the
10 cost of that body also would have to be approved by the
11 CPUC. So in some ways, it doesn't seem like there is a
12 lot of difference there.

13 I also wanted to show you a chart that draws
14 attention to some key differences between these. Let's
15 look at the -- some of the compliance issues. The Brown
16 Act, the Open Meeting Act, in the case of the panel that
17 we have, as it exists right now, we can have an open
18 meeting, like we're having tonight, where there is an
19 opportunity for public comment, but we can also have
20 administrative meetings that are not open to the public.
21 And we have taken advantage of that in preparation for
22 every one of the public meetings that we have held. There
23 is a lot of work that goes into getting ready for one of
24 these meetings.

25 On the other hand, if we were organized under

1 the CPUC, like the Diablo Canyon Independent Safety
2 Committee is organized, all of their meetings have to be
3 public. All of them require opportunity for public
4 comment.

5 Communications with PG&E is another important
6 area to look at. If it is organized as we are, we can
7 have either formal communications or informal. I wanted
8 to get some information from Adam. I had an answer from
9 Adam in a matter of a couple hours. No problem with that.
10 The informality that is enabled for us as we are organized
11 is very important. It makes things go faster, a stronger
12 relationship with PG&E. On the other hand, if we were
13 organized as the Independent Safety Committee is
14 organized, everything has to be formal. Any responses
15 have to be reviewed by the legal department. It goes much
16 slower.

17 Panel members, as organized right now, are all
18 community members. We are looking at proposing adding
19 some ex officio non-voting members, as you will hear in a
20 later presentation. So the emphasis as we are organized
21 is really on the community dialogue. That is our purpose.
22 If it were organized under CPUC and it had all these other
23 purposes, it wouldn't be just the community dialogue. It
24 would be other things as well.

25 I mentioned the Independent Safety Committee,

1 DCISC. I look at them as an important resource for us.
2 It has been noted that our panel, as it is composed right
3 now, does not have any technical experts. No nuclear
4 scientists on our panel. And if we are dealing with
5 highly technical information, that could be an issue. The
6 Independent Safety Committee, however, has three nuclear
7 scientists on their commission, supplemented by some staff
8 that they have hired. They are all appointed by
9 government officials. It's funded through the CPUC. It's
10 been in operation for about 30 years and they have
11 accumulated a wealth of information about all kinds of
12 aspects of operations at Diablo.

13 The DCISC freely admits that they are, by law,
14 only able to deal with operational issues, not
15 decommissioning. And however, I've made the point to them
16 that a lot of the issues that come up for our panel,
17 decommissioning issues, have parallels in operations.
18 They know all about the operations of the pools, the spent
19 fuel pools, for example. All of these things have a lot
20 of information that they could make available to us.

21 In a communication that I had from them just in
22 the last couple of days, I wanted to ask them what they
23 thought about making available to us responses for
24 anything that had to do with their operational purview.
25 This is what they wrote back to me: "The committee

1 members previously confirmed that with reference to those
2 technical questions presented by the DCDEP that are within
3 the committee's purview, the DCISC will endeavor to
4 provide its response."

5 So I think this is an important aspect of how we
6 can do our job, even when we are dealing with
7 highly-technical things. We can tap into the DCISC. We
8 can also ask PG&E to provide us other experts. As a
9 matter of fact, at the spent fuel workshop, we had an
10 expert flown in from Europe, right, Linda? So that's an
11 example of how we can tap into other technical expertise
12 even though we don't have it on our panel.

13 So Chuck has already given an overview of what
14 we have accomplished. It's been a lot. There have been
15 eight public meetings, six full days of public workshops.
16 We've had administrative meetings to prepare for those
17 public workshops and meetings. There is a lot of ways
18 that we publicize what's going on so that the public will
19 know what's going on. And many topics have already been
20 covered and many yet to come.

21 One of the things that we have accomplished that
22 is very important, and that's the publication of a 40-page
23 vision document summarizing what we have done. And we're
24 going to be turning out periodic supplements to that as we
25 cover additional.

1 So we've been connecting as effectively as we
2 can with the public. Some of you are here tonight because
3 you saw some of the publicity about this meeting. We
4 would like to encourage the public even more to
5 participate. The more we can encourage that, the better
6 we're doing our job.

7 One measure of whether we're connecting with the
8 public or not is how many comments that we've received.
9 It's now over a thousand. That means a lot of people are
10 paying attention and are giving us feedback.

11 Just to highlight, again, the importance of the
12 report that we turned out, this is our mechanism for
13 providing in a formal way our vision, our recommendations
14 and measurable goals. We sent this to PG&E. They
15 requested our recommendations. We're giving it to them,
16 but we also want to make sure that it's available to the
17 CPUC and any other regulatory government body as possible
18 and also to the public. This is really an important
19 aspect of how we communicate and complete our
20 responsibilities.

21 I'd like to tell you that the CPUC is well aware
22 of our existence. Some of us have attended their
23 meetings, and it appears that there is indication that
24 they appreciate that we are operating and giving this
25 feedback. And it's pretty clear that PG&E has been

1 appreciating what we've been doing as well.

2 So could we do better? Of course we could. And
3 why we've invited the public here tonight is to invite
4 your feedback, how we can do better. Already, I will tell
5 you that we've heard one concern that we're not
6 independent of PG&E; therefore, we are suspect because we
7 might be unduly influenced by PG&E. That's one of the
8 comments that we've heard.

9 Well, let me just share my experience, my
10 personal experience. I have never felt pressured in any
11 way by PG&E, any of their staff to take any particular
12 position. Any position that I give is mine and mine
13 alone. I haven't heard anybody else on the panel say that
14 they have been pressured, and I would like to assert that
15 PG&E has been really careful to provide us with a way to
16 operate independently, to have discussions and arrive at
17 our decisions in a very independent way.

18 I'd like to compliment Chuck Anders, who is our
19 facilitator. He has been very careful to observe that his
20 role is just facilitating. He is not operating to
21 pressure us to any particular position. Nevertheless, we
22 take that criticism that we're not independent to heart.
23 And in a presentation that's going to follow here, we are
24 going to hear some of the ways that we might at least
25 address that issue and improve the appearance and the

1 operation of independence.

2 So in conclusion, I'd say PG&E doesn't need
3 another regulatory body or another formal commission to
4 look over its shoulder, but it does need a healthy
5 dialogue with the community, and we're doing that. I
6 think we have accomplished much in terms of promoting a
7 healthy dialogue between the community and PG&E. I hope
8 we don't lose momentum by replacing it, and I hope that
9 you in the public will help us continue to improve. So
10 thank you.

11 MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Loren.

12 As part of the evaluation of community panels,
13 some members of the panel have looked to other examples
14 throughout the country. And Nancy took it on to do her
15 own evaluation and assessment, to try to get a feel or
16 handle for what are other communities doing where there
17 are sites where decommissioning is currently undergoing,
18 has been completed or is anticipated.

19 So Nancy, do you want to share that with us.

20 MS. O'MALLEY: Hi. I'm Nancy O'Malley, panel
21 member for the past year, resident of Avila Beach and a
22 physician in the community. So I'm going to talk a little
23 bit about existing community engagement panels.

24 So overall, there are about 14 nuclear power
25 plants that have existing panels, and a lot of my

1 information was by going to their websites. Most of them
2 have websites, and from there you can actually access
3 their reports. You can watch some of their meetings on
4 video stream. And I found that to be very informative.

5 So what I discovered is that all the community
6 engagement panels are really as unique as the communities
7 they support and the nuclear power plants that they are
8 decommissioning. So every plant is unique and every
9 community is unique. Some of the factors that appeared to
10 influence the type of panel include whether or not it's a
11 merchant plant versus a regulated plant, and we'll get
12 into that. Also, the location of the plant, the history
13 of the plant, those are all just some of the factors.

14 So I am going to start out by defining what a
15 regulated plant is. So a regulated plant is what we have
16 mostly here in California. It produces energy, and the
17 sale of the energy is regulated by its respective Public
18 Utilities Commission. So in California here, it's the
19 CPUC. Each state has its unique regulatory process, and
20 it may have a different name for the agency.

21 On the other hand, a merchant plant produces and
22 sells the energy on the free market, but its Public
23 Utilities Commission does not regulate the prices; so
24 therefore, there is no decommissioning Rate Case. So
25 decommissioning is between the licensee holder, the

1 merchant plant and the NRC, so you see it's a direct
2 relationship there. The states do not have the power of
3 the pursestrings in that case or influence over the
4 merchant plants, so that really impacts how they structure
5 their panel. So as you can see there, there is not room
6 there for the local government or the states to be
7 involved there. It's between the merchant plant and the
8 NRC directly.

9 Okay. Then there is a third lesser type of
10 plant here. It's a government-owned plant, and we have
11 one right here in California, Rancho Seco, and we'll get
12 into that a little bit.

13 Okay. So the best way to look at this is to
14 look at examples, so let's start with the California
15 plants. We'll start with San Onofre, the SONGS plant.
16 Okay. It's in California, regulated by the CPUC. It is
17 located on a military base in federal jurisdiction. It's
18 on Camp Pendleton, and that influences things. So in that
19 case, there are two state agencies that will play a role
20 in CEQA through the whole permitting and environmental
21 review, and that will be State Lands and the Coastal
22 Commission. And the US Navy, actually, has its own
23 environmental review. But there will be no local
24 government role in the permitting process.

25 Okay. So the SONGS Community Engagement Panel,

1 it allows for local government involvement because if they
2 didn't have local government involvement in the panel, you
3 see they wouldn't have much involvement there in the whole
4 permitting process.

5 One thing also unique about SONGS is it's
6 located in a very densely populated area. So if you look
7 at their panel, it has 18 members. And there are two
8 different county governments that are represented, as well
9 as four different cities, so there are many different
10 cities that are impacted there. And then of course, they
11 have various citizen groups involved also. So when you
12 look at all the different cities and counties and
13 different government -- layers of government that are on
14 their panel, you can see how that's probably necessary for
15 them to have a voice.

16 Okay. Another plant in California is Humboldt
17 Bay. Okay. It's also regulated by the CPUC. Now, here
18 the history of the plant, they closed back in 1976, and
19 they have been in SAFSTOR for two decades now. So it's
20 just been sitting there until they decommissioned. It's a
21 smaller plant, and it's not a very powerful economic force
22 in its community right now. And also in that county,
23 there's no coastal program, so the county chose not to
24 have a contract with the Coastal Commission, so their
25 permitting will work with PG&E working directly with the

1 Coastal Commission for permits and the county isn't
2 involved. And that's in contrast to Diablo Canyon.

3 So I don't know if everyone here is familiar
4 with how it will work here, but Diablo Canyon is on
5 San Luis Obispo unincorporated -- County unincorporated
6 land. So our permitting process for Diablo Canyon will be
7 with the county. So there will be lots of opportunities
8 for the public to be engaged and transparency as we work
9 with the county for permitting.

10 Nancy.

11 MS. SEELEY: I have a question. In -- our
12 county is now going through a thing called streamlining of
13 permits that are in the Coastal Development Zone, meaning
14 that they consolidate the permits and that it bypasses
15 county -- it goes from the county planning director to the
16 Coastal Commission, as I understand. I am concerned that
17 our Diablo Canyon decommissioning could go through that
18 process.

19 And I wonder, Trevor, if you could address that.

20 MR. KEITH: Yeah, sure. Trevor Keith. So it is
21 the lead jurisdiction, so the one that went to our board
22 of supervisors for the Morro Bay Wastewater Treatment
23 Plant, it was at the city's request as with Coastal. So
24 it would be to the county, it would be our request. And
25 to date, I don't see that request coming.

1 MS. SEELEY: Who would make that request?

2 MR. KEITH: So it would be our board of
3 supervisors.

4 MS. SEELEY: So how could the public make sure
5 that the board doesn't make that request to just
6 streamline it through the planning commission and straight
7 to the Coastal Commission, bypassing public input?

8 MR. KEITH: So it would be to engage with your
9 local board member at the time that it comes forward. I
10 don't see this being a consolidated permit.

11 MS. SEELEY: You don't?

12 MR. KEITH: No, not this. It's really for more
13 infrastructure, bridges, that sort of thing. And I know
14 Morro Bay Wastewater Treatment Plant, but that was more
15 the request of the City of Morro Bay. But yeah, it's,
16 yeah, not typical.

17 MS. O'MALLEY: Good question, Linda.

18 Okay. So Humboldt Bay, back to Humboldt Bay.
19 So there, PG&E worked directly with the Coastal Commission
20 for permits and the county wasn't involved. So their
21 panel did include some elected officials, representative
22 from the congressional office, county, union, education,
23 environmental groups and citizens.

24 Okay. Rancho Seco, we will touch on that
25 briefly. It is a municipal utility. It was built and

1 owned by the municipal utility. It's not fully merchant.
2 The power was for their customers only, only about a
3 million people or so. It wasn't fully regulated by the
4 CPUC either. They had no community engagement panel.
5 They had a board of directors that served as its own CEQA
6 agency.

7 Okay. So that's it with the California plants.
8 Okay. So as you can see even in California, you know, the
9 process is different depending on where the plants are
10 located and the history of the plant.

11 Okay. So now the plants that are out of our
12 state. So I looked for a community engagement panel out
13 of state that was also in a regulated -- regulated by a
14 Public Utilities Commission, and I couldn't find one. So
15 all the plants that were out of state that I saw that had
16 panels were in merchant plants. So as we said, merchant
17 plants is directly between the licensee and the NRC. So I
18 am going to look at -- we will look at about four or five
19 of them just as examples. Okay. There were only
20 altogether maybe 10 or so out of state.

21 So Vermont Yankee, Indian Point in New York and
22 Pilgrim Nuclear, I kind lumped those together. Those were
23 all merchant generator plants. And they all had
24 state-mandated community engagement panels. So the state
25 actually stepped in and said, "Hey, we need a panel here."

1 They were -- all three of these plants were owned by
2 Entergy, and either sold or in the process of selling to a
3 decommissioning company such as Holtec or North Star.
4 Their panels all had large numbers. They are 19 to 21
5 members, and they had multiple layers of government
6 officials -- state and local government, as well as
7 diverse stakeholders and citizens. So here you can see
8 that the state really wanted to have a voice and needed to
9 have a voice in this process, as well as their local
10 government, you know, the townships and the counties were
11 involved as well.

12 And another example is Zion, Illinois Nuclear
13 Power Plant in Zion, Illinois, also a merchant generator.
14 This was a voluntary panel -- voluntary panel that was
15 started by the merchant utility company. This plant was
16 sold to Zion Solutions for decommissioning. And their
17 panel is a good example of someone that really included
18 different stakeholders. They had state and county
19 government and a wide range of stakeholders: police;
20 fire; schools; business; some residents; medical,
21 particularly in radiology; and vice president of Zion
22 Solutions. And their panel members were appointed by
23 participating groups in the community.

24 And then the last one here is Maine Yankee.
25 This is in a small town in Maine. Also a merchant

1 generator, they also had a voluntary panel. The first
2 four panel members were appointed by the governor. And
3 they had a particular vocal state representative as the
4 initial chairperson who really helped initiate their
5 panel. And they had a diverse set of stakeholders
6 representing local, county and state government, citizens,
7 business, education, medical, science educators, marine
8 resource interests, and environmental. They also
9 completed decommissioning, and they have a very
10 interesting review on their website where they share some
11 of their insights.

12 I'm missing a slide here, my last slide. Is it
13 up there?

14 There we go.

15 Okay. So in conclusion, so merchant plants tend
16 to have panels with multiple layers of government
17 officials; otherwise, there is no process in place for
18 their input. And let's contrast that with Diablo Canyon
19 Power Plant, decommissioning already has a process in
20 place for state involvement, and that's through the CPUC,
21 State Lands and the Coastal Commission. Also, there's a
22 process in place for county involvement through the
23 permitting process, which will involve ample opportunity
24 for public input.

25 Other observations is that Diablo Canyon's

1 engagement panel started earlier in the process than most
2 other panels, which does create more opportunity for
3 influence before plans are already firm with PG&E. It's
4 easier to have influence earlier on before plans are set
5 in stone.

6 Also each community engagement panel should be
7 evaluated in light of its unique situation. And one other
8 thing I gleaned from this, just ideas from people that,
9 you know, we all have two- to three-year commitments to
10 this panel. But as we think about other people to replace
11 us in the future, things we can think of that we glean
12 from other panels would be, perhaps, someone from the
13 Department of Public Health, someone from marine biology,
14 perhaps at Cal Poly, and also potentially a nuclear
15 scientist. I think right now they are all employed at
16 Diablo Canyon, but maybe in the future, and maybe someone
17 ex-military would be an idea. So those are just some of
18 the things that I wanted to pass on that I've learned.
19 Okay. Thank you.

20 MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Nancy. That looks like
21 a lot of work and research.

22 Now is the opportunity for the panel to discuss
23 your thoughts and comments.

24 Alex.

25 MR. KARLIN: Yeah. Thank you, Chuck, and

1 members of the panel.

2 I think that's some valuable information that's
3 been put up. And this issue, I guess, came up last
4 October, October 6th, actually. The panel decided to put
5 together some vision and recommendations for the PUC. And
6 it was at that time that I put together, among other
7 recommendations -- each one of us submitted something.
8 Mine was that the PUC should create a more independent and
9 more robust and sustainable decommissioning advisory panel
10 that would better serve the community and the state and
11 the local government and not be created by PG&E for PG&E.
12 And this went over like a lead balloon, as you might
13 expect on this panel.

14 And we went out for public comments on the
15 alternate visions. And in fact, 140 public comments were
16 submitted supporting or strongly supporting my alternate
17 vision, which was we need a more independent and robust
18 and sustainable committee along the lines of those that
19 exist at the modern decommissioning plants around the
20 country, particularly democratic states. New York has an
21 independent advisory panel that they have created to help
22 advise them -- i.e. the State of New York, and the
23 counties and the governments -- with the decommissioning.

24 New York, Vermont -- and I was the lead judge on
25 the Vermont Yankee renewal process. And Vermont has an

1 independent advisory panel. Indian Point in New York,
2 Vermont, Pilgrim in Massachusetts, and Oyster Creek in
3 New Jersey, those are three states. And I gave the panel
4 at that time the links to those four sites and, basically,
5 there are two kinds of decommissioning panels. One is
6 those that are created by the utility for the utility to,
7 basically, run interference on a public relations basis
8 for the utility to help the community understand and get
9 community input on behalf of PG&E.

10 I think if you -- if you go to slide No. 37,
11 please. Could you do that?

12 And it was the conclusion that -- read that,
13 "PG&E doesn't need yet another regulatory oversight entity
14 to deal with, but what it does need" -- and so the focus
15 is what PG&E needs. And I think that is, you know,
16 representative of utility-created panels. They are to
17 help the utility.

18 Now, the other end of the spectrum, the other
19 type are those that are created with a mission to advise
20 and to help the community, to help the state, the
21 governor, the county, the regulatory agencies and the
22 people, the unions, the other things that exist out there.
23 And those exist in Vermont, New York, et cetera.

24 And contrary to what Nancy says, those states
25 have very strong regulatory presence concerning those

1 nuclear power plants. Let me guarantee to you they do.
2 Vermont has a Public Utilities Commission. Now, they
3 don't regulate the rates, but they have a Public Utilities
4 Commission. And Tony Roisman, a lawyer I know well, is
5 the chairman of that committee, and they are very
6 vigorous. In fact, they went to federal court and
7 litigated because they wanted more role for regulating
8 that power plant. And they have several agencies in that
9 state that take a very strong regulatory rule.

10 New York, the same way, they sued to close
11 Indian Point. They were a very active in a lot of
12 regulatory ways on Indian Point. Vermont -- I mean
13 Pilgrim, et cetera, those states regulate those entities
14 as much as they can and are allowed to under federal law.
15 They don't, as I think is correct, they don't set the
16 rates, and so there is a ratemaking function that we have
17 here, and that is different. But I think it is a false
18 dichotomy to say, "Well, they don't regulate. They're
19 different, but we are a regulated state and they are a
20 merchant state." No, these are very heavily regulated, so
21 I think that's an issue.

22 Another, I think, difficulty in the comparison
23 that you put together, Nancy, is that some of the
24 examples -- over the last 20, 30, 40 years,
25 decommissioning of nuclear power plants has changed.

1 Humboldt was closed. When was it closed? 1970's? I
2 mean, it has been three, four decades that that's been
3 closed, so there wasn't a decommissioning panel created in
4 those days. Same thing with Rancho Seco. Anything that's
5 more than 20 years old, more than 10 years old probably
6 either doesn't have a decommissioning panel or has one
7 created by the utility. The more modern and, I think,
8 better example are those of Vermont, New York,
9 Massachusetts, New Jersey. And it's stunning to me that
10 California, being a progressive and important state, and
11 this community, quite frankly, doesn't sort of step
12 forward and say, "We need something that's set up by us,
13 for us, for the community, not for PG&E." And I think
14 that's what is needed.

15 Now, we've done a good job, this panel has done
16 a pretty good job with what we've been tasked to do, which
17 is help PG&E communicate with the community and help
18 provide, to the extent we can, input that we get from the
19 community. There's nothing wrong with that. And if PG&E
20 wants to fund that, it can. I think it is incorrect to
21 say the funding is the same, as Loren indicated, because
22 right now PG&E is paying for this panel, not the
23 ratepayers. And PG&E has submitted a request to PUC to
24 approve ratepayer funding of this. They haven't approved
25 that yet. So if PG&E shareholders want to pay for a panel

1 to help PG&E do PR with the community, they can do that.
2 And there will be no ratepayers have to pay for it. But
3 if the community and the state wants to have something
4 that looks out for the state's interest, then I think an
5 independent panel is needed.

6 And keep in mind, as I wrote in my article in my
7 alternate vision, this is a long process. Most of the
8 members of this committee had never heard of
9 decommissioning of a nuclear power plant before they got
10 on this thing. Most of them had never heard of the Diablo
11 Canyon Independent Safety Committee before they got on
12 this thing. Most of them didn't know that there were
13 other advisory panels at other decommissioning facilities.
14 And the only exception I would venture is Linda Seeley,
15 who is quite knowledgeable in all this area. And now we
16 are suddenly experts.

17 There is a lot of other communities, and we are
18 not all that unique. Decommissioning is occurring
19 throughout the country in a lot of places. And I think
20 the good models are the ones that are created by the
21 state, by the community, for the state and for the
22 community.

23 MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Alex.

24 Nancy, and then Sherri.

25 MS. O'MALLEY: Thanks for your comments, Alex.

1 Just to say that when I looked at Maine Yankee, I thought
2 it was really interesting that their utility actually
3 spent the first year with their panel members educating
4 them. Because when you say that our panel knew nothing
5 about this prior, I don't know if that's such a bad thing.
6 And that has happened on other panels where they actually
7 spent time educating the panel and learning because they
8 want you to be a liaison with the community. This is a
9 community engagement panel. And so, you know, we want to
10 make sure that we can be a liaison to the community and
11 actually educate the community as well.

12 MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Nancy.

13 Sherri, and then Linda.

14 MS. DANOFF: I think it would be ideal were the
15 PUC to mandate this committee and that it still be
16 advisory. I think what's unique about our situation in
17 this county is that there is a technical body, the
18 Independent Safety Committee, and I have been aware for a
19 number of years and have attended some meetings over the
20 year. I think if they, in fact, continue for 18 months
21 after decommissioning, that we will have a very beneficial
22 situation. But if there is a way that we can retain an
23 advisory capacity and that we can be a required panel by
24 PUC, that that would be ideal.

25 MR. ANDERS: Linda.

1 MS. SEELEY: I have a question, Alex, for you.
2 I think you said -- if I'm not mistaken, I think you said
3 that in these other states that -- where they have
4 merchant plants, that the community panel acts as a
5 regulator.

6 MR. KARLIN: No, they don't. They're advisory
7 panels. And they are -- they advise the people who
8 created them. And the people who created them are the
9 governor and the county and the mayors and the
10 representatives to the state legislature. And they are
11 created to advise the elected and appointed regulators and
12 representatives of the -- who have some power.

13 We're not an advisory committee, in any event.
14 We're an engagement panel. And in fact, if you look at
15 our charter, it doesn't even have the word advisory in it.
16 It just has "engagement." And as was -- I think it was
17 correctly portrayed by Loren, our job -- and he even
18 started with, "What does PG&E want? What do they want?
19 They wanted this. They wanted that. They wanted" --
20 whatever, "they," "they," "they." PG&E is the "they" he
21 is talking about. And I think we should think about what
22 the community wants and what's needed for the community,
23 not what's needed and welcomed by PG&E.

24 MS. SEELEY: Thank you. I want to ask you
25 another question, Alex. So I'm having -- I just want you

1 to clarify for me. The advisory panels in these other
2 states, they advise the legislature, the elected
3 officials, local elected officials, maybe the school
4 boards, people like sort of agencies that -- do they have
5 -- and they advise them -- what do they advise them? I
6 mean, do they advise them like about what's going on in
7 the panel or do they advise them about -- what do they do?

8 MR. KARLIN: Yes. They are only advisory. All
9 these panels are advisory except for ours which is not
10 even advisory. It's an engagement panel. We have chosen
11 to issue advice. I mean, anyone can issue advice and send
12 it to anyone. But PG&E didn't ask us for advice in the
13 charter that it wrote. And nobody else is asking for our
14 advice, but in these other panels, they are advisory, and
15 they are all advisory. I think I am trying to answer your
16 question. They are only advisory.

17 MS. SEELEY: But what do they advise? Whom do
18 they advise?

19 MR. KARLIN: Think about the Diablo Canyon
20 Independent Safety Committee. That's a parallel body. It
21 was created by PUC. And the three members of the panel
22 are selected by the governor, the attorney general and the
23 California Energy Commission. Each of those three
24 entities appoint one of the members of that Independent
25 Safety Committee. It's not appointed by PG&E. It's not

1 appointed by the Independent Safety Committee. It's
2 appointed by a formal process that people apply, they go
3 through, they're evaluated, they're picked. And they
4 advise the governor, the attorney general, and the
5 California Energy Commission on safety related to
6 operations.

7 I think there should be Diablo Canyon advisory
8 committee about decommissioning and we could, as a point
9 in point, advise the governor, the attorney general, the
10 California Energy Commission, the California Coastal
11 Commission, the San Luis Obispo County, the mayor of
12 San Luis Obispo, whatever. And unions and Native
13 Americans would be on that as well. That's what the
14 others look like. I think that's what ours should look
15 like.

16 MS. SEELEY: But my question was what do they
17 advise them?

18 MR. KARLIN: Okay. With regard to the Diablo
19 Canyon Independent Safety Committee, they advise the
20 governor, the attorney general, and the California Energy
21 Commission with regard to safety-related issues of the
22 operation of the plant -- what do they think and how is it
23 going. Peter Lamb is the CEC representative. He goes
24 back and talks with the people at CEC about what he thinks
25 is going on. Each of them talks with their respective

1 appointing entity about what they think the safety of the
2 operations is going on. So they are selected
3 independently. There is a process for it.

4 And we've done a decent job and run some
5 interference and done some public relations stuff and
6 we've got some community input. That's great. But I
7 think in about a year when the PUC ratemaking -- PG&E has
8 asked the ratepayers of this state to pay for this panel,
9 and there is already an Independent Safety Committee
10 panel. And there is already a peer-review panel that
11 deals with seismic, and the ratepayers are paying for
12 that. Should they pay for three different panels?
13 Ratepayers have to pay all that? I think there ought to
14 be some rationalization and get it organized.

15 The real action on this issue is at the PUC, not
16 here. We're happy with what we're doing. We think we're
17 doing a good job. I can't agree with that. I think this
18 community deserves better. I mean, we're a good group,
19 and we're doing hard, but this community deserves an
20 entity that represents the community, not PG&E.

21 MR. ANDERS: Any further comments, questions
22 before we move on?

23 Thank you, Alex, Linda.

24 Nancy, do you have a comment?

25 MS. O'MALLEY: I was just going to give a little

1 picture of what actually some of their meetings look like,
2 some of these big state agencies, because I have actually
3 listened in on some of these meetings. So an example
4 would be the decommissioning licensee, which would be
5 Holtec, they would be -- they would have their
6 representatives there. The NRC would be at the meeting by
7 phone, and they would be giving updates to the panel. And
8 then it might be the state nuclear engineer that's there
9 giving some input. And then otherwise, it really looks a
10 lot like our panel. And when you look at their agenda and
11 their reports, it actually looks a lot like our panel,
12 when you look at the topics they are discussing.

13 The difference is that once you get into
14 decommissioning, you know, you are going to have a
15 constant update on what's happening with the
16 decommissioning. And so you will actually have your
17 engineers that are doing decommissioning giving updates.
18 And the purpose is that they want the community to know
19 what's going on and they want input. You know, even in
20 these meetings that I've listened to, what they really
21 want is they want the community to know what's going on
22 and they want input from the community. And so even at
23 their meetings, we want to make sure that the community
24 does not get lost in the equation.

25 MR. ANDERS: Thank you.

1 Any further comments?

2 Yes, Jim.

3 MR. WELSCH: First off, yeah, I think we
4 appreciate input from an advisory panel, an engagement
5 panel, in any way the community choose to. I just want to
6 be clear, this panel does not represent PG&E. Okay. We
7 support the panel. We moved to action quickly with the
8 announcement of the decision not to relicense, and we knew
9 we needed to move with urgency to tap the power of
10 participation of our community. That's our intention and
11 I hope we can continue to engage in a way that supports
12 and reenforces that. But you know, it's not our intention
13 at all to shape the output, the advice, you know, the
14 engagement of this panel. I know there is a handful of
15 examples already where we have made adjustments to our
16 planning based on input from this panel.

17 I mean, Kara, you cited the example on the
18 perpetuity relative to the property. We made adjustments
19 to our request for proposal on our dry cask based on this
20 panel's input. We expanded the scope of that RFP. We
21 also made sure we'll include content in RFP relative to
22 the safety of the radiological workers.

23 David, thank you for that input.

24 So the Garrick Institute, Risk Institute at
25 UCLA, those two studies we're doing, one, they help the

1 panel be more informed on the safety aspects of the
2 different approaches to used fuel. And then following
3 that will be that risk study on the modes of
4 transportation -- being trucking, barging, et cetera -- to
5 help bring science and facts to the panel. So I think
6 those are -- there's diversity of opinion on this. We
7 would be -- we're fine working with whatever model this
8 community chooses. And it's my commitment to ensure that
9 PG&E stays independent from the work of the panel. We're
10 here to support and ensure that you get whatever resource
11 we can provide for you to do your independent work.
12 That's our intention. And so if you ever feel that's not
13 coming out that way, it's important for us to know. I
14 just want to be clear.

15 Our commitment -- our community is one of our
16 stakeholders, and it's important to me as an officer of
17 the company. It's important to me as a member of this
18 community. I have been here 35 years, children,
19 grandchildren. This is important work, and we value the
20 work of this panel and your engagement. Your reports,
21 your advice is very thoughtfully used in shaping our
22 planning and preparation. But I understand the diversity
23 of models, and we would be fine working with whatever our
24 community wants. I mean, I just want to be clear. We can
25 easily work with whatever model this community aligns to.

1 MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Jim.

2 David.

3 MR. BALDWIN: Thanks.

4 I just want to weigh in a little bit on a couple
5 thoughts. So the charter requires that we as the
6 panelists provide input from the community to PG&E. And
7 Jim just gave some examples of how that's been going on.
8 But I think that the input -- the way it's going to come
9 about with us being selected onto this panel, from
10 whatever leadership positions we might have or positions
11 of influence in the groups that we work with, that they're
12 diverse is the whole point, I think, of what makes this
13 panel work. If we were all experts from the nuclear
14 industry, then although that is great for certain
15 discussions, we would miss out on other discussions that
16 only come from diverse viewpoints. And the charter calls
17 out for those diverse viewpoints.

18 Now, whether PG&E wrote that in the charter or
19 we as a panel approved that in the charter doesn't really
20 matter to me. It's still the right thing to do. And I
21 think that shouldn't be lost in the discussion. I think
22 that if we -- if we're not careful and we look at too much
23 of a panel that's driven by politics, or only elected
24 officials, or those who may already have positions are
25 selected for the panel, then I think we are going to lose

1 value from our ability to go out to the community in the
2 diverse groups that we represent and bring back the true
3 sense of what the community is saying, what the community
4 is feeling, what the community wants. This panel is made
5 up -- I'm looking around here, you know, we have diverse
6 viewpoints. We don't agree on everything, but we've been
7 able to get a lot of work done. And I think it's because
8 of those diverse viewpoints.

9 The fact that Mr. Karlin, who I have great
10 respect for -- obviously, he knows what he is talking
11 about. The fact that he is on this panel should be
12 evidence enough, that that was done, that the diversity of
13 the panel wasn't lost in the selection of the panel.

14 So thank you.

15 MR. ANDERS: Thank you, David.

16 Any further comments, questions?

17 Alex.

18 MR. KARLIN: I agree with David that diversity
19 is important on these panels. And I think if you look at
20 the panels in New York, Vermont, Massachusetts and
21 New Jersey, those are quite diverse, so that's important.

22 The next is to representativeness or
23 representation. I don't know how representative we are of
24 this community. We weren't elected by anybody. We don't
25 represent any particular group. Even Trevor who is here,

1 he works for the county. He is a key man, but he is not
2 representing the county. He is here as himself. Other
3 people are involved in groups, and some of them think that
4 they are here on this panel to represent those groups.
5 I'm not sure -- okay, maybe that's the way it is.

6 Some people on this panel are working with PG&E
7 to achieve negotiated deals for some of the land or some
8 of the facilities separately, and that would not be or at
9 least those kind of things would be put on the table if it
10 was a publicly-created committee, like the Diablo Canyon
11 Independent Safety Committee. So I don't think that we
12 are all that representative.

13 And I don't actually have that much -- I think
14 that people if they were appointed by the governor, by the
15 attorney general, by the county, by Cunningham, by
16 Monning, by Carbajal, by the mayor, appointed by those
17 people, they would have resources. When they went back
18 home after a meeting, they have some resources. They have
19 some fire power. They could go to those people and ask
20 for help. We can't do that. We go home and get on Google
21 and try to figure out what the key words were that
22 somebody that PG&E told us about. They would have
23 resources, and they would be appointed by representatives
24 who are duly established and elected by the people of this
25 state, and I think that's good.

1 MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Alex.

2 One last comment, and then we'll move on.

3 Linda.

4 MS. SEELEY: I have a concern about that because
5 elected officials are very much subject to political
6 pressure. I mean, that's who they are, right? They want
7 -- their purpose in life frequently is to get re-elected.
8 And so I worry that it might be an overly-political,
9 politicized kind of panel if it were made up of elected
10 officials.

11 And also, elected officials have a lot on their
12 plate. A decommissioning panel might take up like
13 one-sixteenth of their plate because they have tremendous
14 amount of other things they need to attend to. For a lot
15 of us on this panel, this panel is a good portion of our
16 plate.

17 You know, it is very engaging, not to make a
18 pun, but it truly is. The way we've operated, to me, has
19 been very engaging. And I think that our process has been
20 so -- our process has been very clear. I mean, all of our
21 meetings are very self-directed and we haven't -- I don't
22 think that we are pressured like elected officials are in
23 this. And as you say, if you need an expert, if you're an
24 elected official, you can ask an expert. We can too.

25 MR. ANDERS: Okay. Thank you, Linda.

1 Let's move on to the next topic. This dialogue
2 has chewed through all my spare time. I had an agenda.
3 Obviously, this panel has been discussing this issue for
4 some time. And Frank took on in coordinating an
5 assessment or investigation of the panel's structure and
6 so on.

7 So Frank, I'll turn the next agenda item to you.

8 MR. MECHAM: Okay. First of all, I really
9 appreciate the comments of the panel. I've learned an
10 awful lot. Alex, I do support some of your comments.
11 Others, now I feel pretty inadequate based upon what
12 you've said. But we did -- we were asked, and they kind
13 of pointed to me and said, "Would you go talk to the
14 elected officials and find out what their perspective of
15 our work has been, whether we should continue, whether it
16 should be changed." Being a recovering mayor and a
17 recovering county board supervisor, I arranged for those
18 meetings and asked David Baldwin if he would accompany me,
19 and we did.

20 The mayors meet once a month. They have a
21 mayors meeting, and I started that in 2000. And they
22 gather together, basically, to support one another for
23 issues that they have within the community. So we thought
24 it would be beneficial to meet with all the mayors and ask
25 them what they have observed of us and what we do and if,

1 in fact, they would recommend changes. We also met with
2 the liaison from the County Board of Supervisors, which
3 was Supervisor Compton and Supervisor Hill. And
4 collectively, none of them wanted to be on a panel. They
5 thought we were doing just fine. They would highly
6 recommend that we continue the way that we were and that
7 any resource that we would require or request, they would
8 be more than happy to provide if that was requested of
9 them.

10 So I came away from this realizing that -- and I
11 don't mean, with all respect, a lot of them were not well
12 informed about the decommissioning process and what was
13 taking place. For a lot of them, I think it was kind of
14 out of sight, out of mind, and they were leaving it up to
15 others to, basically, do the heavy lifting before it came
16 to them because they are ones -- mostly the board of
17 supervisors will be making a lot of the land use
18 determinations and then it will go to the Coastal
19 Commission as well. So it was important to hear from the
20 board what they felt about our work and whether we should
21 continue. And they were very, very supportive of what we
22 were doing and the changes to the -- the recommended
23 changes to the charter. Kara will talk about that, but I
24 don't know if David has anything to add to the discussion.

25 One other comment I wanted to make, though, when

1 we started talking about are we an advisory, no, we are
2 not an advisory, but it's is a pretty fine line between
3 recommendations and advice, and we do give
4 recommendations. And I would consider that to be somewhat
5 of an advisory position.

6 David?

7 MR. BALDWIN: I think you framed that pretty
8 well, Frank. That pretty well captures it all.

9 It's true that the elected officials did make
10 clear that they didn't seem to have a whole lot of
11 interest in being on this panel, but I would imagine part
12 of that is due to the workload they must have with all
13 they have on their plate. But also, it's indicative that
14 elected officials are in a lot of ways, I guess, like the
15 rest of us here in that they are just community members
16 who got elected to office. They come from all different
17 backgrounds and all different groups. And for the most
18 part, probably like the rest of us in the community, they
19 don't have expertise in the nuclear field. It's part of
20 what they learn as they go through that process, just like
21 many of us have done here. Thank you.

22 MR. MECHAM: And I guess with that, I'd turn it
23 over to Kara and she can go through some of the
24 suggestions that have been made concerning our charter.

25 MS. WOODRUFF: Hi, everyone. I just wanted to

1 say a quick comment before we get on to just four slides
2 following up. And the first, in some ways this is a very
3 theoretical discussion. We've been presented almost with
4 two choices: number one, carry on as we largely have been
5 formed; or two, we change our structure entirely and we
6 become part of some panel that's totally independent and
7 appointed or created by the state. And what I would say
8 is that decision is really beyond any control that we
9 have. If the state should say, or the NRC, or any other
10 entity should say, "You have to have an advisory
11 committee. It has to look a certain way. It has to be
12 strictly independent," whatever that means, that's nice.
13 If that happens, we will respond as a community and we'll
14 carry on, but that's not an option on the table right now.
15 This is the only advisory -- this is the only engagement
16 panel that we have. And so as members of this panel,
17 let's focus on how we can make ourselves as best and
18 efficient and have as much integrity and independence as
19 we possibly can because this is the only game in town
20 right now. This is what we are stuck with.

21 So I just had four slides I wanted to present
22 today. But before doing so, if you look at that picture,
23 I had a comment, "What are those animals and where did you
24 take that picture?" And I just wanted to clarify that is
25 not the Diablo Lands. It's actually Hearst Ranch. And I

1 think those are feral pigs, which are not necessarily
2 friendly to the ecosystem but any way, just to clarify
3 that.

4 So in struggling with this question about who
5 are we as a panel, are we doing our job, are we doing good
6 by our own community, we all have been talking about this
7 for weeks and months, really. And we put together a poll,
8 and all the members of the panel were invited to
9 participate. And I think nearly all of us did. And the
10 questions posed were:

11 "Do we like the current structure?"

12 "Is the organization appropriate?"

13 "Are we sufficiently independent?"

14 "Do we have integrity?" Et cetera, et cetera.

15 And then after we completed the poll, we got
16 together in May and we had a meeting and discussed those
17 poll results, and we had some hearty debate about what we
18 thought the community panel should look like going
19 forward, assuming we have any control. And I think at
20 least three of us at that meeting, maybe four, but maybe
21 the fourth was you, Alex, who wasn't there at the time,
22 came in with an opinion or perhaps a curiosity about maybe
23 a better way to run an engagement panel that is to be more
24 akin to what Alex has suggested, something that wasn't
25 formed by PG&E, but rather it was created by a state

1 authority.

2 By the end of the meeting, I think all of us
3 there agreed that that wasn't the direction that we wanted
4 to recommend going forward. And I think we came to that
5 conclusion based on what Loren has already described,
6 there are so many facets of this panel that have been
7 really helpful, and we think are beneficent.

8 And one of the, I think, most compelling reasons
9 that I changed my mind, because I came into this meeting
10 with a thoughtful concern for us looking a little bit
11 differently, was when we talked about communications.
12 When you're a regulatory panel, or something that operates
13 under the auspices of a state or a federal agency, there
14 are a lot of constraints regarding communications. And
15 one example of that is if you're watching the CPUC
16 hearings, when a party to a CPUC hearing has a question
17 for PG&E, they submit a formal question, some time passes,
18 lawyers are consulted, a formal response comes back. It's
19 usually a minimal, not very helpful response that answers
20 the question precisely and in only the way a lawyer could
21 love. But when we ask questions as a panel, I feel like
22 our answers are far more informative and I experienced
23 that personally.

24 I became aware that that 1200 acres that we
25 talked about earlier was supposed to be mitigation for a

1 project, and yet it was never formalized. It was never
2 recorded. And that's a grave concern. That's a lot of
3 property that we think should have been conserved, and it
4 wasn't so far. And so during one of our panel meetings, I
5 brought this up with Tom Jones and others at PG&E and I
6 said, "I'd really like to understand what's happening with
7 these 1200 acres? Why isn't this conserved yet?" And at
8 the next meeting, I not only got an answer to my question,
9 I got a three-ring binder full of every document
10 documenting the history of these negotiations from the
11 very beginning when this was put in as a mitigation for a
12 permit for the steam generator. So I think that, to me,
13 is very compelling.

14 This panel may not be perfect. We've got some
15 changes in store for the future. But in the meantime, I
16 feel like I've been able to get a lot of information that
17 simply would not have been available to me had we been a
18 more formalized, authoritative committee. That's my
19 perspective anyways.

20 So having said that, at the end of the meeting,
21 I think we generally agreed this is the structure we are
22 with now. This is all we have, but what can we do to make
23 it as strong as possible, independent as possible, with as
24 much integrity as we could find and with no actual or
25 perceived conflicts? And we really came up with three

1 major modifications to the panel. The first is creating a
2 memorandum of understanding, also called an MOU. The
3 second is creating our own website as a panel. And the
4 third is some changes to the charter. And I want to talk
5 about these all in turn.

6 So the next slide is the MOU. We talked about
7 this a little bit earlier today. Right now, the panel's
8 funding is provided by PG&E. They have a budget. They've
9 submitted a request by the PUC to have a more formalized
10 budget that's paid for by the ratepayers. And PG&E,
11 mostly unilaterally, has been spending money for the
12 purposes of this panel. And many times that we have asked
13 for resources, they have cost money, PG&E has covered that
14 cost. But we came up with, as a panel, a recommendation
15 on how to make the funding for this panel more
16 independent.

17 And so what we decided to do, and we least we
18 have very preliminary -- it looks like it might work from
19 PG&E's perspective. We have nothing formal back -- is
20 what we'd like to do is every year as a panel get
21 together, discuss the cost of the panel, and together
22 negotiate an agreement that states what are the things
23 that are going to be funded by the utility, what are the
24 projects that we want to undertake, what might our travel
25 budget be. And so then as a panel and PG&E as together a

1 collective, we come up with an agreement that governs our
2 activities and how those are funded for every year.

3 That's the first one. I think that's very important.

4 Okay. The second is we heard input that people
5 are not having an easy time accessing the website in order
6 to get information about what we're doing as a panel and
7 what's going on in the decommissioning. So we opted as a
8 panel, we're going to be establishing our own website, and
9 it's not up yet. It's going to take us some time to get
10 it together, but you'll find us in the future at
11 diablocanyonpanel.org. And on that website, we're going
12 to post the strategic vision that the panel has approved.
13 And we're also going to post other really relevant
14 documents, like what are the conclusions we've reached
15 about -- recommended on spent nuclear fuel, what are some
16 of the relevant articles about that issue, what are the
17 documents and history of the 12,000 acres of the Diablo
18 Lands, what information do we want to post about their
19 conservation in the future, what are some of the ideas and
20 concepts behind repurposing of infrastructure, what about
21 local impacts of the closure, et cetera.

22 So every issue that we can think of as a panel
23 that's relevant to decommissioning or the lands or the
24 infrastructure and of possible interest to the community,
25 we're going to post. And that means any time you'll have

1 access to that information. It's not going to be filtered
2 through PG&E. It will be our decision as a panel what we
3 want to post. And we don't expect nor will tolerate any
4 authority by PG&E to edit the content in any way. It will
5 be certainly coming from us.

6 So next slide. So the third piece -- the first
7 was the MOU, the second was the website. The third is the
8 charter itself. You probably all haven't read the
9 charter. The charter was drafted by PG&E. And when we
10 first met as a panel, we kind of went through the charter,
11 we made some modifications to it, but we really thought we
12 needed to look anew at the charter language and see if it
13 really reflects what we want our panel to look like in the
14 future. So we came up with a number of recommendations.
15 We haven't formalized them yet, because we're asking you
16 as the public, either here today or those watching, take a
17 look at the charter, take a look at how we recommended it
18 be modified. Please provide your input. When we've heard
19 that input and we have a response from PG&E, we should,
20 maybe by mid-July or even thereafter, prepare a final
21 revised charter. And that too will be posted on our new
22 website.

23 But let me summarize some of the key changes as
24 we envision the charter going forward. First of all, we
25 wanted to recognize right up front that our input is not

1 only for the benefit of PG&E, but also for regulatory
2 agencies and other stakeholders, including the community.
3 That's something we're already practicing. When we
4 completed our strategic vision, formally it was submitted
5 to the PUC, but it was also informally sent from the panel
6 members straight to the PUC and to the Coastal Commission
7 and to the County of San Luis Obispo, and many others. So
8 we view our job not only reporting back to PG&E on what
9 we're hearing from the community, but we're reporting back
10 to regulatory agencies and other stakeholders, and
11 certainly also the community.

12 Secondly, the original charter called for
13 membership selections to be done by PG&E. Going forward,
14 it's going to require both panel approval and PG&E's
15 approval. So if PG&E has this ideal candidate that's
16 going to be in their pocket, too bad, the panel can reject
17 that recommendation.

18 Also, we had a lot of discussion about whether
19 elected officials should be on the panel. The original
20 charter said no elected officials. We largely agreed with
21 that conclusion, but we've expanded it a little bit. We
22 want to add up to three people who would serve as
23 ex officio members. What that means is if you work for a
24 government entity, maybe you are an elected official, you
25 serve in that capacity as a representative of your

1 organization to serve on the panel. You're a non-voting
2 member. And an application of that may very well be
3 Trevor Keith. He is the director of the county planning
4 department. Looks like going forward, we may, as a panel,
5 recommend that he serve in an ex officio capacity, rather
6 than as an individual. So when he shows up, he is going
7 to be representing the County of San Luis Obispo, rather
8 than maybe his own personal perspective.

9 And then final slide, we have heard some
10 feedback about panel meetings. Going forward, we hope to
11 be much more involved in the preparation for those
12 meetings, the hosting of them, conducting the meetings
13 themselves, preparing materials. I prepared this
14 wonderful Hearst Ranch slide presentation for you, so you
15 will see a lot less uniformity going forward because we're
16 going to have individual voices of the panel members being
17 presenting materials.

18 And then we talked a lot about reimbursement of
19 expenses. We concluded that our time here will not
20 reimbursed. We're serving as volunteers strictly. But if
21 we have reasonable travel expenses to see, for example,
22 Rancho Seco or Humboldt Bay later this year, we may have
23 PG&E cover those costs. We're not going to take a
24 corporate jet, but we will ask PG&E to cover the cost of a
25 bus.

1 And then there is a one provision in the charter
2 itself that says that panel -- charter revisions are
3 really a uniquely PG&E task. We have specifically said
4 we're going to have input in charter amendments and that
5 we all have to agree on the charter amendments, not only
6 PG&E but members of the panel itself.

7 So that's a quick summary. You can find the
8 charter as it now stands and revisions on the general
9 website. It will be on our website when we begin it. And
10 I just want to encourage you again, please take a look at
11 what we've done. See if you agree. If you have other
12 thoughts, we would love to hear them. Thank you.

13 MR. ANDERS: Thank you very much, Kara.

14 Any comments or discussion? We have about five
15 minutes.

16 Yes, Frank.

17 MR. MECHAM: Just quickly, and I think that Alex
18 raised this point real well. This is really just the
19 beginning. When this plant closes down, that's when the
20 real heavy work is going to start. So I think what the
21 panel is doing now is basically setting the foundation for
22 future panels as they go, because this is going to be an
23 ongoing process for quite a long time.

24 MR. ANDERS: Thank you very much.

25 We are coming up our -- oh, I'm sorry, Loren?

1 You guys throw stuff at me if you need to.

2 Alex, and then Loren.

3 MR. KARLIN: Okay. Thank you.

4 Yeah. I think that the charter amendments,
5 first off, really are more cosmetic in terms of, quote,
6 independence than real. PG&E still retains veto over any
7 charter amendments. PG&E still retains veto over any
8 members to be selected on this committee. PG&E retains
9 the power of the purse because before we reach this MOU,
10 it takes two parties to tango, two parties to agree, and
11 one of them is PG&E. And if they say no, then I don't
12 know what our committee is going to do.

13 Now, we can all hasten to add that PG&E will
14 never say no and they will always give us what reasonably
15 we want. But, you know, I don't think these charter
16 amendments do anything except create a cosmetic appearance
17 for the community, maybe, that we're more independent. I
18 really don't think it moves the ball at all.

19 MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Alex.

20 Loren, and then Kara.

21 MR. BROWN: I'd just like to acknowledge that I
22 think PG&E is making a good-faith effort to help support
23 our efforts to actually achieve a level of independence
24 that did not exist before. The whole idea of a memorandum
25 of understanding actually came from PG&E. Tom brought

1 that to our attention, so thank you for that.

2 MR. ANDERS: Kara.

3 MS. WOODRUFF: I wanted to mention the question
4 of veto. Yeah, PG&E can veto membership on this panel,
5 but the panel can also veto membership on this panel. So
6 both of them have the veto power. When it comes to
7 amending the charter, yes, PG&E can veto an amendment to
8 the charter, but we can too. So yes, they do have veto
9 power, but so do we. So I think you need to bring up that
10 part too.

11 MR. KARLIN: Well, I would just say the Diablo
12 Canyon Independent Safety Committee, PG&E does not have
13 veto over amendments to that charter. PG&E does not have
14 veto over the members on that committee. And that is a
15 committee appointed by officials, elected officials. And
16 I don't think that's a particularly political committee,
17 so just because they're appointed by governmental people
18 or entities doesn't mean that it needs to be a political
19 entity and go down into that route.

20 MR. ANDERS: All right. Any further comments?
21 Yes, Linda, the last one.

22 MS. SEELEY: Just in response, Alex. Of course
23 it's not a political committee. They are technical
24 experts. It's a technical committee, so it's completely
25 different.

1 MR. KARLIN: No. I hope we have technical
2 people on our committee and technical support consultants
3 as they do.

4 MR. ANDERS: Okay, everyone. Good discussion.

5 So we are on our break. We're coming up on our
6 break. So it is almost 8:05. Let's reconvene at 8:15.
7 And we will have the opportunity for public comment and
8 hear from the public. If anybody hasn't done so, please
9 turn in your blue cards, and we will take them in the
10 order received.

11 (Break taken.)

12 MR. ANDERS: I guess we are ready to go. We
13 will wait 30 seconds for Loren.

14 We have two blue cards from the public who would
15 like to speak. And our first speaker -- and each speaker
16 will have three minutes -- is Dave Houghton.

17 And Dave, please say your name and your
18 residence.

19 MR. HOUGHTON: Thank you, Chuck. My name is
20 Dave Houghton, and I live in San Luis Obispo.

21 Interesting meeting. I didn't expect to see a
22 lot of Pasion at a meeting like this, but I think we're
23 getting some and that's good.

24 So I was at the last meeting where Bob Budnitz
25 held forth with what's happening actually with

1 decommissioning and the process and so forth and the
2 technical side of it. And at that meeting, I recall that
3 there was a possibility that the DCISC would continue into
4 decommissioning, and that that may have been a proposal
5 before the PUC, so that's one question I have. Does that
6 having legs? Is that likely to go anywhere? And is that
7 committee likely to continue? Because it seemed like
8 everybody agreed that would be a nice idea.

9 So I am going to roll on with my questions --

10 MR. ANDERS: Our normal process is to not
11 respond during your comments but possibly after.

12 MR. HOUGHTON: Okay. So should I keep asking
13 questions?

14 MR. ANDERS: Yes.

15 MR. HOUGHTON: And then you'll rack them up.
16 Okay.

17 And my next comments and questions are about
18 Alex's proposal.

19 And Alex, I certainly understand the
20 philosophical underpinnings of what you're getting at
21 there, and my question is more about the practical side of
22 it. So are you concerned truly about influence that might
23 be exerted by PG&E or are you concerned more about the
24 perception of the structure of this? And are there
25 specific actions that you think that might or might not be

1 taken by this committee -- and again, remembering that's
2 only advisory, not even advisory, but engagement -- that
3 you could point to that you think might be harmful, that
4 either would or wouldn't be taken?

5 And then my last question was about the cost of
6 this committee has been mentioned a couple of times. And
7 I probably could look this up somewhere. I did try to
8 look up the new website, and all I got was something that
9 told me that my phone was being infected; so whoever
10 that's connected to right now probably need to --

11 So the cost, what is approximately the cost of
12 this and the budget of this committee? I understand it's
13 shouldered by PG&E and currently by shareholders rather
14 than ratepayer funding. It's my understanding it's not in
15 the rate base. And are there per diems for this committee
16 in addition to covering traveling expenses? So those are
17 my questions. Thank you.

18 MR. ANDERS: Thank you.

19 There will be a discussion period after the
20 public comment and the panel can choose to answer the
21 questions, if they choose to.

22 MR. HOUGHTON: Okay.

23 MR. ANDERS: Your next speaker is Dave Weisman.
24 David.

25 MR. WEISMAN: Good evening, Panel. David

1 Weisman, Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility. And it's
2 not really a question, unless the question is so what are
3 you all doing on June 28th? Okay, there you go. That's
4 the question. And I don't know, maybe this has already
5 been announced and I'm late to the party on this one. But
6 in this very room on the 28th of June -- tell me if I am
7 already -- this has already been out there. Okay. In
8 this room on June 28th will be a public forum or a
9 symposium put on -- I think the host is our senator, Bill
10 Monning. And it will be the introduction or unveiling of
11 the results of the Senate Bill 968 study on the economic
12 ramifications of a post Diablo Canyon economy for this
13 county. And as I understand it, it's 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. on
14 Friday the 28th of June in this room.

15 So having seen that that's item No. 14 here,
16 introduction of next meeting topic, Economic Impacts of
17 Decommissioning, it would seem probably a good thing to be
18 in attendance for that meeting on June 28th. And as I
19 understand it, they are going to have AGP video, and it's
20 going to be taped and recorded as well, and there will be
21 a public comment period. You'll be able to -- I'm
22 assuming we will be getting some kind of press release
23 from the senator's office about this at some point.

24 And then a couple other dates for folks to put
25 on their calendars, not just here tonight but in the

1 county in general, and that would be August 7th and
2 August 8th because those are the dates the judge in this
3 decommissioning hearing has scheduled the public
4 participation hearing for the nuclear decommissioning
5 triennial proceeding at the CPUC. And once again, I think
6 they have reserved this room because of its video and
7 television capacity. So the public might want to put
8 those two dates. I think it's the evening of the 7th and
9 the day of the 8th, if I'm not mistaken. So that's all I
10 have to say is just put those dates on your calendar if
11 the public is looking to have further input and
12 participation in the decommissioning process. Thank you
13 very much.

14 MR. ANDERS: Thank you, David.

15 We do have one third speaker, and that's Jane
16 Swanson.

17 MS. SWANSON: Yes, Jane Swanson. I am speaking
18 just as an individual, not on behalf of an organization
19 tonight. And this is very brief and very general, but
20 this discussion has been excellent tonight. And everybody
21 has valid points to be made. But the question is how do
22 you bring it together? And I have no wisdom on that, but
23 I just wanted to point out some reflections on the word
24 expert. Some of the -- a fair amount of the discussion
25 was about the availability of experts and the value of

1 experts. And yeah, experts are very valuable, but I want
2 to point out my own personal thoughts that being an expert
3 does not make one right or wise. If you think about what
4 experts do, in my personal vision, what experts -- there
5 is a risk -- I'm not saying all experts do this, but there
6 is a risk for an expert to get a little bit of tunnel
7 vision and not see beyond it.

8 So I was just thinking -- so talking about
9 technical experts that know a lot about nuclear physics,
10 what have they done for the world so far? Well, they
11 brought us atmospheric testing of weapons which has
12 polluted our earth totally. They brought us the bombing
13 of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and some people justify that.
14 I won't argue about that. I'll just say experts did that,
15 and some of those experts had second thoughts about it
16 also. And so I don't mean my comments to be geared only
17 toward nuclear experts, but it's true of anything. City
18 planners, experts in medicine, whatever, it's easy to get
19 into the tunnel of your expertise and not see the broader
20 vision. That's why I come to these meetings because I am
21 not an expert in anything. But like some people on this
22 panel, I've been around for 75 years, so I know a little
23 bit about life and the bigger picture. Thank you.

24 MR. ANDERS: Thank you very much.

25 Any other members of the public that would like

1 to speak?

2 Okay. Thank you.

3 Panel, this is the opportunity for you to make
4 observations, comments and answer the questions.

5 So Sherri and Frank.

6 MR. MECHAM: Are you going to answer the
7 questions of the gentleman?

8 MS. DANOFF: I'd like to address your inquiry
9 about whether the Independent Safety Council will
10 continue. They are recommending that they continue, not
11 necessarily the same people but the committee continue for
12 just basically 18 months after decommissioning, after
13 cessation of energy production; however, there won't be a
14 decision on that for some months, so I can't remember when
15 that would be. I think not before August is my
16 recollection. And this I am just bringing forward as
17 having attended a recent meeting that they held.

18 MR. HOUGHTON: Can I respond?

19 MS. DANOFF: Sure.

20 MR. HOUGHTON: So will this engagement panel
21 have an opportunity to discuss and make a recommendation
22 on the extension of that committee? Is that something
23 that's in your purview?

24 MS. DANOFF: Yeah, I would think. Thank you for
25 mentioning that.

1 MR. HOUGHTON: Okay.

2 MR. ANDERS: And the other two questions were,
3 just for your information, concern about influence or
4 perception -- I think that was a question to Alex -- and
5 then the cost of the committee.

6 Alex.

7 MR. KARLIN: Yeah. Those are good questions,
8 Mr. Houghton. First, will the Diablo Canyon Independent
9 Safety Committee continue? The committee itself wants to
10 continue. They are suggesting to the PUC that their
11 budget continue after 2025. Right now, they expire in
12 2025. So they are asking for it, and there will be a
13 discussion and PUC will make a decision whether to
14 continue, and if so for how long and in what the role and
15 that sort of thing. That's unknown and PUC will make that
16 decision. It probably won't be until a year from now.

17 Okay. Second, you asked me will I talk about
18 the cost of our committee. I don't know exactly, but I
19 can give you a couple data points. One is the Diablo
20 Canyon Independent Safety Committee has a separate budget
21 that we can all see. It's a ratepayers budget. PUC puts
22 it out there. It's \$900,000 a year. And actually, we are
23 a little under that this year, and that's good, 850 or
24 something. So that was order of magnitude of those three
25 people on that committee, and they meet three times a

1 year. Our committee, PG&E has submitted, if I understand
2 it correctly, in its triennial proceeding documents in
3 December of 2018, a budget -- and maybe Tom or Jim can
4 help me with this -- but I think it's \$1.6 million for
5 three years for public engagement. It doesn't say this
6 panel. It just says "public engagement."

7 So I don't know when you look at cost, there is
8 something to consider. One is the exterior cost -- how
9 much does it cost for this room, how much does it cost for
10 our travel, how much does it cost for X, Y and Z. But the
11 hidden cost is how much does it cost PG&E staff, how many
12 PG&E staffers are sitting here? That isn't in the budget
13 there directly, as far as I can tell. How many PG&E
14 people respond to the questions? I'm not sure whether
15 that's on the books separately or it's just part of their
16 other budget. So cost is something I would be interested
17 in too.

18 Finally, with regard to my proposal or concerns,
19 am I concerned about the perceptions of independence or
20 the reality of independence? I am concerned about the
21 reality, of course. And PG&E is not a nefarious
22 organization. They are trying to get their
23 decommissioning done as efficiently as possible. There's
24 nothing wrong with that. They're good people. They're
25 coming here and trying to help us. But when we had our

1 first meeting, they laid out a charter for us, or Chuck
2 did, and they told us "These are the things that we need
3 by the end of the year in order for us to submit our
4 triennial proceeding. These are the X topics, five or six
5 topics. We need you to cover these, and these are the
6 most important ones."

7 Now, did they control us? Did anyone come to me
8 afterwards and say, "Alex, you've got to vote this way" or
9 "You can't vote that way"? No. But there is a joke, you
10 know, in My Big Fat Greek Wedding, and the man, the father
11 says, "I am the head of the household," and the wife says,
12 "Ah, but I am the neck and I tell you where you are
13 looking so I point the head." And so I think that we're
14 working towards things that PG&E has set up. And we're
15 working independently. Nobody is coming here -- but
16 independence really means you have to have the selection
17 of the people by an independent entity, and it needs to be
18 more transparent.

19 It doesn't undermine communications. I disagree
20 with the -- the Diablo Canyon Independent Safety
21 Committee, those members meet with PG&E frequently all
22 through the year. They meet with me. They meet with
23 Linda. They meet with anybody they want to, and committee
24 communications are not undermined. In fact, I think they
25 are enhanced because when they ask a question, PG&E has to

1 answer it and it has to answer it correctly. When we ask
2 a question, it may be manana, and we don't get an answer
3 for a while.

4 MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Alex.

5 And thank you, Mr. Houghton.

6 MR. HOUGHTON: Just to follow-up, the funding,
7 is it coming from --

8 MR. ANDERS: Mr. Houghton, in deference and
9 fairness to all the other people who presented, our
10 process is three minutes.

11 MR. HOUGHTON: Sure.

12 MR. ANDERS: And the panel will be available,
13 all of us, after the meeting if you have specific
14 questions. Thank you.

15 Yes.

16 MS. WOODRUFF: He also had a question if we
17 receive a per diem, and the answer is no.

18 MR. HOUGHTON: Okay.

19 MR. ANDERS: Any other comments or thoughts?

20 So we have this time to discuss, you do, the
21 path forward and where we go from here. We have -- which
22 I'm going to talk about in a minute. The meeting in
23 September is dedicated to economic impact, which has been
24 noted, and so preparation for that meeting. You have the
25 final decisions on the charter on revisions. You also

1 have the finalization on the spent fuel recommendations,
2 and anything else that the panel chooses to do. So this
3 is an opportunity for that discussion.

4 Yes, Linda.

5 MS. SEELEY: It was suggested to me, and I think
6 it's a terrific idea that we have, that after we finish
7 the spent fuel section, that we not put that away away,
8 but that we address that every year because that's going
9 to be something that continually is coming forward for us.
10 And so that maybe like in the first quarter of each year,
11 we address the current spent fuel concerns and what's
12 happened and what are our recommendations. I am just
13 throwing that out there for -- just to cook.

14 MR. ANDERS: Any other comments, thoughts?

15 MR. KARLIN: I have a question. Could we ask
16 PG&E to tell us what the costs are for this engagement
17 panel, their best estimate?

18 MR. JONES: Sure. I'll get a precise number for
19 you to have them in the follow-up. The Rate Case, I think
20 the number is closer to 300,000 a year of direct costs,
21 plus some level of effort from staff. So that allows for
22 mobilization, the facilitator cost, all those hard and
23 soft costs for the program. We will get you the precise
24 number on that. That's prospective. We've had spits and
25 bits.

1 Frankly, the county has saved us tens of
2 thousands of dollars by meeting here. So for instance,
3 our mobilization to meet at the Embassy Suites for those
4 two days, just for the facility and the video was about
5 \$15,000. The county graciously makes this available to us
6 for free, so we pay only simply AGP staff costs. That's a
7 huge advantage that we have here, our home court advantage
8 in San Luis Obispo versus what San Onofre goes through.
9 So we didn't count on that from a budgeting perspective,
10 and we make sure that we have a margin to do all the work
11 we need to do, but those are the approximate numbers, and
12 we'll get you the hard costs.

13 MR. ANDERS: Jim.

14 MR. WELSCH: You know, the guidance to the team
15 is to fund what's necessary to make the panel effective.
16 So there is no guidance that says, "Here is a point at
17 which, you know, we stop." I mean, for instance, Garrick
18 Risk Institute from UCLA study on used fuel, we haven't
19 determined where that's getting funded from yet. It
20 doesn't matter because it's important to get that
21 information to inform the panel, so we're funding that
22 study. We have the resources in-house. We have risk
23 analysts, well respected. We could have done that study
24 in-house, but we thought it was important to go to an
25 independent organization that's internationally respected,

1 like the Garrick Risk Institute at UCLA, just try to add
2 -- avoid the thought maybe that, well, we crafted it to
3 fit our needs.

4 So I'll just be clear, I mean, we fund -- the
5 goal is we want to make sure you get what you need. Tom
6 and the team look for efficient ways to be good stewards
7 of the money, but the guidance is we'll do what it takes
8 to ensure the panel gets what it needs. Just a little
9 extra background, this is some spend above what Tom is
10 thinking of. And these studies from the UCLA Risk
11 Institute are additional costs that we're going forward
12 with and we'll figure out who pays for them, which bucket
13 of money at PG&E pays for them later.

14 MR. ANDERS: Thank you.

15 Frank.

16 MR. MECHAM: Well, since we're talking about the
17 path forward, I'm curious when the discussion will begin
18 about where do we go from here. We are talking about
19 transportation and we're talking about spent fuel, the
20 economics. Where are we going from there and how often
21 will this panel be required to meet? What type of issues
22 will we be confronted with? And I'm really curious to
23 know where we're going to go. Anybody?

24 MR. KARLIN: Well, that's exactly right, and we
25 shouldn't ask PG&E. We should ask ourselves, obviously,

1 and that's what you're doing. And I think that's a
2 fundamental point that should precede any discussion of an
3 MOU with PG&E about our budget. We need to say what do we
4 want to do, what do we expect it will take, how often do
5 we need to meet. And once we figure out a, quote, agenda
6 or plan like that for the next year, then we put some
7 numbers to it and try to think how much is that going to
8 cost and we work with PG&E to figure out what numbers are
9 right with that agenda that we develop, obviously.

10 MR. MECHAM: I mean, we're already halfway
11 through the year. Everything is moving along pretty
12 quickly, so I'm just trying to get a grasp of where we're
13 going to be going.

14 MR. ANDERS: So based on that comment, one of
15 the things on the panel's agenda as we move forward should
16 be identifying the issues that you want to tackle, what
17 the frequency of the meetings might be and what level of
18 effort would be required to tackle the issues you choose.

19 Yes, Sherri.

20 MS. DANOFF: Do you happen to have handy the
21 calendar that we have done for this year?

22 MR. ANDERS: I have a calendar, yes.

23 MS. DANOFF: You know, maybe you could mention
24 what, you know, we've scheduled already, what topics and
25 so forth.

1 MR. ANDERS: This year -- I think it's
2 September 18th -- we have a meeting, a public meeting,
3 that's dedicated to economic impact. And I believe the
4 date is November 12th where we're talking about
5 transportation and transportation-related issues and
6 impacts.

7 MS. DANOFF: Yes.

8 MR. ANDERS: Yes, Linda.

9 MS. SEELEY: You know, I just mentioned how I
10 want to revisit or would like our panel to revisit the
11 spent fuel issue. I think we also are going to have to
12 revisit the repurposing issue. That's going to be big.
13 The breakwater, the lands, all of those things, those are
14 ongoing, changing things. So just because we've taken
15 this sort of look at all of these issues doesn't mean
16 we've dug into them. So I don't think we are going to be
17 at a loss for things to do.

18 MR. ANDERS: Yes, Kara.

19 MS. WOODRUFF: I wanted to mention, too, in the
20 fall, we hope to take maybe at least two tours. We hope
21 to visit Rancho Seco, which is the closed plant, nuclear
22 plant, outside of Sacramento, and also Humboldt Bay. And
23 in addition to that, the panel has talked about going to
24 visit the Stewardship Council. For those who aren't aware
25 of that, when PG&E declared bankruptcy years and years

1 ago, one of the outcomes of that proceeding was 140,000
2 acres were transferred from PG&E to other entities for the
3 purpose of conservation for public benefit. And the task
4 of looking at those properties and determining how they
5 should be managed and owned in the future was carried out
6 by an entity called the "Stewardship Council." So they
7 have a Sacramento meeting twice in the fall, and we're
8 going to look to take a trip up there and learn more about
9 that precedent.

10 Obviously, PG&E has declared bankruptcy a second
11 time. We don't know what the future holds on the
12 12,000 acres of land called the Diablo Lands, and
13 Stewardship Council provides an interesting precedent. So
14 next year, it would be very nice if we could devote a
15 meeting to the follow-up and lessons learned from our
16 visit to Humboldt Bay and Rancho Seco, and I think another
17 meeting devoted to the Stewardship Council and other land
18 conservation opportunities that may exist would be two
19 great topics.

20 MR. ANDERS: Thank you.

21 Nancy.

22 MS. O'MALLEY: So the path forward, I think our
23 next topic is a huge one, economic impacts. And I think
24 it's very important to our community. So aside from
25 lands, I think our second most-frequent commented topic

1 was the economic impacts of plant closure. And so I don't
2 know if we've announced it yet that Loren Brown will be
3 heading up our committee, our subcommittee on economic
4 impacts. So really, we're open to suggestions from the
5 community.

6 Thank you to David for suggesting this meeting
7 that's coming up on the 28th -- that's a good place to
8 start -- and then forming the subcommittee. And then
9 really we're open to suggestions from the public as well
10 about ideas, ideas for repurposing, as Linda mentioned.
11 So really brainstorming. We're at the early brainstorming
12 stages, and we have got a lot to learn in that area.

13 And then regarding just our panel, I just want
14 to also make sure that really, as everyone knows, as Kara
15 mentioned, a lot of things are out of our hands, but our
16 California Public Utilities Commission, they will actually
17 make a decision as to what this panel structure should
18 look like going forward. That is actually is before the
19 Rate Case, is my understanding, that they will make a
20 decision of if they want to fund the panel to be
21 independent and separate or if it should remain as it is
22 under the utility. And so that's out of our hands, and we
23 will see what they decide.

24 And they will also make a decision on the
25 Independent Safety Committee as to how that should be

1 funded, whether or not they should proceed after plant
2 closure with maybe a more limited charter that focusses
3 more on spent fuel, so those are things to consider.

4 MR. ANDERS: Thank you.

5 That reminds me that to encourage the public,
6 the folks that are here and the folks that might be
7 watching, and others that you might talk with, to utilize
8 the panel's Public Comment Form on the current website and
9 submit your comments, submit your opinions. All of those
10 comments and opinions go to the panel members. So if you
11 have opinions about the structure or anything else, or
12 topics that might be useful for the panel to address,
13 please encourage the public to use that information form
14 and submit their opinions and thoughts.

15 I can't remember, Kara, did you --

16 MS. WOODRUFF: I'm good.

17 MR. ANDERS: Loren.

18 MR. BROWN: Another topic that we'll want to
19 stay on top of, and that is the request for proposals that
20 PG&E is sending out for new cask -- dry cask systems.
21 That's a very important topic. And sometime during the
22 2020, I believe, you'll be receiving those proposals. And
23 as far as possible, I would hope that this panel will be
24 thoroughly informed and even given a chance to express our
25 opinion about what the selection should be.

1 MR. ANDERS: Thank you.

2 Nancy.

3 MS. O'MALLEY: One other issue that we've talked
4 about before was the desalinization plant. I know we had
5 toyed around with having a tour of that and really looking
6 at economic feasibility. That's something of concern to
7 the community as well, so that should be on our agenda.

8 MR. ANDERS: Great.

9 Jim.

10 MR. WELSCH: Not in the interest of guiding the
11 engagement panel, but I just want to be clear in my role
12 as trying to lead our organization on the planning and
13 preparation for decommissioning, the engagement panel here
14 is a key source of recommendation. I've also met with
15 each of our supervisors. I have also met with Jordan
16 Cunningham. You're probably familiar with the Hourglass
17 Project. There is numerous -- so as you strategize, I
18 don't know what your -- is there any opportunities to
19 interact with.

20 Ideally for PG&E, you're not working for me, but
21 what ideally, we would have a fairly unified collective
22 community set of recommendations on repurposing land use,
23 et cetera, because then when we're asking our state to
24 support us, CPUC or otherwise, they don't find themselves
25 so much in the arbitration mode. And so we want to submit

1 to CPUC a plan that has wide support from the community.
2 And so this is a key component. I know the board of
3 supervisors is interested in the Hourglass Project input
4 on repurposing of the site. We know that the board, Adam
5 Hill and Lynn Compton, to focus on decommissioning. So
6 there will be opportunities to make sure there is
7 opportunity for some synergy, perhaps.

8 I'll deal with whatever I get from all three --
9 all the various entities, but the goal on my end will be
10 to be able to put a plan forward for the shareholders and
11 the ratepayers via the CPUC that has broad community
12 support to improve the likelihood that we get the type of
13 support through the state to do this well and do it in a
14 way that excites the community.

15 MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Jim.

16 Kara, and then Loren.

17 MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you, Jim.

18 I have to respond. You said it would be good to
19 get direction from us regarding some of these issues, and
20 we have provided some direction. Take a look at our
21 strategic vision on the lands issue. We heard from a lot
22 of people, nearly unanimous support for conservation of
23 all 12,000 acres. So if you want to know what we think,
24 that's what we think on that issue, 100 percent
25 conservation of the 12,000 acres.

1 Repurposing, we also had a lot of expressed
2 interest in repurposing the facilities on Parcel P.
3 That's a little bit more difficult to get detailed with
4 right now. Nobody is committing to use a building eight
5 years before the plant goes away, but I think there is
6 strong support for conservation of the 12,000 acres that's
7 overwhelming. And there is also very strong support for
8 repurposing, to the extent feasible, of Parcel P
9 facilities. And that's in writing available on the
10 strategic vision on your website. Check it out any time.

11 Thanks.

12 MR. WELSCH: And that's the engagement panel,
13 right?

14 MS. WOODRUFF: Correct.

15 MR. WELSCH: Right. I'm looking to get similar
16 endorsement from our board, et cetera. No, I agree, and I
17 think that's - I'm aware of that. I am just saying that
18 collectively as we move forward with our decisionmaking on
19 planning, decommissioning and land use, I am really trying
20 to ensure I have input from a broad set of stakeholders.
21 This is one group. I have the board of supervisors, they
22 are involved in our permitting. Elected officials
23 represent the community. And I know one supervisor in
24 particular strongly aligns with the suggestions and the
25 recommendations of this panel.

1 I'm not sure because I am not following this
2 close. I assume you've got connections and there is also
3 the opportunity for broader synergy amongst the various
4 entities that have an opportunity to weigh in with PG&E on
5 our plans. So no, I understand.

6 MR. ANDERS: Thank you.

7 Loren.

8 MR. BROWN: Jim, I just want you to know that
9 I've already met with folks at the Hourglass Project, and
10 I am hoping that they will have a strong presence at our
11 September meeting. I know that there is an effort to
12 quantify the economic impact, that there is a report that
13 should become available sometime this summer. I am hoping
14 that that will be represented.

15 We've had a number of different entities that
16 are interested in how we can repurpose. I think the whole
17 issue of repurposing inevitably is going to be part of the
18 conversation at that meeting. I would invite any of you
19 on the panel, as well as the public, if you have ideas of
20 what kind of content and invited speakers we should have
21 at that Septembers meeting, please direct those to me.
22 And further, if any of you want to be on that
23 subcommittee, among you panel members, would you let me
24 know.

25 MR. ANDERS: Thank you.

1 Dena.

2 MS. BELLMAN: Thank you.

3 Well, I will volunteer because my next message
4 was going to be that I sat on several economic development
5 and impact committees, and so I know that we'll have
6 significant contribution in San Luis City, other cities
7 and their economic development folks. The chambers of
8 each area will have significant suggestions and thoughts
9 on how that should work. And then I think we've got some,
10 you know, other entities, like Cal Poly and other folks
11 like that that will have a lot to say, so I think that it
12 can be a really engaging meeting. And I think we can
13 really use a lot of their input to guide potentially
14 things that we wouldn't come up with ourselves, so I would
15 look forward to that.

16 MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Dena.

17 Alex.

18 MR. KARLIN: Yeah. I think in terms of our
19 recommendations and PG&E, remember last December, PG&E
20 filed a \$4.8 billion ratemaking request with the PUC
21 asking for rates to be increased to cover the
22 decommissioning costs. Various people and entities and
23 parties were able to intervene and challenge some or
24 various parts of PG&E's request. The County of San Luis
25 Obispo filed an intervention, and I read it the day it was

1 filed. And one of their big points was they were greatly
2 concerned that this panel, this panel, was not independent
3 enough. And they specifically cited the land use and
4 repurposing problem. They said this panel had made a
5 number of recommendations regarding land use and
6 repurposing, and none of them are reflected in PG&E's rate
7 making request.

8 Now, you could just throw that off as a timing
9 issue. Our formal report didn't come out until
10 January 8th or something, and PG&E submitted their thing
11 on December 8th or 15th, but PG&E was fully aware of what
12 we were thinking and what we wanted vis-à-vis land use.
13 And the county itself raised as a question about this
14 panel's value and independence, that PG&E had not
15 incorporated our suggestions regarding land use and
16 repurposing.

17 Now, I might also mention that our panel
18 recommended that the decommissioning be completed within
19 10 years. PG&E's submission to PUC for \$4.8 billion
20 dollars contemplates a 13-plus year decommissioning
21 process. So you know, sure, they're not going accept all
22 of our recommendations, but the county itself raised
23 questions of "Well, you don't even discuss them. You
24 don't even discuss what the panel recommended."

25 MR. ANDERS: Thanks, Alex.

1 Kara, and then Loren.

2 MS. WOODRUFF: I want to respond to one issue
3 about the timing. I mean, I think that what the county
4 wrote was interesting, but I think there was some
5 follow-up conversations after that where they really
6 stepped back from some of those comments. I know, Frank,
7 you talked to Rita. I did as well. So that one I think
8 we need to do some further digging to understand where the
9 county really stands.

10 But I can tell you on one land use issue, I am
11 very encouraged because our vision statement specifically
12 stated we wanted to ensure the in-perpetuity conservation
13 of the 1200 acres next to Wild Cherry Canyon. And here we
14 are five months later, and we're hearing a commitment that
15 that's going to happen. So I am actually encouraged, not
16 discouraged when it come to land use. That's all I want
17 to say.

18 MR. ANDERS: Frank.

19 MR. MECHAM: And I did follow up with comments
20 that came from the county. I spoke to county counsel as
21 well as the CEO, and they did step back on some of those
22 issues. They said it needed to be clarified. They
23 strongly support what we're doing and they think we're
24 doing a good job with this. And I said, "Well, it just
25 didn't come out that way to some." And they said, well,

1 they apologize for that, but they said they had no problem
2 with what we're doing.

3 MR. ANDERS: Thank you.

4 Any other comments or questions?

5 Yes, Trevor.

6 MR. KEITH: I think just moving forward on the
7 agenda, as we get closer to PG&E submitting land use
8 applications, it's something that's on our kind what we
9 call our Tier 1 kind of work plan. So the county
10 planning/building, we can come out and update the panel as
11 to where we are in the process as things move forward, so
12 just kind of putting that out there for the panel.

13 MR. ANDERS: Great. Thank you.

14 Yes, Loren.

15 MR. BROWN: Yeah. I just want to make sure that
16 we are clear about when we are going to reach a decision
17 on the matters that were the subject of the agenda today.
18 There are two matters. One, is our panel going to make a
19 recommendation to PG&E and to the CPUC whether this panel
20 should continue or whether we want to recommend
21 consideration of an independent, so that's one decision.
22 The second decision is the proposed revisions to the
23 charter. And those should be decided, and I think as soon
24 as we can because these have been contentious issues. We
25 need to put them behind us. Let's make a decision and

1 move on. And I think at the next administrative meeting
2 that should be top of the agenda.

3 MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Loren.

4 Any other comments or questions?

5 As I mentioned before, our next meeting is
6 September 18th, and it's going to be held here at this
7 location, and the topic is economic impact. Loren and his
8 committee will be working to pull that meeting together
9 and to line up speakers and collaborate and coordinate
10 with other organizations that are working on this issue.

11 Yes, Frank.

12 MR. MECHAM: I want to follow up on Loren's
13 comment. How do we make this determination? How do we --
14 are we going to do this publicly or are we going to do
15 this in an administrative meeting? How are we going to
16 make a determination on saying, yes, we support the
17 revisions to the charter and which way we want to go with
18 this panel?

19 MR. ANDERS: It's my understanding at the last
20 working meeting, this panel had agreed that you would
21 propose to move forward with the existing structure --
22 that was an agreement -- and work on modifications to the
23 charter that would make the panel more independent within
24 the charter mechanism. And that's recorded in our notes
25 and basic agreement. Alex wasn't at that meeting.

1 And I assume, Alex, you would disagree.

2 MR. KARLIN: And you're right, I wasn't there.

3 I apologize I wasn't there. And if that's what the panel
4 voted on and that's what you voted on. I don't think
5 there's any suspense there. I do understand that the
6 actual amendments to the charter were put out for -- you
7 know, were inviting public notice and that that may be
8 something for the next meeting, but the details of that
9 are different. And I respectfully disagree on the merits.

10 MR. ANDERS: So as I understand it, the panel
11 has -- unless someone here disagrees, has agreed to, you
12 know, move forward in this structure, feel it is generally
13 working well. The CPUC will make a decision independent
14 of this body. And the panel will -- as I can't remember
15 who put it, Kara, someone, we'll work with that. But the
16 question is the charter.

17 So Kara.

18 MS. WOODRUFF: Well, I think, as I understand
19 it, we tentatively have approved as a panel, at least by
20 majority vote, to make the changes we discussed tonight,
21 but we're asking the community to provide input. So we
22 don't want to approve them yet.

23 MR. ANDERS: Right.

24 MS. WOODRUFF: We want to give people at least
25 30 days to consider it and provide input. If we get no

1 feedback or if we get feedback that informs us, we may
2 want to change the charter. We'll have to wait and see.
3 But I don't think we want to formally approve our
4 suggestions until we hear from the community. And I think
5 after that, we can either decide as a panel to do it
6 administratively or we can do it more formally at the next
7 board meeting -- in the September meeting, if we prefer.

8 But in any case, I think we really have to allow for
9 community input before we formally adopt the changes.

10 MR. ANDERS: I would recommend that we ask the
11 public to get their input in within two weeks so that
12 input would be available on your next working meeting.

13 MS. WOODRUFF: Except for the fact I said
14 tonight that we would give them 30 days, so I don't want
15 to change that. The slide said July 15th, so I don't want
16 to depart from something that we're posting on the
17 website. So I think since it says July 15th, if it's okay
18 with everyone, I think we want to give people at least
19 that long to comment.

20 MR. ANDERS: Okay. Sounds good.

21 Linda.

22 MS. SEELEY: It's my understanding that this
23 panel, we don't vote. We reach consensus. And I
24 appreciate that about this panel because I think that the
25 process for reaching consensus allows us to really air our

1 concerns and understand what other people are thinking.
2 And so, to me, that is a healthier way to resolve issues
3 than voting where people sort of sometimes hold back the
4 why of what they are doing rather than expressing the why
5 and persuading others.

6 MR. ANDERS: What you've done in the past where
7 there was a dissenting perspective or difference of
8 opinion is you have worked on the basis of general
9 consensus where typically all but one or two people,
10 mostly one, had a different opinion, and then you included
11 that opinion in a minority opinion or perspective with the
12 majority opinion or the collective opinion so that nothing
13 is hidden, nothing is not on the table. Everyone who
14 looks at that understands that for the most part there was
15 a general consensus and there was a different perspective
16 and here it is.

17 So I would anticipate the charter would be very
18 similar. And it's my understanding, and correct me if I
19 am wrong, so for moving forward purposes, that the panel
20 did agree to continue and recommend the current structure
21 with efforts to make the charter more independent at your
22 last meeting. And if anybody has a different
23 understanding, please say so because that would be a
24 general consensus by the panel.

25 MR. BROWN: Chuck, I think it was more in the

1 spirit of a tentative decision subject to receiving public
2 input as a result of this meeting. I mean, that's why it
3 was on the agenda tonight to air these issues, so I think
4 we do need to have a confirmation of that decision.

5 MR. ANDERS: Okay. Thank you.

6 So at a future meeting, we will have the
7 opportunity for the panel to consider all of the public
8 input and either reconfirm their preliminary direction or
9 change it.

10 Great, thank you.

11 Any other comments, thoughts?

12 So what I have noted is a lot of opportunities
13 here. One is to finalize the potential revisions and
14 recommendations for changes in the charter. We need to
15 finalize any spent fuel storage recommendations. We need
16 to prepare for the upcoming economic impact meetings and
17 do outreach and coordination related to that. And we need
18 to start thinking about future agenda items for next year,
19 and really identify future agenda items in the process of
20 putting together an MOU with PG&E.

21 Did I miss anything?

22 Okay. So again, the next public meeting is
23 September 18th at this location at 6:00 p.m., and topic is
24 economic impact of decommissioning. And with that, we are
25 ready to adjourn. Before we do, I just want to check in

1 with everybody and see if there is anything in future
2 meetings where you would like to see changed or improved
3 or things that you've identified in the meetings the way
4 they are that you really like and want to reinforce them.
5 Any comments? You like our structure?

6 Yes.

7 MR. MECHAM: I'll make one comment. Relative to
8 the meetings that we've had and the meetings that we're
9 going to be going forward with, I've only seen one elected
10 official here ever, and we've offered that. As a matter
11 of fact, when David and I went to the meetings, we
12 extended an invitation for any elected official to come if
13 they had any questions, and we haven't seen any of them.
14 I know we also send letters or we send e-mails out to the
15 city councils, so it is kind of difficult to hear what
16 they have to say if they don't come. And so I just
17 thought I'd throw that out there. If they want to
18 participate, if they want information, we'd be happy to
19 provide it, but I haven't had any requests.

20 MR. ANDERS: In previous discussions, the panel
21 has indicated a desire to enhance the outreach to the
22 local cities and other organizations, and a number of
23 panel members have volunteered to make presentations and
24 keep those organizations informed and create a stronger
25 bond with them, and that would probably increase the

1 participation at these meetings and their involvement. So
2 that's another thing we need to put on your agenda is to
3 structure an opportunity for panel members to meet with
4 city councils or make presentations at their meetings and
5 provide the resources that are necessary for you to do
6 that well.

7 Yes, Alex.

8 MR. KARLIN: I would just amend that with one
9 thing, Frank. Greg Haas of Congressman Salud Carbajal's
10 office here in town has almost always attended these
11 meetings. He is not here at the moment. He was here
12 earlier in the evening. And I appreciate that fact, that
13 they are paying attention. I think others are paying some
14 attention, but it is a problem. If these people don't
15 think our activities are important enough to bother
16 coming, maybe it tells you something about what they
17 think. They're not paying attention.

18 MR. ANDERS: Dena.

19 MS. BELLMAN: I would disagree. I have many,
20 many meetings with city and county officials. And quite
21 honestly, I think after those conversations, they feel
22 that they're updated. Also, a lot of them do it from
23 home. I mean, we go pretty late so they're streaming it
24 or watching it. And I have had several feedback that, you
25 know, they couldn't do it that night, there was a

1 conflict, but they watched it a different night.

2 MR. KARLIN: Carbajal came to our meeting, our
3 workshop on spent fuel.

4 MR. MECHAM: I guess my point is that when I was
5 a mayor of a city and also the county supervisor, when
6 there's an issue this big, you'll either appoint somebody
7 to be there or, you will be there, or you will assign one
8 of the council members or one of the board of supervisors
9 to kind of stay updated. Now, I know the supervisors do
10 that because they have a liaison and they do get
11 information, but it was a little disappointing when we met
12 with the city representatives that it just seems like they
13 were asking questions that we shook our heads and thought,
14 "Boy, they are really not in the loop with this." And I
15 didn't really get from them that they wanted any more
16 information.

17 I don't know, maybe I'm wrong, but maybe it's
18 just not as important -- I think in a lot of cases, out of
19 sight, out of mind. I know it's that way in the North
20 County, there's not much interest in this. The only time
21 that there seemed to be interest from all the cities is
22 when they talked about the economic part of it and they
23 wanted some money from this.

24 MR. ANDERS: Thank you.

25 Dena.

1 MS. BELLMAN: So I do think that when -- there
2 is an expectation, in my conversations, that when we are
3 looking for specific input on a specific item, I do think
4 that they expect that we may reach out to them more
5 significantly. So probably the outreach process that
6 you're talking about would assist with that.

7 MR. ANDERS: Another thing to think about, we
8 will report the viewership also, because with these
9 meetings being live-streamed and recorded and available to
10 view at people's convenience, you know, physical
11 attendance is not necessarily a direct indication of the
12 number of people that are actually watching or involved.

13 Any other comments?

14 MS. DANOFF: Well, I was just thinking that the
15 location of Diablo is the unincorporated area, and so it
16 would make sense, to me at least, that the board of
17 supervisors would be the entity that pays the most
18 attention. That's all. Thank you.

19 MR. ANDERS: All right. With that, let's
20 consider the meeting adjourned. Thank you everyone, and
21 everyone travel safely.

22 (Hearing concluded at 9:10 p.m.)

23

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA.)
2 COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO) SS.
3)

4 I, CAROLYNN E. SPERE, CERTIFIED SHORTHAND
5 REPORTER, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING PAGES
6 COMPRISE A TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS
7 HAD IN THE WITHIN-ENTITLED MATTER, REPORTED BY ME BY
8 STENOTYPE ON THE DATE AND AT THE HOUR HEREIN WRITTEN, AND
9 THEREAFTER TRANSCRIBED UNDER MY DIRECTION INTO
10 TYPEWRITING.

11 IN COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 8016 OF THE BUSINESS
12 AND PROFESSIONS CODE, I CERTIFY UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY
13 THAT I AM A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER WITH LICENSE
14 NUMBER 10091 IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.

15 WITNESS MY HAND THIS 24TH DAY OF JUNE, 2019.

16 
17 _____

18 CAROLYNN E. SPERE
19
20
21
22
23
24
25